

# THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXXI.—No. 21

SUNDAY, MAY 21, 1911

PRICE TWOPENCE

*The world HAS to obey him who thinks and sees in the world. The world can alter the manner of that; can either have it as blessed continuous summer-sunshine, or as unblest black thunder and tornado,—with unspeakable difference of profit to the world! The manner of it is very alterable; the matter and fact of it is not alterable by any power under the sky. Light; or, failing that, lightning: the world can take its choice.*

—THOMAS CARLYLE.

## The Raw Material of Religion.

IN all discussions on religious education in State schools the word "Rights" plays a prominent part. We hear much of the rights of the parent, the rights of the citizen, the rights of the teacher, and the rights of the community. Only occasionally, and in a more or less casual manner, do we hear about the rights of the child. In the quarrels of the adults the child has, so to speak, been mislaid. We have been so concerned in discussing who shall give the education that we have almost forgotten what it is we are educating. We select the teaching that will please adults, and neglect the more important question of what education will suit the child. And surely the child is, or ought to be, the chief consideration. Perhaps when we are all fully alive to the fact that there is a child involved in the question, even that the child is the question, a saner view of the matter may obtain. We may then realise that a by no means unimportant aspect of the case against religious instruction is that—quite apart from the question of whether religion is true or false—it is obviously and demonstrably unfitted to become part of a child's school education.

In a sinister sense it is true that professional religionists do not forget the child. On the contrary, they are keenly alive to its existence, and—from their point of view—rightly regard it as one of their most important assets. For apart from the child the future of religion is positively hopeless. I do not think that a case can be cited anywhere of a person brought up without religion, who has received a fair education, and who on arriving at maturity has embraced religion. Where the "conversion" of mature individuals occurs it is traceable to the power of early influences, or to emotional forces operating upon a mentally ill-equipped or mentally ill-balanced constitution. To secure itself a future, religion must effect a lodgment while each individual is young. There is an infection period for religion as for certain infantile diseases. And the religious germ, once introduced, opens the organism to recurrent attacks from germs of the same or from kindred species.

There is an underlying reason, deeply embedded in human nature, why a susceptibility to religion should characterise the immaturity of the individual. It lies in the fact that religious ideas are characteristic of the immaturity of the race. A civilised people never create a religion. At most they perpetuate it; and it is nearly always a perpetuation with modification. Their function is critical and iconoclastic. The origins of all religious ideas have to be sought amid conditions that are now only found in uncivilised communities, or in civilised ones only so far as they

duplicate the mental stages through which their ancestors have passed. And this duplication occurs more or less with each of us. In a rough and ready way one may say that each child is, in the earlier stages of its mental development, a picture in miniature of the once normal condition of the average adult. The fear of a child in face of the unknown, the indistinct sense of causation, the readiness to ascribe life to inanimate objects, the strong tendency to read its own feelings into all around it, bring us face to face with the mental conditions from which religion springs and to which religion still makes its most fervent appeals.

Childhood thus offers a natural opportunity for the inculcation of religious ideas. A child's mind is normally in the fetishistic stage, and to it, one readily admits, religion is so far natural. But with us a child is not destined for life in a savage community, but in a civilised one. And the normal and vital forces of its environment make of necessity for the destruction of fetishism and of supernaturalism in all its forms. Nor, under proper conditions, would there be any need to trouble over this fetishistic stage of mental growth. A perfectly healthy expression could be found in fairy tales or poetry, while the pressure of a properly organised social life would prevent its perpetuation beyond the years suitable to its expression. But this natural and proper growth is not permitted. Professional religion feels that once the child escapes its control it is for ever free. And so, by means of parents with a mistaken sense of duty, and a professional priesthood with a keen sense of self-interest, this passing mental phase is seized and by artificial stimulation strengthened and perpetuated through life.

One need go no farther than these simple considerations to understand the anxiety of priests of all creeds to force religion upon the child. Childhood is the most favorable period—practically the only period—for the inculcation of religion. It is when the sense of the mysterious is strong, and it is enforced by a feeling of helplessness and a consciousness of ignorance that religion grips its devotees strongly. At other times it may strike one here and there as a plausible speculation, but it fails to rouse a strong sense of conviction and to awaken a belief that religion is of all things the most important to a right ordering of life. The priest is thus driven to fight for the possession of the child as the one means of perpetuating his power. Whether the child is captured in school or out of school matters little. If school, home, and Church combine so much the better. But captured the child must be if religion is to live. In a very special sense the child is the raw material of religion.

It may be said that the priest is only doing what we all do more or less—training the child in the direction we would have it go. This is true, although there are one or two important distinctions to be made. In the first place, I do not believe that anyone is justified in giving a child as truths what are at best merely speculations, however valuable they may appear to us. Children should have their individuality respected equally with that of adults, and there are few adults who would not resent a teacher putting before them as unquestioned truths things that were no better than speculations, and were, in fact, hotly contested. Not less care, but infinitely

more care should be exercised in this matter towards children. The responsibility of the adult is increased by the helplessness of the child. And in the next place a distinction must surely be drawn between training in social habits and instruction in mental and moral teachings as to the value of which we are all substantially agreed, and which in the form in which they are given are suitable to the child's understanding, and teachings that are subjects of the keenest dispute, and which are far beyond the child's comprehension. At any rate, we do see that the reason for social and moral instruction and mental training becomes clearer to the child as it grows older. With religion the mystery remains to the end, or if the mystery goes the religion usually goes with it.

But the more serious objection to religious instruction is that it does not constitute a part of real instruction at all. To confuse the understanding is not to instruct, nor can mystification be transformed into enlightenment. A good teacher seeks to make a pupil independent of him; a priest to keep one dependent upon him for guidance. Rational education seeks to convince; religion, at most, instructs. In the one case, proof or disproof is available. In the other case, nothing of the kind exists. The former aims chiefly at training the reason and exciting a love of inquiry; the latter lulls reason to sleep, exalts faith, and treats critical inquiry as more or less reprehensible. Examination and criticism are foreign to the truly religious mind, and are never submitted to without protest. And, after all, the most valuable part of a child's education is not *what* it learns, but *how* it learns. It is the development of capacity that is of importance, not the loading with knowledge. Given the first, knowledge may be acquired at leisure. But without the development and training of capacity all the knowledge in the world is only so much unusable lumber. The value of any education lies in the temper of mind induced, the habits formed, the custom of finding reasons for beliefs, the cultivation of a habit of sane criticism, the development of the power to examine opinions with the minimum degree of prejudice. Given all this, and the child becomes a valuable social asset. Without it, he becomes the dupe of all who are acute enough to prey upon his weaknesses.

The child is the raw material out of which church and chapel create their future patrons. This is the bottom fact of the situation. In church and chapel habits are developed, the seeds of which were sown in the impressionable years of childhood. Hence the efforts of the priests of all religions to get control of the child. Having secured this the rest is practically easy work. Without this nothing is possible. The tenacity of early impressions is notorious. The man dying in delirium babbles of his childhood days; the condemned criminal thinks of the time when he learned his lessons at his mother's knee. The religious lessons learned during childhood seldom completely disappear. Their effects lurk in the innermost recesses of our being, ready to assert themselves when we are most completely off our guard. We may not always be conscious of their presence or of their power, but they are there like the scar of a wound long since healed.

The child is not only the raw material out of which religion makes its clients, it is also the raw material from which the citizen of the future is fashioned. Consequently, the struggle between the priest and the social reformer is far more than a mere contest of opinions, it is a struggle for the direction of civilisation. To religion the question is one of life and death. In a modern civilised State it cannot hope to control the adult mind in virtue of the power it derives from the vital forces of art, literature, science, or sociology. For all these inevitably clash with the teachings of religion and undermine its authority. Its only chance of living on is to mould the plastic mind of childhood to conformity with a set of doctrines that it shrinks from placing before the liberated adult intelligence. If religion is to rule, it can only do so by imposing the past upon

the present. The issue is, therefore, a simple and yet a profoundly important one. It is, in a word, whether the developing mind of the child is to be directed by agencies which, however imperfect, have at least served to raise mankind from savagery to civilisation, and placed him a monarch where he once cringed a slave; or by a priesthood which, under all its forms, and whether consciously or unconsciously, has had the effect of retarding the development of the mind and placing an embargo upon much that is most dignified and lovable in human nature.

C. COHEN.

### "Where are your Hospitals?"

SUCH is the question perpetually and triumphantly hurled at the heads of Freethinkers by enthusiastic but ignorant defenders of the Christian faith. It sounds very plausible and is believed to be terribly crushing. Vain is it to inform them that Freethought does not exist for the immediate purpose of building hospitals, but for that of overthrowing supernatural religion, which, had there been any truth at the back of it, would have obviated the necessity of founding hospitals. Hospitals are, indeed, but a cloud of witnesses loudly proclaiming the non-existence of God. Surely, all will agree that disease is a defect in the constitution of Nature, and that hospitals are merely a human provision for successfully treating the sick poor. As everybody ought to know, they have been in existence from earliest times. In ancient Greece the temple with its adjacent buildings was everywhere utilised as a hospital. At Rhodes, Cnidus, and Cos there were celebrated medical schools, and the inscriptions at Athens tell us that the doctors attended the poor gratuitously. "Besides the temple schools and hospitals," the secretary of the Charity Organisation Society, London, says, "there was a secular organisation of medical aid and relief. States appointed trained medical men as physicians, and provided for them medical establishments (*iatrcia*, 'large houses with large doors full of light') for the reception of the sick, and for operations there were provided beds, instruments, medicines, etc. At these places also pupils were taught. A lower degree of medical establishment was to be found at the barbers' shops. Out-patients were seen at the *iatrcia*. They were also visited at home. There were doctors' assistants and slave doctors." Plato speaks of the slave-doctors in his *Laws*, iv., 720, stating that they did "a great service to the master of the house, who in this manner is relieved of the care of his slaves." There were also travelling physicians whose first duty, on entering a town, was to attend to the sick poor.

The same thing is true of Ancient Rome also. Dr. Emile Reich, in his *History of Civilisation*, refers in glowing terms to the wonderful magnanimity and benevolence practised by the Roman people. Lecky admits that there "are traces of the distribution of medicine to the sick poor"; that "there were private infirmaries for slaves, and also, it is believed, military hospitals." At first the head of each house acted as its physician, treating his family, his slaves, and his friends. Then professional doctors appeared, and in each house there was an infirmary to which the sick were conveyed for proper treatment. Lecky mentions "a very valuable, but little-known book," called *Collections Relative to the Systematic Relief of the Poor* (London, 1815), in which the opinion is maintained that there were public as well as private hospitals in Pagan Rome. Lecky, while admitting that the State did administer charity on a large scale, yet casts suspicion upon its motive, claiming that it was "dictated much more by policy than by benevolence." But Tacitus makes it abundantly clear how unjustifiable such a suspicion is. A fearful disaster had just occurred at Fidenæ, not far from the imperial city, in which multitudes of people perished, while "the maimed and lacerated lingered in torment, beholding, as long as daylight lasted, their wives and

children in equal agony, and, during the night, pierced to the heart by their shrieks and groans." News of the calamity spread like wildfire, and crowds from Rome rushed to the spot. "One lamented a brother, another his near relative; children wept for their parents, and almost all for their friends." Then Tacitus speaks thus:—

"The grandes of Rome displayed their humanity on this occasion; they threw open their doors, they ordered medicines to be distributed, and the physicians attended with assiduity in every quarter. The city of Rome recalled, in that juncture, an image of ancient manners, when, after a battle bravely fought, the sick and wounded were received with open arms, and relieved by the generosity of their country" (*Annals*, iv., 62, 63).

Those who are fairly familiar with the teachings of Pagan philosophy would have been woefully disappointed had the Romans behaved in any other fashion on such a mournful occasion.

Now let us turn to Christian charity, the praises of which Lecky so lustily sings. Of course, from Lecky, as from the Bible, it is possible to prove any assertion, even the wildest; and nothing is easier than to quote him to his own undoing. Indeed, when he says that "Christianity for the first time made charity a rudimentary virtue" (*History of European Morals*, vol. ii., p. 79), he contradicts his own statements in the preceding pages, as well as the uniform teaching of the Stoics. Mr. J. A. Farrer is much nearer the truth when, in his *Paganism and Christianity*, p. 79, he observes:—

"There is, indeed, no fact more patent in history than that with the triumph of Christianity under Constantine the older and finer spirit of charity died out of the world, and gave place to an intolerance and bigotry which were its extreme antithesis, and which have only in recent years come to be mitigated."

With this observation in mind, let us consider the motive which prompted the establishment of the first public Christian hospital. The founder of it was a lady, Fabiola by name, whose only object was to do penance for her sins. This is frankly admitted by Lecky himself. While claiming that "Christianity for the first time made charity a rudimentary virtue, giving it a leading place in the moral type, and in the exhortations of its teachers," he does not scruple to state that the very first Christian hospital was erected "as an act of penance." In other words, the motive that led to its establishment was the most selfish conceivable. It was not benevolence that inspired Fabiola, but self-love, the desire to ingratiate herself with Heaven. Lecky admits that Christianity regards "the poor as the special representatives of the Christian Founder, thus making the love of Christ, rather than the love of man, the principle of charity." This is perfectly true; but its being true is the completest condemnation of Christianity imaginable. In a world created, sustained, and governed by a God of justice and of love, the presence of rich and poor, of disease, suffering, sorrow, and endless evils, is unthinkable and unbelievable; and yet, however unthinkable and unbelievable, it is an undoubted reality. Blind to the real situation, an Anglican missionary in Nova Scotia rhapsodises thus:—

"Visit the homes for lepers, schools for the blind, homes for the fallen and afflicted, asylums for the insane, and hospitals for the sick, and then say, if you can or if you wish, that there is no sympathy, or that there is no sacrifice, in the world to-day. And when you have seen these things, praise the Lord for his goodness and for his wonderful works to the children of men."

According to the missionary, and he by no means stands alone, we are to praise the Lord for his marvellous condescension in inspiring Christian people to do their utmost to nullify or counteract his own shortcomings as Creator, Preserver, and Ruler of the world. Leprosy, blindness, affliction, insanity, and sickness are symptoms of imperfection, evidences of incompetence in the designer and director of the processes of Nature, if designer and director there be, and the conclusion to which reason forces us is

that their existence, which cannot be denied, negatives the existence of an infinitely powerful, just, and loving Creator and Ruler of the Universe. On the assumption that such a Deity exists, our hospitals mock him to his face. "Where are your hospitals?" unbelievers are tauntingly asked, and their only answer is, "Be proud of *your* hospitals, if you dare, and reconcile the necessity for them with your belief in God." But Christians deliberately decline to discuss the subject in this light. So far is the Anglican missionary just quoted from apprehending the real point at issue that he does not stop short of laughing Atheists to scorn, calling them "fools," and saying:—

"Those who a few years ago won their fame by lecturing against the faith, what have they gained? To-day they are gone, but still the good things of God flow on like a mighty river, and 'he that doth the will of God abideth for ever.'"

The ignorance betrayed in that short extract is abysmal, and nothing more needs to be said about it.

We will grant that hospitals are primarily of religious origin, and that in Christendom they are mainly Christian institutions; but what requires to be pointed out is that when they came into existence disease was looked upon either as a material substance to be extracted, or an evil spirit to be exorcised by some form of incantation. In either case disease came from God as the punishment of wrongdoing; and, in the last analysis, the only possible healer of it was its sender. In the Æsculapian schools the priests were physicians only as God's representatives. The habit of praying for the sick originated in the belief that in reality there is no earthly cure for any disease. The physician is helpless except merely as a Divine agent. Christians still pray God to restore the sick, but few of them believe that he ever does it. Still the Christian Church has never realised that disease is a thing that either can or ought to be wiped out. She contributes largely to the support of, and prays earnestly for God's blessing upon, hospitals; but she has never even dreamed of encouraging the scientific study of disease with a view to its total extermination. Hospitals are splendid institutions and deserve generous support; but had it not been for the arrest, for fully fifteen hundred years, of scientific investigation, for which Christianity alone is responsible, it is possible that ere to-day poverty would have ceased to be, and disease entirely stamped out. The preaching of the false gospel that poverty is a blessing in disguise—to the poor, and that sickness is an instrument God uses for chastening purposes, has done much to engender and perpetuate unjust economic conditions and to retard the victory over disease. Hospitals will doubtless be needed for some considerable time yet; but forces are now at work which are calculated, if they get fairplay, to abolish poverty and to eradicate all disease from the world. Let science have free scope, the science of sociology and the science of medicine, and in sixty or seventy years from now both poverty and sickness will be things of the past. And soon thereafter the last remnant of the superstition which has unhappily dominated the world so long would finally vanish. The signs of the times are most favorable. One by one the so-called essentials of Christianity are being surrendered by the divines, and day by day the Church is being materially impoverished. But science is marching on to glorious triumph. Then hospitals will be sought for in vain.

J. T. LLOYD.

## Humanity.—II.

(Concluded from p. 305.)

PLINY, who corresponded with the emperor Trajan, and whose name is familiar to the student of Christian Evidences, exhorted parents to take a deep interest in the education of their children. He

largely endowed an institution in his native town of Como for the assistance of the children of the poor. His humanity was extended to the slaves. He treated his own with great kindness, allowing them to dispose of their own earnings, and even to make wills. Of masters who had no regard for their slaves, he said, "I do not know if they are great and wise; but one thing I do know, they are not men." Dion Chrysostom, another Stoic, plainly declared that slavery was an infringement of the natural rights of men, who were all born for liberty; a dictum which cannot be paralleled in any part of the New Testament. It must be admitted, indeed, that Paul, in sending the slave Onesimus back to his master Philemon, did bespeak humane and even brotherly treatment for the runaway; but he bespoke it for him as a Christian, not simply as a man, and uttered no single word in rebuke of the institution of slavery.

Plutarch's humanity was noble and tender. "The proper end of man," he said, "is to love and to be loved." He regarded his slaves as inferior members of his own family. How strong, yet how dignified, is his condemnation of masters who sold their slaves when disabled by old age. He protests that the fountain of goodness and humanity should never dry up in a man. "For myself," he said, "I should never have the heart to sell the ox which had long labored on my ground, and could no longer work on account of old age, still less could I chase a slave from his country, from the place where he has been nourished for so long, and from the way of life to which he has been so long accustomed." Sentiments like these were the natural precursors of the abolition of slavery, as far as it could be abolished by moral considerations.

Epicetetus, the great Stoic philosopher, who had himself been a slave, taught the loftiest morality. Pascal admits that he was "one of the philosophers of the world who have best understood the duty of man." He disdained slavery from the point of view of the masters, as he abhorred it from the point of view of the slaves. "As a healthy man," he said, "does not wish to be waited upon by the infirm, or desire that those who live with him should be invalids, the freeman should not allow himself to be waited upon by slaves, or leave those who live with him in servitude." It is idle to pretend, as Professor Schmidt of Strasburg does, that the ideas of Epicetetus are "colored with a reflection of Christianity." The philosopher's one reference to the Galileans, by whom he is thought to have meant the Christians, is somewhat contemptuous. Professor Schmidt says he "misunderstood" the Galileans; but George Long, the translator of Epicetetus, is probably truer in saying that he "knew little about the Christians, and only knew some examples of their obstinate adherence to the new faith and the fanatical behavior of some of the converts." It should be remembered that Epicetetus was almost a contemporary of St. Paul, and the accurate students of early Christianity will be able to estimate how far it was likely, at that time, to have influenced the philosophers of Rome.

Marcus Aurelius was one of the wisest and best of men. Emperor of the civilised world, he lived a life of great simplicity, bearing all the burdens of his high office, and drawing philosophy from the depths of his own contemplation. His *Meditations* were only written for his own eyes; they were a kind of philosophical diary; and they have the charm of perfect sincerity. He was born A.D. 121, he became Emperor A.D. 161, and died A.D. 180, after nineteen years of a government which illustrated Plato's words about the good that would ensue when kings were philosophers and philosophers were kings. Cardinal Barberini, who translated the Emperor's *Meditations* into Italian, in 1675, dedicated the translation to his own soul, to make it "redder than his purple at the sight of the virtues of this Gentile."

Marcus Aurelius combines reason with beautiful sentiment. His emotion is always accompanied by thought. Here, for instance, is a noble passage on the social commonwealth—"For we are made for

co-operation, like feet, like hands, like eyelids, like the rows of the upper and lower teeth. To act against one another then is contrary to nature; and it is acting against one another to be vexed and to turn away." In a still loftier passage he says—and let us remember he says it to himself, not to an applauding audience, but quietly, and with absolute truth, and no taint of theatricality—"My nature is rational and social; and my city and country, so far as I am Antoninus, is Rome; but so far as I am a man, it is the world." In his brief, pregnant way, he states the law of human solidarity—"That which is not good for the swarm, neither is it good for the bee." And who could fail to appreciate this sentiment, coming as it did from the ruler of a great empire?—"One thing here is worth a great deal, to pass thy life in truth and justice, with a benevolent disposition even to liars and unjust men."

Here, again, it is the fashion in some circles, to pretend that Marcus Aurelius was influenced by the spread of Christian ideas. George Long, however, speaks the language of truth and sobriety in saying, "It is quite certain that Antoninus did not derive any of his Ethical principles from a religion of which he knew nothing." To say, as Dr. Schmidt does, that "Christian ideas filled the air" is easy enough, but where is the proof? No doubt the Christian writers made great pretensions as to the spread of their religion, but they were notoriously sanguine and inaccurate, and we know what value to attach to such pretensions in the second century when we reflect that even in the fourth century, up to the point of Constantine's conversion, Christianity had only succeeded in drawing into its fold about a twentieth of the inhabitants of the empire. Enough has been said in this article to show that the idea of our common humanity is not "a purely Christian conception," that it arose in the natural course of human development, and that in this, as in other cases, the apologists of Christianity have simply appropriated to their own faith the fruits of the political, social, and moral growth of Western civilisation.

G. W. FOOTE.

## The Apocalypse.—IX.

(Continued from p. 294.)

CHAPTERS xii. and xiii. of the Book of Revelation form a somewhat remarkable Jewish addition to the original Apocalypse. Commencing Chapter xii. the writer says:—

"And a great sign was seen in heaven; a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars; and she was with child: and she crieth out, travailing in birth and in pain to be delivered" (Rev. xii. 1—2).

There can be no doubt as to the meaning of this symbolical statement. The woman symbolised the nation to which the writer belonged—Israel. The twelve stars represented the twelve tribes. The sun and moon were regarded by the Jews as created for their especial benefit. Isaiah, speaking to Israel in the name of the Lord, says: "Thy sun shall no more go down, neither shall thy moon withdraw itself" (ix. 20). Continuing, the Apocalypticist says:—

"And there was seen another sign in heaven; and behold, a great red dragon.....And the dragon stood before the woman which was about to be delivered, that when she was delivered, he might devour her child. And she was delivered of a son, a man child, who is to rule all nations with a rod of iron: and her child was caught up unto God, and unto his throne" (Rev. xii. 3—5).

The dragon, further on, is stated to be "the old serpent, he that is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world"; there can therefore be no doubt of his identity. Neither can there be any doubt as to the "man child," as may be seen from the following passages:—

"Isa. liv. 1, 5.—"Sing, O barren, thou that didst not bear.....For thy Maker is thine husband; the Lord of hosts is his name."

"Isa. lxii. 5.—"And as the bridegroom rejoiceth over the bride, so shall thy God rejoice over thee."

"Mic. v. 2—4.—"And thou Bethlehem Ephrathah .....out of thee shall one come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth are from of old, from ancient days. Therefore will the Lord give them up [to their enemies] until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth.....and he shall stand and feed his flock in the strength of the Lord."

Here we have the woman that prefigured the nation of Israel, her "husband" being the Lord of hosts, who, the ancient Jewish writers erroneously believed, watched over and protected that nation. An excuse is, of course, found for his not having done so: the nation had sinned, and so on. Now it is announced that this king or Jewish Messiah should be born in Bethlehem, the city of David, whence it is inferred that he would be a lineal descendant of David, whose coming had been predicted by Isaiah and Esdras. We thus arrive at "the lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David," who is stated in Rev. v. 5 to be the only mortal worthy to open the seven seals. The lion of Judah would, no doubt, be a warrior-king; who would "rule all nations with a rod of iron"; but not having been born, his place was taken by "the Lamb."

With regard to the Jewish Messiah "ruling the nations," etc., we need only turn to the following, among other passages, in which that mythical personage is described. The writers, speaking in the name of the Lord, say:—

Psalm ii. 6—9.—"Yet I have set my king upon my holy hill of Zion.....The Lord said unto me, Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee. Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." [In the Septuagint the words italicised read: "Thou shalt rule them with a rod of iron."]

Isa. xi. 1—4.—"There shall come forth a shoot out of the root of Jesse.....and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him.....with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth: and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked."

There can thus be no doubt that the "man child" in the Apocalypse represented the Jewish Messiah or "Anointed One," who was to make Israel independent of all other nations and the greatest kingdom upon earth, as predicted in the book of Daniel and elsewhere. It is needless to say that this Messiah had no connection with Jesus Christ; he was to be a king like David, who brought all the surrounding little kingdoms into subjection, and a great general like Judas Maccabæus, who defeated large armies with very much inferior forces.

The writer of the "Revelation" goes on to say that eagles' wings were given to the woman "that she might fly into the wilderness unto her place where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time": after which "the dragon waxed wroth with the woman, and went away to make war with the rest of her seed which keep the commandments of God." The last sentence leaves no doubt what the writer symbolised under the name "the woman."

As to the great Serpent—Devil—Satan—Dragon, this imaginary creature is not quite so easy to find. The name Satan means "an adversary." In the Septuagint the term employed is "the Devil," which means "an accuser." We find a very mild species of Satan mentioned in four places in the Old Testament—1 Chron. xx. 1; Job. i. 6, ii. 1; Psalm cix. 6; and Zech. iii. 1, 2. These passages are useful as showing the ideas which prevailed amongst the Jews respecting this personage two centuries or more prior to the Christian era.

In 2 Sam. xxiv. 1 it is stated that "the Lord" instigated David to number the people. This the Chronicler has altered into: "And Satan.....provoked David to number Israel." In Psalm cix. 6 the pious writer, entreating the Lord to punish an enemy, says: "Set thou a wicked man over him;

and let Satan stand at his right hand." In Zech. ii. 1—2, we read:—

"And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to be his adversary. And [the angel of] the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; yea, the Lord that hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee."

The words placed within brackets have fallen out of verse 2. A New Testament writer, referring to a passage in an apocryphal writing, says that "Michael the archangel, when contending with the Devil about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee" (Jude 9). According to these passages Satan was a kind of demi-god who was to be treated with great respect, and was evidently a more important personage than the highest of the angels.

In the book of Job we find the following pretty story, which I have slightly abridged:—

Job. i. 6—12.—"Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them. And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it. And the Lord said unto Satan, Hast thou considered my servant Job? .....a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil? Then Satan answered the Lord and said, Doth Job fear God for nought?.....But put forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and he will curse thee to thy face. And the Lord said unto Satan, Behold, all that he hath is in thy power; only upon himself put not forth thy hand. So Satan went forth from the presence of the Lord."

Biblical critics now tell us that the book of Job is a poem. This may be the case with the long speeches in that book; but there can be no doubt whatever that the whole writing was regarded by the ancient Jews as a work of history. The writer of Ezek. xiv. cites Job as one of the most righteous men who had lived prior to his time (xiv. 14, 20). The writer of the Epistle of James also refers to Job as a historical person (v. 11). In any case, we see what was believed as to the position occupied by Satan at the time the book of Job was written. He was certainly an adversary and an accuser of men; but he appears to have been almost independent of the Lord God. He was also possessed of miraculous power, for he "smote Job with boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown" (ii. 7). The words "sons of God" in verse 6 are in the Septuagint rendered "angels"; so Satan was not one of that body. This is all the information we can draw from the Old Testament. In the Apocalypse the Satan—Dragon is portrayed as a huge creature that cast down to the earth "the third part of the stars" with a flap of his tail. This imaginary Colossus was probably suggested to the writer by the following passage in one of the "holy books":—

Isa. xxviii. 1.—"In that day the Lord with his sore and great and strong sword shall punish Leviathan the gliding serpent, and Leviathan the winding serpent, and he shall slay the dragon that is in the sea."

Later on, the apocalyptic dragon is "punished," but not slain.

In the middle of the narrative of the Woman, man-child, and Dragon, is interpolated an account commencing: "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels going forth to war with the dragon; and the dragon warred and his angels" (Rev. xii. 7), with the result that the great Dragon "was cast down to the earth, and his angels were cast down with him" (xii. 9). Here the Dragon is called "the accuser of our brethren.....which accuseth them before God day and night." According to this ridiculous statement, the Lord God has been pestered with the accusations of the Satan-dragon during every hour of the day and every hour of the night for century after century, until that reptile was finally cast down to the earth. No wonder the Lord is said to be "long suffering." This account of the "war in heaven" appears to have been taken from some apocryphal writing similar to that quoted by Jude, but not now extant. One Biblical critic is

of opinion that the "war in heaven" was perhaps derived from the Babylonian Creation story, in which the god Merodach and the other Babylonian deities warred against the great dragon Tiamat and her demons. We have, however, no evidence to show that this story was known to the Apocalyptist. The probability is that the cuneiform system of writing was as much a sealed book in the first century as it remained through all the centuries which followed, until comparatively recent times. ABRACADABRA.

(To be continued.)

## National Secular Society.

### ANNUAL CONFERENCE.

KING'S HALL, CORPORATION STREET,  
Birmingham.

WHIT-SUNDAY, JUNE 4, 1911.

### Agenda.

1. Minutes of last Conference.
2. Executive's Annual Report. By PRESIDENT.
3. Reception of Report.
4. Financial Report.
5. Election of President.  
Motion by Birmingham, North London, and Kingsland Branches:—  
"That Mr. G. W. Foote be re-elected President."
6. Election of Vice-Presidents.  
(a) The following are nominated by the Executive for re-election: J. Barry, W. H. Baker, J. G. Bartram, E. Bowman, R. Chapman, Victor Charbonnel, C. Cohen, W. W. Collins, H. Cowell, W. Davey, F. A. Davies, J. G. Dobson, R. G. Fathers, Léon Furnémont, T. Gorniot, John Grange, J. Hammond, W. Heaford, S. L. Hurd, R. Johnson, W. Leat, J. T. Lloyd, A. B. Moss, James McGlashen, G. B. H. McCluskey, J. Neate, R. T. Nichols, Horace W. Parsons, J. Partridge, S. M. Peacock, C. Pegg, Mrs. M. E. Pegg, W. T. Pitt, C. G. Quinton, J. H. Ridgway, J. T. Ross, G. Roleffs, Mrs. Roleffs, Thomas Robertson, Victor Roger, S. Samuels, F. Schaller, T. Shore, H. Silverstein, W. H. Spivey, Charles Steptoe, W. B. Thompson, T. J. Thurlow, John H. Turnbull, Miss E. M. Vance, C. J. Whitwell, Frederick Wood, W. H. Wood, G. White.  
(b) Motion by Executive:—  
"That Miss Kathleen B. Kough and Mr. E. A. Charlton be elected Vice-Presidents."  
(c) Motion by Liverpool Branch:—  
"That Miss Mary Ross be elected a Vice-President."  
(d) Motion by Birmingham Branch:—  
"That Mr. F. E. Wallis be elected a Vice-President."
7. Election of Auditors.
8. Motion by Wood Green Branch:—  
"That in future only five Vice-Presidents shall sit as such upon the Society's Executive, and that Branch delegates sitting upon the Executive shall be in the proportion of one delegate for every 20 members or part of 20 members."
9. Motion by Renfrow Branch:—  
"That the Executive take steps to supply the Branches on loan with essays on important questions relating to the principles and propaganda of Freethought."
10. Motion by Kingsland Branch:—  
"That this Conference resolves to honor the memory of Charles Bradlaugh by establishing a Bradlaugh Lectureship for the delivery and publication of an Annual Lecture on a Freethought subject."
11. Motion by Birmingham Branch:—  
"That the Society should publish a program of courses of study in Freethought, and that every member be provided with a copy; and that copies should, as far as possible, be judiciously circulated at meetings and otherwise."
12. Motions by Liverpool Branch:—  
"That with a view to organising unattached Freethinkers, and increasing the area of activity of the N. S. S., the Executive should, if finances permit, appoint competent lecturers to give Freethought lectures

in centres where no Branch of the N. S. S. already exists, with the object of attracting local Freethinkers to the lectures and forming new Branches."

#### 13. Motion by the Executive:—

"That this Conference hails with delight the prospect of a complete Arbitration Treaty between Great Britain and the United States, and hopes that this will lead to similar treaties between all civilised nations."

#### 14. Motion by Mr. C. Cohen:—

"That this Conference notes the desperate Sabatarian efforts being made by the clergy of all Christian denominations to hinder or suppress opportunities for rational enjoyment on the people's weekly day of rest, and trusts that ample attention will be given to the reports of Chief Constables that picture theatres, in particular, have contributed so much to the good order of the towns where they exist."

#### 15. Motion by Mr. G. W. Foote:—

"That this Conference rejoices over the continued vindication of Francisco Ferrer which is going on throughout the civilised world, and congratulates the progressive parties in the Spanish Cortes on the splendid effort they have made in this direction."

#### 16. Motion by Executive:—

"That this Conference congratulates the Portuguese Republican Government on its determination to apply the principle of religious equality to the relations between Church and State, and trusts that it will continue to hold perfectly even the balance between the religious and non-religious citizens."

The Conference will sit in the King's Hall; the morning session lasting from 10.30 to 12.30, and the afternoon session from 2.30 to 4.30. Both are purely business meetings. Only members of the N. S. S. can speak and vote. A public meeting will be held in the evening at 7 o'clock in the King's Hall. The President will occupy the chair on all three occasions. A luncheon for delegates and visitors has been arranged at the Colonnade Hotel, New-street, at 1 o'clock.

By order of the Executive,

G. W. FOOTE, *President.*  
E. M. VANCE, *Secretary.*

## Acid Drops.

The Lord's Day Observance Society has been holding its annual meeting at the Westminster Palace Hotel. Amongst the speakers at this melancholy gathering was the Rev. Prebendary H. E. Fox, who complained that too much was said about the needs of the working man, and not enough about Sunday being God's Day. "Sunday," he said, "was the Lord's Day, and God was being robbed by everyone who refused to yield to God his claim that the Sabbath Day should be kept holy." That is, in listening to the Rev. Mr. Fox and his "pals." What a professional view these gentlemen take of everything!

The full report of the meeting of the Brighton Town Council at which the question of Sunday picture shows was settled shows us how right we were in saying that the opposition to them was almost entirely religious. The people who don't want picture shows on Sunday tried to prevent the people who do want them from having them. That is the whole matter in a nutshell. It should be noted that the voting was a tie—24 to 24. Sunday opening was carried by the casting vote of the Mayor. No doubt the Chief Constable's report had its effect on the Council as it had on the Watch Committee. We venture to quote the following passage:—

"Many of the young residential population have, prior to the opening of these establishments, appeared only to obtain enjoyment in perambulating the streets and open spaces more or less noisily, or, like a great many of the visitors, find secluded or quiet places, oftentimes with very unsatisfactory results. Before the opening of these picture theatres it was a frequent occurrence to find young people brought to the police station under very unsatisfactory circumstances; complaints, too, were frequent of disorderly conduct in the streets. But since the opening of these places the appearance of young people at the various police stations, compulsory or otherwise, is now a novelty, and the complaints I have referred to seldom occur.

The Committee will, I am sure, be glad to learn that, although these institutions have been in existence during the periods I have above stated, not one single instance has occurred giving cause for complaint.

I have called for reports from the superintendents of the various divisions, who all agree that the opening of these

theatres has brought about a marked improvement in the order of the town and wellbeing of the young people. These places become the most valuable when the weather on Sunday is bad, and when, but for such places of light entertainment (and in this I include with great emphasis the excellent entertainments at the Dome, the Aquarium, and especially the P.S.A. meetings), many of the visitors and indeed of the residents also would be forced into public-houses, some of them for the first time in their lives.

I am quite convinced that if these theatres are closed on Sundays there would be a repetition of the unsatisfactory state of affairs that existed before these light entertainments were provided."

This seems to be the view of Chief Constables everywhere.

Bigots are always blind. Christians never reflect that if they shut up places of public resort simply on religious grounds—for special immorality at these places on Sunday is not alleged—they simply invite Freethinkers, when they are in the majority, to shut up places of public resort on irreligious grounds. That would close the doors of churches and chapels. Such would be the case at Paris if the Freethinkers imitated the pernicious bigotry of the 24 "wrong 'uns" at Brighton.

The following obviously inspired paragraph appeared in the *Morning Leader* of May 13:—

"DR. DIXON AND THE TABERNACLE.—Dr. A. C. Dixon has written to the friends at the Metropolitan Tabernacle promising to begin his ministry on the third Sunday in June. He says: 'Though I shrink from the great responsibility which it imposes, the chain of providence which led to the call, the unanimity with which it was given, the blessing of God upon the preaching of His word in the Tabernacle for more than two months, and the door of service for Christ and the Church which it opens, convince me that your invitation voices the call of God.' Dr. Dixon, it may be remarked, belongs to the most genial type of American minister. He is certain to work well with the Tabernacle deacons, for he has a quick sense of humor, a sympathetic affectionate nature, and a ready consideration for others. His tall, handsome figure and stately dark head will adorn the Tabernacle pulpit. It is pleasant to remember that his gifts won the hearty appreciation of C. H. Spurgeon."

Evidently the *Morning Leader* knows very little about the Rev. A. C. Dixon. It must have taken the inspired paragraph on trust. Perhaps it will feel that it knows him better when we have done with him. We intend to show him up as the reckless and malignant libeller of Ingersoll. It was this man that Torrey relied upon when he slandered Ingersoll on the occasion of his last "revival" in England. With the brave and invaluable assistance of Mr. W. T. Stead, in the *Review of Reviews*, we succeeded in exposing Torrey to public contempt, and we shall now do the same for Dixon. He is to begin his ministry at the Metropolitan Tabernacle on the third Sunday in June. We will have our exposure ready by that date. It will be in the form of a pamphlet for free distribution. And we shall want volunteer distributors when the hour arrives, as we did in the Torrey case.

When and where, we wonder, did Dixon win the hearty appreciation of Spurgeon? Spurgeon has been dead about twenty years—and Dixon is an American. One thing we are quite sure of. Spurgeon was an honest man. He would never have shown any "hearty appreciation" of Dixon's libellous lies about Ingersoll. We remember quite well, at the time of the "Atheist Shoemaker" case, when we were exposing the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes's falsehoods, how Spurgeon advised Hughes to give all the facts, including the name of his "converted Atheist." If the story were true, Spurgeon said it would be all the more useful to the cause of Christ to have it thoroughly established; and if it were not true, and Mr. Hughes had somehow or other been mistaken, it would be better to have it cleared out of the way at once. Spurgeon, we say, was honest; he was also no fool; he could not help seeing that Hughes's story had been publicly challenged by leading responsible Atheists who ought, in such a case, to know what they were talking about.

Miss Olive MacLeod, who has returned to England after an adventurous journey of 3,700 miles in Africa, through regions where few white men and no white women had ever been seen before, says a good word for the poor unchristianised blacks. "Not once," she told an interviewer, "did we have any trouble with the natives, although for six months we were in a country where a white woman had never been seen before." She couldn't have said more, and would probably have had to say less, if she had been a black and travelling amongst whites.

What a cock and bull story is that of the European "explorers" digging under the Dome of Rock mosque, mis-called the Mosque of Omar, at Jerusalem, to find docu-

mentary proofs of the resurrection of Jesus Christ! There is nothing like it even in the Arabian Nights.

Mr. Gerard Ford, the new Chairman of the Congregational Union, has a very poor opinion of the prospects of "Christian unity." He says that "the idea of a United Free Church of England is simply a dream of the future, and as for union with the Church of England, it is simply out of the question." He might have added, hibernically, that union with the Catholic Church is more out of the question still.

Dr. Ambrose Shepherd, described as Glasgow's leading preacher, preached the annual sermon for the Colonial Missionary Society at the City Temple. According to the daily organ of the Nonconformist Conscience it was "a fine sermon, full of wide wisdom." Very wide! The preacher "claimed that Britain was to become the evangeliser of the world." Vanity, sir, vanity! Just like a Britisher, and especially a North Britisher. All the evangelising that Britain does abroad fails to make up for the loss of true believers at home.

The London City Mission employs 395 missionaries. At its annual meeting the Society was thankful because 4,356 persons had been inducted through its agency. This works out an average of 11 per missionary, and if we place the salary at 30s. per week, it means that over seven pounds was expended for every person inducted to attend church. And that is without reckoning the other expenses of the missions. Still, the Society is thankful, although it laments "the indifference of the people to all religious influences."

Mr. W. A. Tatchell, a missionary homo on holiday from China, says that China is a land of intellectual heathenism, and the natives refuse to believe the gospel when simply preached to them. They are, however, impressed by the medical missions, and would willingly come for treatment. We see no reason to doubt this—indeed it bears out what we have often said. Chinese and Japanese are willing to take all the scientific knowledge we can give them, but they draw the line at religion. And a profession of religious belief made while reaping a benefit from medical attendance is obviously next door to worthless. Besides, the medical mission, so far as it practises scientific medicine or surgery, is not Christian at all. What the missionaries ought to do is to treat disease with prayer and faith—the method of the New Testament. What they actually do is to utilise the secular scientific knowledge of the Western world, and attempt to palm it off on the Chinese as Christianity. And they assume, or appear to assume, that the Chinese are not sufficiently awake to detect the imposture. Missionaries talk glibly enough of the power of the gospel in "heathen" lands. On their own confession, it is the power of the medicine chest or the charitable dole that gains them even the precarious footing they possess.

The Rev. E. Lloyd Jones says: "There is no human being so scarce and exceptional as the Atheist. Positive unbelief in God has never been so weak in Europe as it is to-day." We would remind Mr. Jones that in France, on the occasion of the recent census, nearly six million of these scarce and exceptional beings made their existence manifest. And if Mr. Jones cared to attend a few Freethought meetings in this country, he would have his illusion that the Atheist is rare and exceptional rather rudely dispelled. And beyond the openly professed Atheist, there is the large body of men and women who are Atheists in everything but wearing the label. The constant lament of the Churches is that positive belief in God has never been so weak in Europe as it is to-day—which is the exact reverse of Mr. Jones's statement. It is probable that the majority of European thinkers are either openly or covertly hostile to any positive belief in God. Many may continue to use the word, but analyse their position and it will be found that the essential teachings of Atheism are conceded. And if only the fear of social punishment was not so strong, and people really spoke out their inmost convictions concerning Christian Theism, the Churches would collapse like so many houses of cards.

Mr. Jones admits that while, as he says, disbelief in God has practically disappeared, "the utilisation of God, the using of God for practical ends, is also at its weakest." This is simply disproving one moment what has been asserted the moment before. If there existed any real belief in God, he would not be ignored in practice. When people have got to the point of proceeding about their daily affairs as though God were non-existent they show that Deity as a working hypothesis is no longer necessary to their view of life. This is not, of course, the whole of Atheism, but it is no incon-

siderable portion of the Atheistic position. The distinction here is that what the avowed Atheist does consciously, openly, and as a result of reasoned conviction, others do unconsciously, blunderingly, and with no real perception of the nature of the forces that decide their action. They are forced along by the sheer weight of the life around them. But, consciously or unconsciously, the fact remains. The theory of God becomes increasingly discredited in both theory and practice. People do not always voice their disbelief in God, but this is because they are not always conscious of their own mental position, and even when they are religious terrorism is still rife enough to impose silence upon many. And Christianity vastly prefers a hypocritical profession of religion to an open and honest avowal of disbelief.

The *Methodist Recorder* records the following from a French evangelical paper. An Atheist working man orator said:—

“If there is a God, let Him send an angel here and now to give me two good boxes on the ear.” A workman jumped up, and, coming to him, said: “That can be done at once. No need of an angel for that. Here (smack). There (smack). Do you think the good Lord is going to put himself about for a scamp like you?”

The moral of the story is—that Christian liars flourish as well in France as in England. At least, we fail to detect any other.

Mr. Keir Hardie delivered a sort of sermon under the auspices of the Brotherhood Church, Mountain Ash, recently. It was full of what Mr. Hardie is so fond—chatter about Christ. He actually said that if we took Christ's advice, and trusted in God, he would do for us what he does for the birds and the lilies. Putting the lilies out of the question as too absurd, we wonder if Mr. Hardie really knows what God does for the birds. They have often to work very hard for a living. They often perish wholesale in severe weather. They perish by myriads during migrations. That is what God does for them—and what he would do for us if we trusted him. Mr. Hardie also declared that God “meant the human race to be beautiful.” Well, it is evident that God hasn't succeeded in carrying out his intention—not even in South Wales. We can imagine an improvement even on Mr. Hardie himself—although we recognise his right to differ from us on this point.

“Providence” does not discriminate between its own houses and other persons' in thunderstorms. The church of St. Stephen, Tredegar-road, Bow—Holy Trinity Church, Waltham Cross—and Convil Church, Carmarthen, were all struck and badly damaged by lightning in the recent tempest.

Freethinkers with more ardor than discretion are warned against writing to Mr. Foote something in this way: “I have undertaken to read a paper on (so and so); please send me some literature on the subject. I enclose sixpence. Let me have it by return.” How on earth do they expect a busy man like Mr. Foote to attend to such things? Sometimes he is asked to write the paper for the gentleman to read.

Mr. G. W. De Tunzelmann, who has been delivering a course of lectures on “Modern Physics and Atheism,” concluded the series with an address on “Modern Physics and Rational Ethics.” It is probable that the lectures will be republished, and in that case we may feel inclined to subject this advocate of a belated, even though disguised, supernaturalism to a more extended criticism. At present, we beg to point out that the man who holds that modern science affords a basis for Theism is either using modern science in anything but a scientific sense, or Theism in a non-theistic sense. Modern science—particularly physical science—cannot in its very nature give any basis for Theism. An intelligent and personal ruler of the universe is a conception with which physical science has simply nothing to do. If any such exists, science is bound to ignore it. The essence of science is precision, and precision is a farce unless it is assumed that the forces operating from age to age are both quantitatively and qualitatively constant. This is what Cardinal Newman saw and what he meant when he said that science was atheistic. It is without God, and it will, we think, be more than Mr. Tunzelmann can do to introduce him.

Mr. Tunzelmann remarked that women were naturally more inclined towards religion than men, and this is because man is strongest in his reason and woman in her intuition. Now this is exactly one of those cheap and easy generalisations that mark the careless thinker or the superficial observer. To begin with, what is called intuition is

organised experience. A man who has been all his life among horses “intuitively” seizes the good points of a horse. A professional billiard player “intuitively” gauges the force and direction necessary to score a particular shot. But this does not mean that either judgment is independent of experience, only that their lengthy experience enables them to go through a mental process with great rapidity and unconsciously, while others of smaller experience proceed slowly and consciously. Under certain conditions, and dealing with certain classes of facts, men come to conclusions more quickly than do women. In other directions women hold first place. Both results express experience, and that is all there is in the phenomenon. Women are more inclined to religion than men, not because they see more clearly and deeper into the nature of things, but because their history has made them emotionally more susceptible, and because they are more open to social pressure, and so less ready to adopt and express unconventional opinions. And we would remind Mr. Tunzelmann that the number of women Freethinkers is anything but a small and negligible quantity—and the number is steadily increasing.

A Liberal morning paper, which vies with the Tory papers in flunkeyism, reproduced the other day the brief letter which King George addressed to the nation on the death of his father and his own accession to the throne. King George stated that he felt “strong in his faith in God.” That is a part of the stock language on such occasions. Other men lose their fathers, and have to take up positions which they expected to fill, but they do not assure all their friends and acquaintances that they feel certain that “faith in God” will enable them to pull through. This sort of blarney is left to Kings and Queens. It is a relic of the superstition which still lingers on our coinage in abbreviated Latin—that sovereigns reign by the grace of God.

Nothing damps the self-sufficiency of the men of God. Their religion is the most valuable thing in the world, and they themselves are the salt of the earth. Did not their Master say so? And wouldn't they have known it without him? All the good in creation is due to them. Some time ago Mr. W. T. Stead was denouncing the Christian Churches for their apathy in regard to the peace movement so powerfully stimulated by President Taft and Sir Edward Grey. Canon Hensley Henson now comes forward and assures his Congregational brethren at their annual assembly that “the great dynamic force behind the peace movement, both in Great Britain and America, is the Christian religion, and no greater calamity could come to the nations of the earth than that this force should wane or cease to be effective.” This is cheek—simply cheek. The peace movement didn't begin until Christianity had been some eighteen hundred years in the world; and it was opposed, pooch-pooched, and ridiculed by the Christian Churches until it made such headway that it paid better to patronise it. Just as Theodore Parker said that the anti-slavery cause in America would be better off if the American Churches dropped through the continent, so we may say that the cause of peace would be better off if the Christian Churches in England disappeared. They patronise no good cause until it has won—and then they spoil it.

Mr. E. Hampden-Cook (who is he?), lecturing or preaching at Crewe (we can't see which), declared that the struggle for existence, bad as it was for those left behind, was a good thing for the world; and even the losers will “wear bright crowns” in the sweet by-and-bye. So that's all right. We conclude, however, that Mr. E. Hampden-Cook is not one of the left-behinds and losers himself, but one of the lucky gentlemen who “make the best of both worlds.” He suggests the old proverb, When an alderman has dined the world is happy.

Another of Mr. E. Hampden-Cook's pretty arguments was this. All great modern movements, including the French Revolution, sprang from the English Rebellion in the seventeenth century; now the leaders of the Rebellion were deeply religious men; *argal*—well, the reader can finish it for himself. Cromwell was a Christian—and Mr. E. Hampden-Cook appears to fancy that Charles I. was an Atheist.

“Her second time earth” is the title of a once popular melodrama. Mrs. Besant has brought over to England from the East a young gentleman who is doing his thirty-second time on earth, having begun the first one some thirty thousand years ago. Mrs. Besant also believes now in the early second coming of Christ. “Oh, what a fall was there!”



## Mr. Foote's Engagements.

(Lectures suspended for the present.)

### To Correspondents.

PRESIDENT'S HONORARIUM FUND, 1911.—Previously acknowledged, £237 4s. 9d. Received since:—John Robinson, 2s.; Jonathan Owen, 5s.

JOHN ROBINSON.—Thanks for good wishes.

F. O. RITZ.—Shall appear. It should interest our readers. Thanks for your encouraging letter also. Subscription for paper passed over to shop manager.

J. E. EVANS.—You will see we have noticed Mr. Keir Hardie's sermon. He always had an itch for preaching.

V. WHITTY.—Thanks for reference.

A. G. L.—Whether "John" or "Jean" was in the original draft of the poem is a question that is "off our beat." It seems to be agreed that "Jean" is a female name in Scotland. Mr. Lloyd seems to have been mistaken on that point. But he is not a Scotsman; and, for the rest, what does it matter to his argument in the article?

A. HOPKINS.—Sorry, but we cannot help being a bit "abrupt" sometimes. It was not intended. We understood that we were to keep the letter you enclosed until we had done with it.

E. B.—As we are shutting out all further correspondence on the subject we are bound to include your final letter in the exclusion. The real point raised in your first letter was whether "Jean" was masculine or feminine in Scotland. That point is settled. Whether Lady Nairne wrote "John" or "Jean" in the original draft of the poem is interesting, no doubt, in its way; but it is not a question for controversy in the *Freethinker*. What you say about names like Evelyn being epicene, in the sense that they can be used for either sex, is quite right. Browning's "Evelyn Hope" is a conspicuous case in point.

C. KEEFE.—We quite understand.

MRS. CRAIG.—We cannot tell you how to put your Freethought to other people. If your own mind does not suggest the way it is impossible for us to do so. Perhaps you mistrust yourself too much. We never know what we can do till we try.

A. E. BETHELL.—The questioner was quite right. Irenæus did state that Jesus lived to be fifty years of age. We have not his writings at hand at the moment of answering you, but we happen to have at hand the famous *Free Inquiry* of Conyers Middleton, who was a Doctor of Divinity as well as the Principal Librarian of the University of Cambridge. With regard to Irenæus and his "real character" and "proper degree of credit," Middleton says: "He affirmed that our Savior lived to an old age, or was fifty years old at the least, at the time of his crucifixion." Not only does he affirm it, but he attempts to prove it as follows: first, Christ had necessarily to pass through all the stages of life in order to pattern to all of them; secondly, the old men who knew John and the other apostles "constantly bore witness to the truth" of the statement. Middleton gives the complete quotation as a footnote, with the reference—Iren. 1 ii. c. 39. Edit. Oxon. Cave, in his *Lives of the Fathers*, tries to explain how Irenæus was "betrayed into this error." There is a curious passage in John viii. 57, in which the Jews say to Jesus, "Thou art not yet fifty years of age."

G. R. BALLARD.—Your friend was not "Ontario" who subscribed some weeks ago to the President's Fund. We sympathise with you in the sad loss of your friend.

A. J. KING.—We have read your *Idle Rhymes* and we think they should do good locally, where they would be most completely understood and appreciated. We hope you will make an impression on the Sabbatarians, but they are a terribly hard lot. Glad you have followed the debate with "much zest."

W. P. BALL.—Much obliged for cuttings.

W. DENTON.—See paragraph. Thanks.

C. KERNS.—The question of the Portuguese Government and the Catholic Church will be dealt with in our columns shortly. Meanwhile you should be on your guard against the systematic misrepresentations of the orthodox English press.

T. A. MOSLEY.—The two statements are not exactly irreconcilable, but we cannot deal with the matter in this column. Glad you say of the *Freethinker* that you "would not have missed it for worlds."

D. W. COX.—You were not the speaker alluded to. We don't recollect hearing your name before.

SOME correspondence stands over unavoidably till next week.

THE SECULAR SOCIETY, LIMITED, office is at 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

THE NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY'S office is at 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

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

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

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

FRIENDS who send us newspapers would enhance the favor by marking the passages to which they wish us to call attention.

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

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

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

## Sugar Plums.

We publish this week the Agenda of the National Secular Society's Annual Conference which takes place on Whit-Sunday at the King's Hall, Corporation-street, Birmingham. Branches throughout the country should be represented as far as possible at the Conference. Individual members, not belonging to Branches, but attached to the Society through the Central Executive, will also be welcome, and free to speak and vote.

Delegates and individual visitors to the Conference, desiring hotel or other accommodation at Birmingham, should communicate as promptly as possible with the local Branch secretary, Mr. J. Partridge, 183 Vauxhall-road, who will attend to their requirements. Trains will also be met as far as possible if visitors will inform Mr. Partridge, in reasonable time, when they expect to arrive.

Mr. Foote will, of course, as President, take the chair at the N. S. S. Conference. We are not able to say, at the present moment, whether the general secretary, Miss E. M. Vance, will be able to attend or not. Her illness is still serious, and it is impossible to make any definite announcement. Mr. Lloyd has also been ill lately, but he is now recuperating in South Wales, and we trust he will be himself again by Whit-Sunday. Mr. Cohen is "humanly speaking" sure to be present. We also hope to see Mr. W. Heaford, Mr. A. B. Moss, Mr. F. A. Davies, and Miss Kough if she can be spared from Miss Vance's bedside. Leading provincial Freethinkers are certain to attend, but we have no list to hand as yet. No doubt we shall be more fortunate next week.

The Conference luncheon, after the morning session, will take place at the Colonnade Hotel, New-street. The tickets are 2s. each. It is expected that the tickets for the Whit-Monday excursion to Stratford-on-Avon will be 5s. 6d. inclusive:—return train from Birmingham, river trip at Stratford, hot luncheon at Stratford, and visits to Shakespear's birth-place and the memorial theatre and museum.

The following paragraph from the pen of Mr. James F. Morton is taken from the *New York Truthseeker* of April 29:—

"It has long been customary for the clerical maligners of Thomas Paine to refer slightly to his literary qualifications. The opinion of a real critic is therefore worth noting. Walter Savage Landor took more than one occasion to express a contrary view. In the *Letters and Unpublished Writings of Walter Savage Landor*, edited by Stephen Wheeler and issued in London, in 1897, the following remark will be found on page 56: 'For a style we must have recourse to Goldsmith, Blackstone, and the hated and persecuted Payne.' (The misspelling is Landor's and is characteristic.) On page 195, under the heading 'Toleration,' occur the following lines:—

'Mobs I abhor, yet bear a crowd  
Which speaks its mind, if not too loud.  
Willing would I hear again  
The honest words of pelted Payne.  
Few dared such homely truths to tell,  
Or wrote our English half so well.'

The somewhat timid editor appends the following footnote: 'Thomas Paine, author of the *Rights of Man*, for whom Landor professed to have a certain liking. See Works, 1876, VI., p. 157. De Quincey said that Aroar, in *Gebir*, was too Tom Paineish.'

We may supplement this by placing on record the fact that Landor, who was a personal friend of W. J. Birch (the author of a remarkable book on the *Philosophy and Religion of Shakespeare*) expressed to him the greatest admiration for Thomas Paine's "masculine English." Birch told our friend (and sub-editor) Wheeler, who told us.

Those who belittle Paine, even from a literary point of view, should just take any page of the *Age of Reason* or the *Rights of Man* and see if they can improve it. We commend the idea to the attention of the religious editors in London. The attempt to carry it out might do them good; it would certainly do Paine no harm.

## "Theism or Atheism?"—IV.

### A Public Debate

BETWEEN REV. DR. WARSCHAUER AND MR. G. W. FOOTE.

(Concluded from p. 317.)

Mr. FOOTE: Dr. Warschauer spent some portion of his time in telling you that he was amused at the things I said. I am not amused at anything he says. (Laughter.) I am not even amused at the way in which he makes his quotations, because I have many years experience of the way in which these very same quotations are employed by Christian debaters. I do not object to my opponent quoting from Mill, but I do object to his not bearing in mind all that Mill said. A gentleman at the reporter's table says "Oh!" I never say anything which I am not prepared to justify. Mill wrote that essay on Theism in the pre-Darwinian time. At the end of this very chapter on the design argument, Mill refers to the new theory of evolution, and of adaptation being now explained by biologists as the result of the operation of purely natural causes (hear hear), and he says, It is too soon to pronounce (I am quoting from memory, but I am substantially correct) It is too soon now to pronounce upon these new discoveries, but if they are established it must be admitted that they will greatly attenuate the force of the argument. Now, again, we will take the quotation from Darwin. Darwin is quoted by Christian debaters as Chinese paint pictures—without perspective. They forget that there was a chronology in Darwin's labors as well as in his life. They forget that a man might very well say in his first important book, the *Origin of Species*, what he afterwards saw reason to discard. (Hear, hear.) Now then, turn to Darwin's *Life and Letters*, vol. iii., p. 15, first edition; in 1863, that is, four years after the publication of the *Origin of Species*, Darwin writes as follows to Sir J. D. Hooker, who, as you know, was a very eminent man of science—a great botanist. Darwin writes:—

"I had a most kind and delightfully candid letter from Lyell, who says he spoke out as far as he believes. I have no doubt his belief failed him as he wrote, for I feel sure that at times he no more believed in creation than you or I."

(Loud applause.) Again; in another letter to Hooker, written in the same month, he says:—

"I have long regretted that I truckled to public opinion, and used the Pentateuchal term of creation, by which I meant 'appeared' by some wholly unknown process."

Prolonged applause.) If Dr. Warschauer will carefully read—I may be pardoned for talking thus when at this time of day he deliberately refers me to such a recondite and inaccessible work as Lecky's *History of European Morals*—if Dr. Warschauer will read attentively Darwin's "Autobiography," included in the three volumes of *Life and Letters*, he will note the stages by which Darwin passed from devout Christianity, in which frame of mind he was going to be a clergyman, past doubts, past disbelief, until at last he confessed himself an Agnostic without any belief in God, and with no belief whatever in a future life. Well, now, I say that these things ought to be borne in mind by Christians. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. Warschauer was good enough to say that I did not reply to him last night; I never discuss that; I do not think it is necessary; I do not think it is wise; I do not think it is even good taste (hear, hear) for either disputant to express an opinion of the other. Whether I fail or whether Dr. Warschauer fails, it is for the audience to judge. And beyond all that, I repeat what I said last night—I am indifferent to his failure or mine; I am only regardful of the fate of the truth. (Bravo!)

It was all very well to say that Newman was a sceptic—and extremes meet. They do—in this way. The Atheist looks over a wrangling multitude of Protestant sects and sees on the other side the Catholics with whom the ultimate fight will have to be waged. (Applause.) A Protestant is only a Catholic in a state of dissolution. (Applause.)

I did not mention Professor Knight as a great, a supreme, or any other authority. I mentioned him merely to show that there was no such unanimity amongst Theists as to the validity of particular arguments as Dr. Warschauer seemed to assume. It is not a question of whether Professor Knight is a great thinker. I did not pronounce on that matter at all. And I want to know what Dr. Warschauer means by picking out everybody who does not agree with him and calling him a back number. (Laughter.) Why, if Jeremy Bentham was a back number, it is an extraordinary thing to say (hear, hear) of a man who, as Macaulay said, "Found jurisprudence a gibberish and left it a science." (Applause.) But whether Jeremy Bentham was a back number or not, it does not in any way affect the validity of his reply to that particular argument of Plato's. The strength of an argument does not depend upon the man who uses it (hear, hear) otherwise where should Dr. Warschauer and I be?

(Laughter.) And mark how you invito retorts by labelling great Freethinkers in this manner, for I might have said last night, and as it has been repeated to-night, I do say that if back numbers are to be reckoned in this way some of us regard Jesus Christ as a very back number. (Loud applause.)

I cannot help the opinion of Mr. McCabe. I am not aware that I have any particular difference with Mr. McCabe on any matters of principle. (Hear, hear.) I think if Mr. McCabe were to write down a statement of his philosophy and I were to write down an equally brief statement of mine there would be extremely little difference between us. (Hear, hear.) But it is not a question of whether every Freethinker sees eye to eye with every other Freethinker. (Hear, hear.) What I said was, and I repeat it because it seems to have been misunderstood, that in matters of natural knowledge the more men investigate and the more they discuss the nearer they arrive at unanimity of conclusion. The longer they investigate and discuss in theology the wider and the more irreconcilable they become. (Hear, hear.) Why is that? Because in science you are studying facts and in theology you are studying fancies. (Applause.)

Dr. Warschauer declared that all authorities agree in the declaration of the existence of God. Yes, and the moment the words are out of the mouths of the theologians they begin quarreling as to what they mean. (Applause.) Declaring the existence of God is nothing in itself. What do you mean by God? (Hear, hear.) Bradlaugh well pointed out that if a man asks whether you believe in God you should ask him what he means by God (hear, hear), and I say without any intentional profanity—of which you know I am perfectly incapable—I say that until you define the word God you might as well spell it backwards. (Laughter and applause.) I beg Dr. Warschauer, as the theologian of to-night, to tell us what is God. (Applause.)

Dr. WARSCHAUER: Last night Mr. Foote received a request on my part to answer certain questions. (Oh!) Oh, yes, you will hear about those questions. He met them with an emphatic refusal. To-night, forgetting that refusal, he wound up his subject by addressing a question to me. How should the Christian meet the Freethinker after the way in which the Freethinker has met the Christian? My friend has already supplied the answer. Meet him as a Christian. To define God is, as my friend knows perfectly well, an impossibility. (Hear, hear.) I will tell you something, friends. You tire me; you just tire me. (Laughter.) I mean there is a limit beyond which even pardonable stupidity should not go. (Applause.) To define God is an impossibility because God is infinite, and how are you going to define infinity? That is a contradiction in terms, and I have already said that I leave that to the other side. I do not venture into contradictions in terms, having no use for them. On the other hand, I spent my opening statement last night in saying of God, not defining him, but predicating of him the qualities of consciousness, intelligence, purposiveness, and personality. I spoke of him as the ground and cause of all existence, the guide, the sustainer in all and through all and above all. That is not a definition, but it is a sufficient description, and, to borrow a phrase of Mr. Foote's own (laughter.—Chairman: Please, please)—to describe, he told me last night, was more than to define, so I have more than satisfied him. (Applause.) According to his own standards I have more than satisfied him by describing instead of defining the Deity.

I am sorry that Mr. Foote, suffering no doubt from a lapse of memory, is so incurably given to misquoting me. I did not say that he did not reply to me. I said that he did not answer my questions. That is not only true, but Mr. Foote confessed himself unable to answer those questions, and there I leave that. (Interruption.)

THE CHAIRMAN: Will you please leave any matter in dispute to the two speakers. I will allow Dr. Warschauer the time for this interruption, but I must point out to you that you are seriously encroaching on the speakers' time in interrupting in that manner. It would be very unfortunate indeed if at the end of this debate you were to wind up with anything approaching unpleasantness. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. WARSCHAUER: I am not incorrect in my memory; I remember exactly what was said on that occasion; and I believe a shorthand report may be forthcoming to confirm what I have said. Next, Mr. Foote dealt with my use of quotations—that I did not bear in mind all that Mill had said. I wonder whether Mr. Foote bears in mind all that Professor Knight said. I am perfectly familiar with the essay on Theism. I know that Mill, like other people, felt the shock of the evolution theory, which was then a novelty, and did not immediately adjust himself to it. At that time it did appear as though the theory of evolution would materially weaken the teleological argument, the argument from design; but, after all, on that question affecting biology we will take the authority of one greater in that particular field than Mill—I mean Professor Huxley. I suppose I may give you a quotation from memory, just as my friend Mr.

Foote did. What Huxley says is that while the old-fashioned teleological argument—the Paley type of theological argument—had been overthrown by the theory of evolution, there was a wider teleological argument, which, so far from being overthrown by evolution, was materially strengthened by it. (Applause.) Those are the words of Thomas Henry Huxley, who is a greater authority on evolution than John Stuart Mill, and, of course, lived the longer to see what was implied in evolution, and brought it into better focus than was possible for an older man like Mill.

Mr. Foote has reminded you that there is a chronology in Darwin's labors, and I am perfectly willing to accede to that, to admit that. Mr. Foote gave you a quotation from Darwin's *Letters*, dated 1863. Well, there is a chronology in Darwin's letters and labors, and I will give you a quotation from 1873. In that year Mr. Darwin wrote to a Mr. Deeds, while safeguarding the statement, while saying that he was not at all sure whether the argument was a sound one, he said then that the impossibility of conceiving that this grand and wondrous universe, with our conscious selves, arises from chance, seems to me the chief argument for the existence of God. Why do you not clap? I will tell you why you do not clap; because, in spite of your profession of openness of mind, you are persistently applauding whatever makes in the direction of dogmatic denial (applause), and you are excessively nonplussed when there is anything quoted that makes in the direction of affirmation. If that is Freethought, then heaven preserve me from such an attitude! (Disorder.) If you cannot keep order, might I suggest that some of you might try to imitate the behavior of gentlemen on this occasion only. So much for the chronological argument in Darwin's life and labors; 1873 against Mr. Foote's 1863. I say expressly that he is quite unable to see whether this argument is really valid; but he says: "The impossibility of conceiving that this grand and wondrous universe, with our conscious selves, arose from chance seems to me the chief argument for the existence of God." I hope you will not think that in 1873 Darwin was merely truckling to any public opinion. (Hear, hear.)

I do not know whether my friend meant to speak sarcastically when he said that Lecky's *History of Rationalism*—or the *History of European Morals*, rather—was so recondite as to be almost inaccessible. I see, however, a smile and a twinkle in Mr. Foote's eye that I am correct in my assumption that really this was spoken sarcastically, for I seem to remember that that work—no, it is not the *History of European Morals*, it is the *History of Rationalism*—has been published recently by the R.P.A. (A Voice: A reprint.) It is, still, a work which the R.P.A. thinks good enough to reprint, and thinks good enough to reprint in its rationalistic propaganda; and if you do not see the humor of that, I do. Perhaps that may be one of the points in which Mr. Foote does not see eye to eye with Mr. McCabe of the R.P.A.; but we should not go into these domestic differences, of which I know nothing. Mr. Foote says that apart from a definition of God you might as well spell it backwards, and he said that that was not intentional profanity. Now, I speak without intentional desire to wound, but it does not strike me as profanity; it strikes me as a rather heavy-handed form of humor. That is all. I cannot say the same about another remark of Mr. Foote's, on which I shall speak in a moment, but perhaps you will allow me to say a word on this point in the way in which the Evolution argument bears on Theism. Mr. Foote seemed to think I really had only one argument—one string to my poor Theistic fiddle. Even if I gave you a performance on one string only, it does not prove that several strings do not exist. What I say is, that if evolution has taught us anything it is that all faculty attests fact. All faculty attests fact! Now, I give you that compact simile. Now, let us undo the wrapper of the parcel. It means that there would not be such a thing as any single faculty, say sight, but for the fact of light. The faculty of eyesight has sprung into being simply in response to the fact of light, and that this is so you may see from the fact that moles have closed-up eyes and the fish in the Kentucky caves are blind. Where there is no light eyesight does not develop. In the same way the ear is not merely the instrument for receiving sound; but it is the answer of the human organism to the fact of sound. In a soundless universe evolution would not develop any faculty of hearing. Now, what is true of our mental is true of our moral and our spiritual faculties. How do you account for the fact of the worshipful faculty struggling up in many shapes—aye, and often very misshapen—but how do you account for the fact that this worshipful faculty has maintained itself all through the ages. There is no faculty but corresponds to fact. If the worshipful faculty survives, and always has survived, all the attacks that have been made upon it, it is because of the fact that there are spiritual realities which create and respond to the worshipful faculty. Well, all our faculties—

sight, hearing, feeling, and worshipful faculty, can be either developed or they can be stunted. You may individually stunt your eyesight, you may destroy your sense of hearing; you may fatally impair your faculty of worship, but it does not prove that there is no light, it does not prove that there is no sound, and it does not prove that there is no God. (Loud applause.)

The CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon Mr. Foote I again want to remind the audience—I do not want to trespass again on the time of the speakers—will you please cease to interrupt in any way in the last two speeches of this debate. I dare say, as I said at starting, that any of us, or all of us, could do it better than the speakers, and know better what they ought to say—only you are not here but there. They have the platform and you have not; will you please bear that in mind for the rest of the evening. Now I ask Mr. Foote for his last speech of fifteen minutes.

Mr. FOOTE: I must dismiss this matter of quotation now. I did not suppose that Dr. Warschauer or anybody else could remember all that Mill had written on every topic whatsoever. Naturally, what I said was bounded in its significance by the matter in hand; and I do complain again that Dr. Warschauer should have forgotten what Mill wrote in the very same chapter from which he was quoting. If Dr. Warschauer knew that Mill wrote, or recollected that Mill wrote that if evolution—for that is the name we give these new discoveries that we refer to—were established the force of the evidence for the design argument would be greatly attenuated; if he recollected that, then I say it was not fair to make that quotation without making that addition. (Hear, hear.) I have to complain again that Dr. Warschauer quoted Darwin, and he ended, not with a full stop, but with a semicolon. (Oh! oh!) I will venture to give you the whole of the passage. You see it happens to be a subject on which I am pretty well up. (Laughter and applause.) The letter is Dated April 2, 1873. "I may say," Darwin states, "that the impossibility of conceiving that this grand and wondrous universe with our conscious selves arose through chance, seems to me —" What? Now, what? "the chief argument for the existence of God;" but Darwin does not say that *he* accepted it. (Applause.) On the contrary, he goes on to say "but whether this is an argument of real value I have never been able to decide." (Loud applause.) I have not finished the quotation yet.

"I am aware that if we admit a first cause the mind still craves to know whence it came, and how it arose, nor can I overlook the difficulty from the immense amount of suffering through the world. I am also induced to defer to a certain extent to the judgment of the many able men who have fully believed in God; but here again I see how poor an argument this is. The safest conclusion seems to me to be that the whole subject is beyond the scope of man's intellect; but man can do his duty."

Dr. Warschauer will have his questions in again. It is like King Charles's head. I did not say I was incapable of answering his questions. (Applause.) I said I refused to accept them. (Hear, hear.) I said that I was quite prepared to answer questions at the proper time and in the proper place, and offered Dr. Warschauer the opportunity of a Socratic debate. (Hear, hear.) And his fondness for putting questions does not appear to prompt him to the position of having to answer them also.

Dr. Warschauer said it was impossible to define God. I am very glad he says so. The old definitions of God that you will find in all the books of theology before they began to be frightened (laughter) are abandoned.

Dr. Warschauer will not commit himself to a God of infinite power, infinite wisdom, and infinite goodness. All he has got is a God of some sort. It is a sort of a something. (Laughter.) Is it a God that we can worship; is it a God that we can approach in prayer? Dr. Warschauer admits nothing of the kind. He repeats the old phrase about a first cause, and says it cannot be a second. I know that; a schoolchild knows it; but I denied that there could be any rational application of the term first cause to the infinite and indestructible existence, whatever it was, which was the universe, and was indeed the matrix of all phenomena. Cause and effect only apply to changes; they do not apply to unchanging substance. You can change matter from one form to another, yet a scientist will tell you that the original substance is never altered. You may apparently destroy matter in a retort, but scientific processes and instruments will register every atom which has disappeared from view. (Applause.) Well, now, if that be so, I am entitled to deny the applicability of first cause to anything which is not in a great endless line of cause and effect. Cause must be something previous; effect, something following. This effect springs from that cause; that effect is the cause of another effect; that cause was the effect of another cause; and so the mind stretches that way and that way, past and future, and you can imagine no end to the process of causation. (Applause.)

Now I want to finish my last speech by finishing the argument which I advanced in my first speech. The greatest blow which has been struck at the God idea has been dealt by anthropology and the science, as Dr. Tylor calls it, of animism. Just as the human embryo before birth goes through every stage of biological development from the lowest to the highest before it is born a member of the human family, so every individual being goes through, in epitome, the intellectual, moral, and imaginative history of the race. (Hear, hear.) A little girl has a doll. She talks to it in the same way the savage talks to external nature, regarding the inanimate world around him as filled with the same feelings and ideas as himself. (Hear, hear.) He sees in the lightning the flash of an angry being, he hears in the thunder the roar of his wrath. He prostrates himself; he begs that he may be spared whoever else may be killed. The civilised man knows what the thunderstorm is, knows the infinitesimal danger to himself individually, and if he be a man of a certain temperament his whole nature dilates with the storm, and he enjoys the magnificent spectacle. (Applause.) What makes the difference between the abject savage and the erect civilised being? Knowledge. (Hear, hear.) Knowledge is power; knowledge is emancipation. (Hear, hear.) Knowledge is deliverance, is happiness. I do not deny the ideal, but I say that the God that man has been seeking is the nature which he knows; the heaven which he has been hoping for is but the reflex of the heaven he may enjoy on earth. (Applause.) "Hell," as Omar Khayyam says, "is but the shadow of a soul on fire." "Atheism," in the language of Bacon, "leaves a man to sense and philosophy." It leaves a man to knowledge; leaves a man to comfort; leaves a man to humanity. We do not know anything about God, and we believe you know as little (applause), but we claim to know something about this world and our fellow-man. We claim to strive for man, not for God. And if we cannot realise with you what you call the Fatherhood of God, if we cannot work with you for what you call the Kingdom of God, we can clasp co-operative hands together and build up the mightier Republic of Man. (Bravo! and loud applause.)

The CHAIRMAN: Dr. Warschauer will now close the debate in a speech of fifteen minutes. There is the usual condition that no new matter must be introduced in the last speech. That is, of course, so that each speaker will have the chance of replying to all that has been said, and I hope during the last speech you will give Dr. Warschauer your most attentive hearing. (Loud applause.)

Dr. WARSCHAUER: Mr. Chairman, if this last speech of mine should pass off without interruption, it will be the first speech that has so far passed off. It will be the first in the course of this whole two-nights' debate; and so, perhaps, you will try and establish at the last moment a record.

Mr. Foote said: "What makes the difference between a savage and a civilised man? Knowledge." Well, I have discovered among my multitudinous papers, which I keep in bad order, being, moreover, afflicted with short sight—I have at length discovered a passage from Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace which I tried to quote from memory before. I suppose Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace would not be classed by Mr. Foote as a savage; he would not even be classed by him as a peculiarly ignorant man; he might, with more justice, be classed as the greatest living man of science in the English-speaking world. Alfred Russel Wallace says that to explain life and the phenomena of life it is necessary to postulate—I quote—the absolute necessity for an organising and directive life-principle in order to account for the very possibility of these complex out-growths. "I argue," he says, "that they necessarily imply, first, a creative power which so constituted matter as to make these marvels possible; next, a directive mind which is demanded by every step of what we call growth, and often looked upon as so simple and natural a process as to require no explanation; and, lastly, an ultimate purpose in the very existence of the whole vast life-world and of its long course of evolution throughout the æons of paleological time." (Applause.) Now I put it to you that whether or not Mr. Alfred Russel Wallace has enjoyed precisely the advantages of Mr. Foote, he has not been called either a savage or ignorant. He maintains, then, at the end of over fifty years of the most careful investigation of natural phenomena, the necessity for postulating creative power, directive mind, and ultimate purpose. I leave you to decide between Alfred Russel Wallace and Mr. Foote.

Now turn once more to the passage from Darwin. I said distinctly, when I gave the quotation, that in the very next sentence Darwin qualified his statement by saying that he did not know in the least whether it was a really good or valid argument. That did not seem to impress you when the quotation came from me, but when it fell from the lips of Mr. Foote some of you seemed to go beside yourselves with rapture as of some new star swimming into your ken. When Darwin says that mind after all craves to know

whence the first cause came, he only demonstrates that supreme gifts in one field may go together with a singular lack of insight in other fields. Gladstone was a great statesman, and, I believe, a very poor theologian. Darwin was a supreme biologist, but an extremely poor philosopher, because only a man who was almost devoid of the philosophical faculty could commit himself to so unphilosophical a statement as that the mind craves to know whence the first cause came, when, in the very idea of first cause, the idea of whence is excluded. I say once more, so far as these contradictions in terms go, I make a present of them with all my heart to the other side, having no use for them myself. Darwin admitted towards the end of his life, in a passage which will be familiar to Mr. Foote, that he had lost all faculty for enjoying either music or poetry or anything of imaginative value—that he had become a mere machine for grinding out facts and was unable to go beyond the mere matter in which he worked. That may account for the gradual and deplorable loss of the religious faculty in this vast intellect. (Laughter.) Your sense of humor and mine are unfortunately different. That is all. Things amuse you that do not seem to me very amusing. A great man like Professor Clifford said (laughter). Oh, I would not dream of saying that Dr. Clifford was a great man before this packed audience. A great man like Professor Clifford said, with unspeakable sorrow and anguish, that the great companion was dead; but what to a great man like Clifford was a soul's tragedy, is, to some of you, a mere matter for paltry jesting. (Hear, hear.—Disorder.) Oh, yes, you can shout me down but you cannot argue me down. Oh, you can hiss—

A VOICE: There was no hissing. Don't be silly. Get on with your argument.

The CHAIRMAN: May I say if there was any hissing I did not hear it?

A VOICE: Treat the audience fairly.

The CHAIRMAN: If there was — (Interruption) Will you please be quiet?

A VOICE: He ought to act as a gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN: If there was any hissing, and Dr. Warschauer heard it—(A Voice: I heard it)—I am sorry. I am also sorry that it should not have passed unnoticed by the speaker, which would have been the wiser course, I think. Still, that is his province. I want to say now, if there has been hissing do not let it occur again. I want all of you to remember, whichever side you belong to, that in irritating a speaker on the opposite side you are injuring the side you are most interested in. Now I want all of us to act up to that to-night. Let us not interfere again with Dr. Warschauer's time; and I ask you to keep perfectly silent about anything of which you disapprove.

A VOICE: The audience are entitled to respect.

The CHAIRMAN: Will you please be quiet.

A VOICE: They are entitled to respect.

The CHAIRMAN: Be quiet.

A VOICE: You will have to be quiet, or you will go out by force.

The CHAIRMAN: I am asking for good manners and good temper. I repeat that it is regrettable when any person makes an interruption. It is also regrettable when a public speaker does not see the benefit and necessity of a little forbearance in ignoring a slight interruption that might pass unnoticed if not attended to. Now I have tried to keep, as well as I can, the scales level. I have asked repeatedly that you should all keep perfectly silent. I want you to do it, and if you think that a speaker is trying to irritate, well, in the name of all that is sensible, do not let him. You are in your own hands; do not let a speaker irritate you. Why I would not allow any speaker to irritate me, still less if I thought he meant to do it. Now, I repeat, let us have this meeting end as it began, in perfect quietness, good feeling, and good humor. (Hear, hear, and loud applause.)

Dr. WARSCHAUER: It was Mr. Foote, I believe, who first introduced the question of good manners in an address directed to me. I am, therefore, perfectly at liberty to introduce the topic of good manners in what I want to say to this audience, and I will say that in all my experience of public speaking I have never been subjected to so much rude and inconsiderate interruption as on these two evenings.

Rev. Mr. WALLACE: Somebody called the speaker a liar. I object. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to protect the speaker. Somebody called him a liar.

The CHAIRMAN: I can only ask again for you to keep quiet. (Interruption.) Order, please. Now will you please keep quiet. Will the gentleman on the platform also please keep quiet.

A VOICE: Turn him out.

The CHAIRMAN: You be quiet for me. I can keep you in order, I think. (Voices: Turn him out.) I do not want any physical force to be used on any person. It can be used if necessary, but I do not want it; and I again say, let those on the platform keep quiet. I think I have done my level best to keep you all quiet. I can only appeal to you to act

in a way that is creditable to you. Now I again ask Dr. Warschauer to continue his speech; and if he will oblige the Chair by ignoring any comment that any ill-advised or ill-tempered individual may care to make, he himself will contribute in no small measure to the pleasantness of the evening.

Dr. WARSCHAUER: I am sorry that I have once more to correct an unintentional misquotation on the part of Mr. Foote. I did not say that he was incapable of answering my questions—although I am still under the impression that he spoke of his inability to answer them because they were carefully excogitated, and because they were presented to him at the end of my speech. If I am mistaken in that I am sorry, but I think that is what I said.

Mr. Foote said that in my address I did not go into the infinite power, the infinite wisdom, and the infinite goodness of God. He should have given me more opportunity to introduce those topics in his remarks. I do not believe that God is, in the strict sense, omnipotent, because that would mean that there was no will in the world but God's will—and that would mean that we were all automata. Now I believe that God limited his own omnipotence by conferring upon us a certain degree of freedom so that within these limits we can use that freedom.

The CHAIRMAN: May I interrupt Dr. Warschauer for a moment? I am sorry to do so, and I do not want to stop him saying a brief word or two on that subject; but you will all see that to discuss the nature of God's omnipotence and the question of the limitation of God's will in a last speech is distinctly new matter. I do not want him, I repeat, to stop saying a word or two on it, as it has been mentioned; but any description of God now in a last speech is obviously unfair, since his opponent has no chance of dealing with it. If he had given a description in a previous speech that would have been a different matter, but he has not; and that to my mind is distinctly new matter.

Dr. WARSCHAUER: Mr. Cohen, I am perfectly willing to submit to your ruling, but Mr. Foote spoke about the infinite power, wisdom, and goodness of God in his last speech, and I thought that gave me the opportunity of dealing with it.

The CHAIRMAN: I just want to make myself plain to Dr. Warschauer on the point.

Mr. Foote: Mr. Chairman, will you allow me, as one of the disputants, the favor of a word? I beg the Chairman, and I beg the meeting, to let Dr. Warschauer say during the rest of his time what he wishes to say. Never mind, since this little unpleasantness has arisen, about absolutely accurate etiquette. I beg you—Chairman and meeting—to let Dr. Warschauer pursue his way uninterrupted. That will be from our side the best exhibition of good temper, and if he accepts it, it will be the best exhibition of the same on his side.

The CHAIRMAN: Of course. That takes all my chance of objecting away. I have no desire to object. I would again only point out in confirmation of my ruling that Mr. Foote was not discussing the infinity of God; he simply said that theologians had left off defining God in the old-fashioned way, and then I objected naturally as to a discussion of those attributes being introduced at the last moment. Still, if Mr. Foote does not object it is not my place to do so; at least I have no need to do so.

Dr. WARSCHAUER: Mr. Chairman, I am going to follow your ruling absolutely. I am, however, entitled when Mr. Foote said I did not say anything about God being worshiped—an object of worship—I am entitled to say that in my last speech I devoted some time to speaking of the worshipful faculty. (Hear, hear.) Now the worshipful faculty, without a being to address it to would be a contradiction in terms; and for the fourth or fifth time to-night I say I have no use for such. If I believe in a worshipful faculty, then I believe in the fact, and I believe in the being which calls forth that worshipful faculty; that is all. Mr. Foote speaks of the indestructible existence of the universe; so that after all the hither and thither and round about it, he does commit himself to a theory of the universe, namely, that it is indestructible. I am not going to discuss it. I will only say that there is this distinct and rather dogmatic pronouncement. There I leave that.

Cause and effect, says Mr. Foote, are only applicable to changes. Be it so. The changes have arisen in the universe from the time of the primeval fire-mist, and I want to know what the cause is which has set those changes in motion. "Cause," says Mr. Foote, "means something produced." Exactly; that which is produced to all time and to all creation is that being which the Theist calls God. "The mind," says Mr. Foote, "can imagine no end to the process of causation," but what the mind can or cannot imagine is in itself no standard of reality or possibility. There are many things we cannot imagine—such as the divisibility or indivisibility of an atom. There I may leave that.

Now I think, ladies and gentlemen, my time must be very very near its close, and I wish to speak rather under than

over my time, because this last period has been unduly lengthened, and I think the lengthening has imposed a strain upon all of us. May I, then, close with a quotation from one of whom Darwin said, "than whom we have no stronger, clearer exponent"—that was Professor John Fiske, who was led by the doctrine of evolution back to Theism, back to belief. Professor Fiske says:—

"The infinite eternal power that is manifested in every pulsation of the Universe is none other than the living God. We may exhaust the resources of metaphysics in debating how far his nature may fitly be expressed in terms applicable to the psychological nature of man. Such fine atoms only serve to show how we are dealing with a theme that must ever transcend our finite powers of conception. But of some things we may feel sure; humanity is not a mere local incident in an endless and aimless series of cosmical changes. The events of the Universe are not the work of chance, nor are they the outcome of blind necessity. Practically, there is a purpose in the world whereto it is our highest duty to learn to listen, however well or ill we may fare in rendering a scientific account of it. When from the dawn of life we see all things working together toward the evolution of the highest spiritual attributes of man, we know, however the words may stumble in which we try to say it, that God is in the deepest sense a moral Being; the everlasting source of phenomena is none other than the infinite power that makes for righteousness."

"Thou canst not by searching find Him out; yet put thy trust in Him, and against thee the gates of Hell shall not prevail, for there is neither wisdom nor understanding nor council against the eternal." ("Bravo!" Loud applause.)

Mr. Foote: I want simply to propose the usual vote of thanks to the Chairman. (Hear, hear.)

Dr. WARSCHAUER: I second that. (Applause.)

The CHAIRMAN: I thank you all, and I only want to say this, that in debate it frequently happens that temperatures rise; but if Freethinkers go away seeing that there is, perhaps, more to be said for Theism than they thought, and if Theists go away thinking there is more to be said for Atheism than they thought, the two debaters will both be satisfied, I am sure, and everybody connected with the debate will be well pleased. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

(The proceedings then terminated.)

## Correspondence.

### RESEARCH DEFENCE SOCIETY.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Let me remind your readers that 95 per cent. of experiments on animals are inoculations, or of the nature of inoculations; that is to say, they involve no "vivisection"—no sort or kind of operation on any animal. Let me also remind your readers that no operation, more than the lancing of a vein just under the skin, is allowed to be done on any animal in this country unless the animal is under the influence of an anæsthetic.

I am greatly interested by your phrase, "the extension of the moral law to animals." It would be hard to find a better instance of that extension than the work of Pasteur and his followers. The animals, we say, have a right to our protection. Very well; the best way to protect them is to protect them against disease and death. That is just what Pasteur did; that is just what he taught men to do. For five years he studied the diseases of silkworms—*flacherie* and *pébrine*—which were half wrecking the silk trade of France. He discovered how to protect the worms against these diseases. Then he studied the fowl cholera and anthrax, and he discovered how to protect fowls, sheep, and cattle. Later, Nocard, one of his followers, discovered how to protect horses against tetanus. Indeed, the list is a long one. *Flacherie* and *pébrine*, fowl cholera, anthrax, rinderpest, pleuro-pneumonia of cattle, Texas cattle fever, swine erysipelas, African Coast cattle fever, horse sickness, nagana, glanders, distemper, tuberculosis of cattle, lockjaw of horses—all these great scourges of the animal creation are better understood, better diagnosed, better treated, or better prevented, thanks to experiments on animals. Millions, literally millions, of animal lives have been protected against disease and death.

The Anti-vivisectionists would rob the very sheep and cattle, the very horses and swine, of their right to our protection. They would defraud them of health and of life. I call that, surely, cruelty to animals and torturo of animals.

STEPHEN PAGET,

Hon. Sec. Research Defence Society.

[We have not time at present to give Dr. Stephen Paget a proper reply, which, to be satisfactory, would fill columns. All we can do at the moment is to point out (1) that nearly every statement in his letter has been challenged, although no one would think so from the bland way in which he writes—and (2) that there is characteristic ingenuity in the plea that the lower animals are vivisected for their own sakes. It would be delightful, if the matter were not so tragic.—EDITOR.]

**SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.**

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

**LONDON.****OUTDOOR.**

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

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S. (Brockwell Park): 3.15, Miss K. B. Kough, "Christian Science."

EDMONTON BRANCH N. S. S. (The Green): 7, Mr. Marshall, "Christianity and its Practical Value."

FINSBURY PARK: 11.30, F. A. Davies, a Lecture.

KINGSLAND BRANCH N. S. S. (Ridley-road): 11.30, C. Cohen, "What the World Pays for Religion."

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

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (outside Maryland Point Station, Stratford): 7, H. Thurlow, jun., "The Problem of Evil."

WOOD GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Jolly Butchers Hill, opposite Public Library): 7, Mr. Allison, "Immortality."

**COUNTRY.****OUTDOOR.**

ST. HELENS (Market Place): Joseph A. E. Bates—Sunday, "Phantoms of the Clouds"; Monday, "In the Valley of the Shadow"; Tuesday, "Christian Credulities"; Wednesday, "Kingcraft—Past and Present" (with some reference to the forthcoming Coronation of George V.); Thursday, "Ethical Objections to the Salvation Army." At 7.30.

WIGAN (Town Square): Joseph A. E. Bates—Friday, May 19, "Mythological Elements in Christianity." At 7.45.

**FLOWERS OF FREETHOUGHT**

By **G. W. FOOTE.**

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

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

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

**BUSINESS CARDS.**

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

PROPAGANDIST LEAFLETS. New Issue. 1. *Hunting Skunks*, G. W. Foote; 2. *Bible and Teetotalism*, J. M. Wheeler; 3. *Principles of Secularism*, C. Watts; 4. *Where Are Your Hospitals?* R. Ingersoll. 5. *Because the Bible Tells Me So*, W. P. Ball. Often the means of arresting attention and making new members. Price 6d. per hundred, post free 7d. Special rates for larger quantities. Samples on receipt of stamped addressed envelope.—N. S. S. SECRETARY, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

**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.

**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.

**THE SECULAR SOCIETY**

(LIMITED)

Company Limited by Guarantee.

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

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

Secretary—MISS E. M. VANCE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY.

President: G. W. FOOTE.

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

#### Principles and Objects.

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

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

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

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

#### Membership.

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

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

Name.....

Address.....

Occupation .....

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

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

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

#### Immediate Practical Objects.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

America's Freethought Newspaper.

### THE TRUTH SEEKER.

FOUNDED BY D. M. BENNETT, 1873.

CONTINUED BY E. M. MACDONALD, 1883-1909.

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

#### SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

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

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

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

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

### 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 ... .. 8d.  
*Full of facts and figures.*
- An Outline of Evolutionary Ethics ... 6d.  
*Principles of ethics, based on the doctrine of Evolution.*
- Socialism, Atheism, and Christianity.. 1d.
- Christianity and Social Ethics ... 1d.
- Pain and Providence ... .. 1d.

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

### DEFENCE OF FREE SPEECH

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

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

With Special Preface and many Footnotes

Price FOURPENCE. Post free FIVEPENCE.

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

## 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 "grew" 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**

*Beynolds'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.**