

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXXII.—No. 29

SUNDAY, JULY 21, 1912

PRICE TWOPENCE

When the captain of the LONDON shook hands with his mate, saying, "God speed you! I will go down with my passengers," THAT I believe to be "human nature." He does not do it from any religious motive,—from any hope of reward, or any fear of punishment; he does it because he is a man.—JOHN RUSKIN.

Charles Bradlaugh.

[I was unable to join the annual visiting party to the great Charles Bradlaugh's grave on Sunday, July 7. What I might have said if I had spoken at that function would have been something on the lines of the speech I made at the Memorial Service at the Hall of Science on the evening of Monday, February 2, 1891, before Bradlaugh's burial at Brookwood Cemetery. I have often been asked to reprint that speech, and I take the present opportunity of doing so.—G. W. FOOTE.]

MR. BRADLAUGH was our old general. He is dead at the age of fifty-eight. It is young, as political life goes; his life was not a long one, measured by the ordinary standard. But we must remember he began his public life early. He was working for principles at an age when most young men are only weaving dreams. If we measure life by heartbeats, by thoughts, by wise words and bold deeds, he lived the life of many men. What a life it was! What a great character! He seemed a compendium of many men and of many varieties of human power. When but a lad he became a Freethought orator. In his very youngest days, while he spoke as a Freethinker, he was also an ardent social reformer. He was a temperance lecturer even in the Army, and when they sought to stop his tongue he knew how to use it and keep within the law. I remember him saying to me, "You know, Foote, I always cared for the condition of the people." I venture to say they never had a better friend. He never sought plaudits by cheap claptrap. His mind was of that earnest cast, that he hated mere feather-brained talk. His tongue he used as a weapon for definite ends. As a social reformer he did a grand work in calling public attention to that great question of population, which thinking men are beginning to see lies behind all others, and may nullify all other reforms unless it is wisely dealt with. He was a politician, as well as a Freethinker. His legal knowledge and his time were ever at the service of the people. The younger school of politicians have used harsh words of him which might easily be rebuked by the elder ones, who know what he had done in the past. He was not only a politician, he was a statesman. The fact that he commanded the respect even of bitter opponents proved his quality. It is so easy for prejudice to rise rampant against one who differs in opinion, but personal contact proves that human brotherhood is grander than all creeds and sectional differences. He showed his sagacity and large heart in his care for the millions of India. That dominion comes to us as an historic legacy. Mr. Bradlaugh wished the Hindoos to be governed justly, wisely, and with a view to their being educated up to the point when they may take their destinies in their own hands. In this he showed a wise and statesmanlike foresight. At the Congress to which he went in India he showed that hatred of mere feather-brained talk

of which I have spoken. I am not surprised that his death struck heavily at the heart of the best Hindoos.

Bradlaugh was not only a statesman. He was a fighter. While wrongs have to be righted and freedom is trampled on, the fighter is necessary. Like the hero of Browning's poem, he could say, "I was ever a fighter," and like him he met his death as "but one fight more." He faced it with fortitude, with consideration for all about him, and died peacefully. Some day, when the time has ripened, we may see some grotesque story of his having returned to the creed of his youth. With such a man change of the deliberate judgment of his maturity was impossible. He was a Freethinker. After his resignation of the Presidency of the National Secular Society he said to me in his room: "My convictions are not light. When I lay there (pointing to his bed) and all was black, the thing that troubled me least was the conviction of my life. The Freethought party is a party I love." And he showed it by working, by fighting and sacrificing for us.

We now hear a remarkable chorus of appreciation. But we cannot forget the obloquy he suffered before he commanded the respect of his enemies. We remember how he was thrust from the precincts of the House of Commons like a taproom brawler. Those of us who saw that pale, resolute, coat-torn figure standing before the open door from which he was ejected, will never forget the scene to the last day of our lives. The House of Commons challenged him. He accepted the challenge with no light heart, but with a firm one. He fought year by year, and he won. He took his seat, he carried a Bill which prevented the possibility of such another scandal, and he induced the House to expunge from its books the unconstitutional resolution which excluded him. It seemed a poetically arranged drama that he should win the last fragment of victory in this great struggle, and then pay the debt of nature. Yet, by a sad, strange irony, the news could not be told him. He died without knowing it. But we know it, and the world knows it. His motto of "Thorough" describes his victory in this tremendous conflict of one man, with right on his side, against the hosts of wrong.

The general public caught only glimpses of Mr. Bradlaugh's greatness. Too late it began to recognise the solid strength of his character. But the Freethought party knew him intimately and always appreciated his worth. It watched with hope his early efforts, it was associated with his later struggles, it stood by him unswervingly in the darkest hours of adversity, and it rejoiced at his triumph, which, though long delayed, was brilliant and complete. Yes, it was the Freethought party to which he really belonged. It is the Freethought party which is most profoundly affected by his death. What to others is a public loss is to us a personal bereavement. How many of us have sought—and never in vain—his counsel in perplexity and his assistance in distress! How many of us not only admired but loved him! But now his noble personality is gone from us for ever. In the days to come, when the old war with error and evil is waged afresh, we shall miss him where the standards reel, and the smoke is thick, and the fight is hot and deadly. We shall miss that strong arm, that wise counsel, that inspiring voice, and that indomitable courage which flamed like a

beacon of hope in the night of other men's despair. Yet we shall shed no idle tears over his tomb. The war in which he led us has still to be carried on. Could we have stood around our old general as he fell beneath the sword of Death, the invincible lord of all, we should have seen his outstretched finger and heard his cry of "Onward!" As we charge the serried ranks of superstition, his name will spring to our lips. He will live in our hearts, animate our courage, and nerve our arms. Not in metaphor, but in verity, he will fight in our midst. The old general will be with his soldiers in the days of battle. Nor will he cease to inspire the army of freedom when our own hearts are chilled by the touch of death, and others take the weapons from our nerveless hands. For we shall hand on to our successors the tradition of his genius, his wisdom, his magnanimity, and his fortitude; and thus, though dead, he will share in the struggle for the freedom, the welfare, and the dignity of mankind.

The Appeal to God.

I MUST confess to a certain inability to quite appreciate the shiver of horror with which the story of the Atheist pulling out his watch and giving the Deity five minutes to strike him dead has always been received. In the first place, Christians all believe that God *could* do so if he were inclined to exert his power. Nay, they have produced a large number of cases in which they say God's power was manifested in this fashion. A favorite form of Christian evidence used to be that of the unbeliever who was suddenly blinded, or paralysed, or killed as a result of using the name of God in a disrespectful manner. Those who are acquainted with the religious literature of a century ago, addressed to juveniles, will also recall the cases of children who were choked by lollipops, or drowned, or run over in the streets, because they had omitted to say their prayers, or had stayed away from Sunday-school, or had desecrated the Sabbath. Christians themselves had made the summary extinction of the unbeliever one of the proofs of the existence of Deity, and at most the Atheist was only utilising the test supplied by Christians. Moreover, the Atheist did not endanger anybody's life but his own. Had he asked as a proof that God should kill a Christian within five minutes, the latter would have had some cause for complaint. But he took all the risks himself—which is a way Atheists have. And God did nothing—which is also a way the gods have. At any rate, the challenge and its treatment was a matter between the Atheist and Deity. And if God did nothing and said nothing, it seems only proper for the Christian to follow his example.

Even if the story were true, the Atheist was only calling on God to do in a particular instance what the Christian says God does on a much wider scale. When a Christian nation goes to war its prayer men pray to the Deity to strengthen its arms and crush the enemy. If the enemy is crushed, thanksgiving services are held, and the clergy claim that their prayers have been answered, and that God has crushed their opponents. They profess to have no doubt that God helped Christian England to conquer India, the Soudan, and to crush the Boer Republics. If we are to believe that England conquered these countries because of the grace of God, we must also believe that these others lost because the grace of God was withheld, for we cannot imagine for a moment that the grace and power of God is circumscribed by such incidentals as superiority of arms, men, or money. And if one side wins because God is with it, then, clearly, the other side loses because he has forsaken it. The power of Deity that is manifested on the one side by victory, must also be manifested on the other side by defeat. Consequently, God has proven his existence by the destruction of some thousands of combatants. But this is only the watch story on a colossal scale. Instead of God being asked to

strike one person dead within five minutes, he is asked to kill thousands, and take his own time to do it. Yet the Christian shrinks in horror from the first form of the appeal, and greets the other with a special thanksgiving service. Verily, the Christian is a curious psychological study.

The Christian is not slow to produce examples of the special and direct action of the Deity in other directions. For years we have been told how George Muller kept his orphanage in funds by direct appeals to God. He told God exactly how much he wanted, and God at once influenced a number of men and women to send the required amount. When the West London Mission was in urgent need of funds, the late Hugh Price Hughes describes how he asked God to send a thousand pounds by a particular day. The exact date and amount was specially impressed on the Deity, and on the morning of the date named the exact amount came to hand. The Rev. R. F. Horton explains how a girl dying from acute peritonitis was saved because he "asked definitely" of the Lord that she should recover. Canon Knox Little tells of a religious "home" that had need of £40, and the Lord moved a lady to stop her carriage in Regent-street and hand the director of the "home" the exact amount in an envelope. Examples of this kind are numerous, and they are all variants of the watch story on the other side. God is asked to do something of a special kind in a certain time, and the unbeliever is asked to accept the realisation of the request as proof of the existence of Deity. They are all challenges to God; the Atheistic challenge alone causes trouble.

Again, there is the appeal to Deity in the shape of the ordeal by battle, or by exposing oneself to danger in other directions. In the first case, God was expected to manifest his justice by enabling the innocent man to conquer. In the latter case, the accused, by walking blindfold over red-hot bars, or by swearing on the Scriptures, practically challenged God to punish him if he were not speaking the truth. He was thus doing, in principle, exactly what the Atheist is charged with doing in the famous watch story. And in our courts we still have the religious ordeal of the oath. This, it must be remembered, is essentially a religious appeal to Deity. Legally, punishment for not telling the truth could be inflicted without the religious oath. But, on the side of those who impose the oath, the idea is that people will less readily tell a lie when the Deity is called in as a participant. And on the side of the oath taken, the essence of the statement is: "If I do not tell the truth, then may God punish me." Why a Christian should be shocked by an appeal to God to do something to demonstrate his existence, and take it as quite a proper thing for him to be asked to interfere in a police-court case, is rather puzzling to discover.

Perhaps the dislike to the watch story is that God is asked to take someone's life. But if there is a God he does take everybody's life sooner or later; and if religious records are to be trusted, he has deliberately taken the lives of thousands of people to manifest and vindicate his existence. But let us vary the terms of the challenge. Suppose the Atheist, instead of saying "If there is a God let him prove his existence by striking me dead in five minutes," had said "If there is a God let him cause the hour hand of my watch to describe a complete circle in five minutes," no one would have been hurt by this being done, and many would have been benefited. It would have effectually settled all the Atheism in that meeting, if not elsewhere. And it would really have been asking no more than the Christian asks when he calls on God to prove his greatness by trampling his enemies underfoot. If this had been done would the Christian have been more content? I doubt it. When Professor Tyndall suggested testing the power of prayer by taking two hospital wards, giving the patients in one prayer and no medical attendance, and in the other medical attendance and no prayer, the Christians objected quite as strongly. Really, they did not object to

the test, what they object to is a test—one that would be really decisive to thoughtful people. And their concern was not that the Atheist might get killed—many Christians would face that result with the utmost equanimity. They knew the Atheist was perfectly safe, and that it would be impossible in any court in England to sustain a charge of attempted suicide. But it belonged to a class of tests that would be fatal to religious claims all over the world.

Clearly, if the question of the existence of God is of such profound importance as theologians say it is, one ought to feel quite sure on the subject. It is a serious thing for the Atheist if he is in error. It is quite as serious a thing if all the time and money and energy spent in the service of God is being squandered on a myth. In the interest of everybody, some test should be devised that would remove all reasonable doubt. At present no one is sure whether there is a God or not. Or if there is, no one seems to know what he does, or why he does it, or whether he does anything at all. In the old days, when God ruled the thunder, sent disease, and averted plagues, when prodigies appeared as his messengers, and ordeals manifested his power, there was no need for any special proof. Everyone was then certain that God existed; the only question was what to do to please him. But now things are changed. Lightning has become the plaything of a child, and health and disease are reduced to phases in an interminable germicidal warfare. Prodigies are catalogued instead of worshiped, and no judge is impressed by an accused person's appeal to God. If one theologian finds a proof of God in one direction, another is fairly certain to tell him he is wrong in his deduction. If the British Army suffers a "reverse," some people in the pulpit may still talk of the anger of God; but in the House of Commons Christians find fault with Army organisation, or the qualities of the arms supplied. Where one finds in the loss of a vessel like the *Titanic* a divine lesson intended to check human arrogance, another repudiates the conclusion as rank blasphemy. Mr. Lloyd George is quite certain that he is furthering God's work in disestablishing the Welsh Church; but congresses of black-coated gentlemen specially "called" by the Lord have solemnly concluded that the proposal owes its inspiration to a quite antagonistic quarter. In all this babel of proof and disproof, assertion and counter-assertion, how is one to make sure? Above all, how is the poor Atheist to act? How can he decide on a test that will at once leave the tender feelings of Christians unlacerated and satisfy his own mental requirements.

The matter is really serious. Will someone suggest an all-round satisfactory "control experiment"?—to use the language of the laboratory. No one will welcome it more gladly than the Atheist; no one will more quickly put it into operation. For he is an Atheist not because he wants to be, but because he must be. If he is wrong, he desires to be put right. If he is right, he desires others to be right with him. Anyway, the situation is both serious and critical. The world holds millions of Atheists who might be converted could the matter be brought to a clear issue. This is a much more serious question than the low wages of curates or old age pensions for clergymen. We earnestly suggest that the next Church Congress should consider the matter.

C. COHEN.

Mind, Soul, Consciousness.

ACCORDING to Professor Bergson, matter is a sort of bye-product of the evolutionary process; not a thing directly aimed at and definitely worked for, but a thing that slipped in unawares, as if by accident. Consequently, mind, spirit, or consciousness existed prior to matter. It is eternal; at least Bergson gives no hints of its ever having had a beginning. Why it existed, or what it was doing

before it incidentally produced matter, we are not informed; but it appears that it produced matter in order to, or, at any rate, that having produced it began to, play with it, to beat against it, to rush headlong upon it, with the result that at various points it penetrated it, falling asunder in the process. We now see consciousness at work, fighting, subduing, utilising matter, and at last getting out of it again, and leaving it behind as worthless stuff. This view of the Universe is not new, though Bergson has given it an original expression. John Fiske and William James held it, though they were more restrained in their statement of it. The latter, in particular, was careful to emphasise his subscription "to the psycho-physiological formula: *Thought is a function of the brain.*" Having thus expressed his adherence to the theory of "the absolute dependence of our spiritual life, as we know it here, upon the brain," he says:—

"One hears not only physiologists, but numbers of laymen who read the popular science books and magazines, saying all about us, How can we believe in life hereafter when Science has once for all attained to proving, beyond all possibility of escape, that our inner life is a function of that famous material, the so-called 'grey matter' of our cerebral convolutions? How can the function possibly persist after its organ has undergone decay?"—*Human Immortality*, pp. 17, 18.

James admits that "arrests of brain development occasions imbecility, that blows on the head abolish memory or consciousness, and that brain-stimulants and poisons change the quality of our ideas." He also makes the following admission:—

"What the laboratories and hospitals have lately been teaching us is not only that thought in general is one of the brain's functions, but that the various special forms of thinking are functions of special portions of the brain. When we are thinking of things seen, it is our occipital convolutions that are active; when of things heard, it is a certain portion of our temporal lobes; when of things to be spoken, it is one of our frontal convolutions."—*Ibid.*, p. 20.

This is Materialism pure and simple; and yet James was by no means a Materialist. In expressing approval of the mechanical theory of the relation between brain and thought, he ingeniously added that he accepted it only in so far as it applies to our life on earth. The truth of this theory is generally regarded as a fatal objection to immortality; but to Professor James it had "in strict logic no deterrent power." He says:—

"I must show you that the fatal consequence is not coercive, as is commonly imagined; and that, even though our soul's life (as here below it is revealed to us) may be in literal strictness the function of a brain that perishes, yet it is not at all impossible, but, on the contrary, quite possible, that the life may still continue when the brain itself is dead."—*Ibid.*, p. 26.

On earth, mind, soul, consciousness, is a function of the brain; but it does not necessarily follow that the function is a *productive* one. The psycho-physiologists maintain that the brain *produces*—brings into being—the very stuff of consciousness; but James, on the contrary, holds that consciousness is a spiritual substance or entity, which pre-exists, and that the various brains in the world only give it its various special forms. Consciousness exists in the spiritual world in vast unities, as the "world-soul," and the business of our brains is to separate that "world-soul" into parts and give them finite forms.

John Fiske, a great friend of James, advocates the same theory in a clever little book, entitled *Everlasting Life*. He too approves of the dictum that, so far as this world is concerned, thought is a function of the brain. He goes further and makes the following significant statement:—

"The doctrine of the survival of conscious activity apart from material conditions is unsupported by experience, and it is inconceivable, and we may observe that it is inconceivable just because it is entirely without foundation in experience. Our powers of conception are narrowly determined by the limits of our experience, and when that experience has never

furnished us with the materials for framing a conception we simply cannot frame it. Hence we cannot conceive of the conscious soul as entirely dissociated from any material vehicle."—*Everlasting Life*, p. 61.

This is quite true and exceedingly well put; but the mischief is that Fiske immediately ignores it. He says that the argument is perfectly sound, but denies that it amounts to anything as against the doctrine of survival. There is an entire absence of testimony that survival is a fact; but that "does not even raise a negative presumption except in cases where testimony is accessible." But if in the absence of all testimony a negative presumption is not admissible, then why on earth does Fiske adventure to raise a positive presumption in precisely the same circumstances? He declares that "so long as our knowledge is restricted by the conditions of this terrestrial life, we are not in a position to make negative assertions as to regions of existence outside of these conditions"; but he forgets that neither are we in a position to make positive assertions. In the absence of knowledge all assertions should be ruled out of court. If Fiske were true to his own logic he would raise no negative presumption against the mechanistic theory that "conscious mental phenomena are products of the organic tissues with which they are associated." He knows that this assumption a metaphysical one we grant, is the central stronghold of Materialism, which a Christian apologist must storm at all hazards.

Everybody is now familiar with the great law of the persistence of force, or conservation of energy. In pages 67-71 of his *Everlasting Life*, Fiske submits a luminous and beautiful statement of this law, showing that it reigns everywhere except in the brain. He avers that even in the brain it holds good up to a certain point. "No scientific man," he admits, "will for a moment doubt that the little vibratory discharge between cerebral ganglia, which accompanies a thought, is one member in a series of molecular motions that might be measured and expressed in terms of quantity if we only possessed an apparatus sufficiently delicate and subtle." In the absence of such apparatus he takes for granted that the law obtains in the physical motions of the brain, but sceptically asks, "How is it with the accompanying thought? Does the correlation obtain between physical motions and conscious feelings?" The error that underlies those questions is the baseless assumption that thoughts and feelings are not forms of motion, just as heat or electricity or light is. But are not states of consciousness specific forms of motion? Do they not always correspond in character to the stage of complexity at which the nervous tissues have arrived? And are not thoughts and feelings states of consciousness at their highest and best? Of course, Fiske, James, and Bergson, being Idealists, believe that consciousness, thoughts, and feelings are entities, of which the brain is merely the instrument or organ. It never occurs to such metaphysical dreamers that their wild speculations are highly derogatory to the good sense and dignity of the "world-soul," which is represented as breaking up into parts, penetrating into innumerable chunks of matter, and organising them until they become so refined and complex in structure as to be able to transmit individualised consciousnesses to goodness knows where. As Mr. A. J. Balfour well says:—

"Mr. Bergson regards matter as the dam which keeps back the rush of life. Organise it a little (as in the Protozoa)—i.e., slightly raise the sluice—and a little life will squeeze through. Organise it elaborately (as in man)—i.e., raise the sluice a good deal—and much life will squeeze through."—*Hibbert Journal*, October, 1911, p. 18.

The whole process is so silly, so insane, or, as Fiske would put it, so inconceivable.

When John Fiske was in London some forty years ago, he asked Tyndall if he thought that there is a complete correlation between the physical and the psychical, and the great scientist answered that he did. Herbert Spencer was of the same opinion, and

expressed it even in the 1900 edition of his *First Principles*, where he says (§. 71a), that the "the facts oblige us to say that physical and psychical actions are correlated, and in a certain indirect way quantitatively correlated, so as to suggest transformation." He admits, it is true, that "how the material affects the mental, and how the mental affects the material, are mysteries which it is impossible to fathom." Then he adds: "But they are not profounder mysteries than the transformations of the physical forces into one another." Our conclusion necessarily is that consciousness is not a thing in itself apart from matter, and using matter as an instrument of expression, but a state or condition of the brain, or, as Büchner calls it, "a performance, or action, or phenomenal activity, of certain parts or tissues of the brain." The same thing is true of memory, thought, and emotion. It is the organism that is conscious, thinks, feels, and incites to action; and it is with the organism alone that we are capable of dealing. A man never belies himself. In the long run, whatever he is he does, and whatever he does he is. All we can do is to remember and endeavor to act upon the old Latin proverb—"Mens sana in corpore sano," which in modern English means that a sound body of necessity implies a sound mind, and essentially embraces the whole Philosophy of Secularism.

J. T. LLOYD.

Christian Chicanery.

SHELLEY has been once more brought to the notice of the average newspaper reader by the Keats-Shelley matinées at the Haymarket Theatre, and book-lovers have reason to be grateful for the handsome edition of Shelley's poems which has been issued by the firm of Methuen. The great poet died so long since that one would have thought that the facts concerning his life were well known to every lover of poetry. Yet Christian writers are very loth to admit Shelley's Freethought. Being religious themselves, they pretend that a man of genius cannot be an Atheist; and so they tell lies, and strain their faculties to disprove what Shelley asserted all through his life.

In a recent issue of the *Daily News and Leader* a writer thus referred to Shelley:—

"Courageously and Christianly he held to his faith in the perfectibility of man. He did not believe in it, it is true, according to the Christian method. But to believe in it at all is a sort of Christianity."

If this were an isolated example it would be unworthy of note; but in the case of Shelley orthodox writers are always finding opportunities of imposing upon the ignorance and credulity of ordinary readers. Professor Henry Morley, whose pen was at work in the interests of the Great Lying Christian Church for so many years, was a typical sinner in this respect. In his introduction to the popular edition of Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound* he was simply unpardonable. This is the way the Christian Professor defamed the dead Atheist:—

"But the refuge he [Shelley] seeks from the wrongs of life is—though he does not know it—at the feet of Christ. The true Christian hears, through the wildest music in the utterance of *Prometheus Unbound*, the cry to which his own soul answers with sure hope, and claims fellowship with the singer who presses, like the lark, up to the height of heaven, though his way is through the darkness of a cloud."

Professor Morley is not alone in this crusade of robbery and insult. Mr. Edmund Gosse, in his address delivered at the Shelley centenary celebration, since reprinted, said Shelley "rashly styled himself an Atheist, forgetful of the fact that, whatever name he might call himself, he, more than any other poet of the age, saw God in everything."

A more recent writer, Mr. Hector Macpherson, in his *Century of Intellectual Development*, equally debases the moral currency. He writes:—

"While the official religion was aiding the State in its ghastly work of despotism and persecution, Shelley

was bent upon Christianising politics, and pleading for a sociology which would bring the world nearer the ideal of the Sermon on the Mount."

That great poet, Robert Browning, who had hailed Shelley as "Sun-treader," was so biased by his own pietism that he considered that Shelley "would have finally ranged himself with the Christians." R. H. Hutton, of the *Spectator*, asserted that Shelley "learned even to believe in God as he drew near the end." Hosts of critics, from the days of Gilfillan to those of Stopford Brooke, have wilfully refused to take Shelley's Atheism seriously, and admirers of the poet seem as blind as the worst detractors.

Shelley, be it remembered, was expelled from Oxford University for his Atheism, and years after was declared by Lord Eldon, Lord Chancellor, to be unfit to be the custodian of his own children on account of his heterodoxy. The poet's Atheism was never disputed during his unpopular days, when men and women suffered imprisonment for selling his blasphemous *Queen Mab*. But when it was discovered that the star of a great poet had arisen, he was falsely and impudently dubbed a Christian.

The fact does not obtrude itself, but Shelley really belonged to an order of writers of which Rousseau and Voltaire are the greatest representatives. They all wrote, not merely for artistic, but for propagandist ends, to impress their ideas upon others by the force of eloquence. In the last analysis they are alike in their Freethought. Shelley did not originate the philosophy in his poetry; he merely adopted it, borrowing it indirectly from Godwin and directly from the great French Freethinkers. The ideas had all the force of novelty, but Rousseau and Shelley and others merely carried on a great tradition. To the priest-ridden people they addressed, the views propounded were in truth a new evangel.

In the early days this was freely admitted and acknowledged, and Shelley's known Atheism incurred the odium *theologicum*; and no enmity is more relentless or more venomous. The abuse which was supposed to have killed Keats was politeness itself compared with the assault and battery made upon Shelley by the free and enlightened press of a Christian country. Here, for example, was what the *Gentleman's Magazine* had to say of him when the news of his death reached England: "Percy Bysshe Shelley is a fitter subject for a penitentiary dying speech than a landing elegy; for the muse of the rope rather than that of the cypress." That was what a periodical edited by a Christian gentleman for Christian gentlemen had to say of the dead Freethinker. Another representative of the "religion of love," we remember, met Shelley in the post-office at Pisa, called him a "damned Atheist," and knocked him down.

Leigh Hunt, one of the friends who knew him best, spoke the truth.

"Had he lived, he would have made everybody know him for what he was—a man idolised by his friends, studious, temperate, of the gentlest life and conversation, and willing to have died to have done the world a service."

"Had he lived." Even though dead, something of this has come to pass. Better than his contemporaries do we of the twentieth century understand Shelley's motives. More plainly than they do we see that his deeds, even when erratic and blame-worthy, were never inspired by other than lofty ideals. And, in spite of all the malice of pious detractors, our hearts respond as never before to the most anti-Christian of the English poets, a singer whose life-work is illuminated with his enthusiasm for humanity.

"O light of the land that adored thee
And kindled thy soul with her breath,
Whose life, such as fate would afford thee,
Was lovelier than aught but thy death."

MIMNERMUS.

There is not a more singular character in the world than that of a thinking man.—*Melmoth*.

The Persistence of Error.

CRITICAL examinations of the Bible nowadays, like that contained in Mangasarian's *Bible Unveiled*, is called "fighting the phantoms of the past," as though belief in the inspiration and inerrancy of the book were a belief discarded long ago. The state of the community as to belief in the Bible is erroneously judged by the opinions of the most enlightened; and because some progressive minister is tolerated in the pulpit the laymen of the public press conclude that he is voicing the sentiments of the majority or of an overwhelming percentage of professing Christians.

To say that the Bible is not now accepted as it was one hundred or two hundred years ago is to ignore the fact that the largest sect of the Christian world, the Catholic Church, affirms every word of the scriptures to be infallible. The whole anti-Modernist movement in the Church, which has hit Loisy and Murri and the author of the Letters to Pope Pius X., is aimed at the higher criticism of the Bible. If Catholic statistics may be relied upon, some fifteen millions of the people in the United States are committed by their profession of faith to exactly that view of the Scriptures which we are told has been abandoned.

As if to entirely confute the reviewers who deny the present need of polemical writings, the Lutheran Church, which stands fourth, numerically, in the order of denominations, is reaffirming in the strongest terms its adhesion to plenary inspiration and total inerrancy of the Bible. At the big meeting of Lutherans held in St. Louis last month a new declaration was put forth and approved. A resolution unanimously adopted was as follows:—

"It is the sense of this meeting to affirm before God and our Lord Jesus Christ our implicit and abiding faith in the inerrancy of the Word of God, the Deity, virgin birth, bodily resurrection, and atoning blood of our Lord, Jesus Christ, the only begotten son of God, and to testify that the Holy Ghost does not give us the privilege of being unequally yoked with unbelievers."

Another resolution withdraws fellowship from those who would teach as truth anything out of harmony with the foregoing. Afterwards was read an address written by Professor W. H. T. Dau, of Concordia Seminary, who thus outlined the Lutheran faith:—

"We believe, teach, and confess that the sacred writings of the Christian Church, both of the Old and the New Testament, not only contain, but are, the the inspired Word of God; that God in the compilation of this book, not only suggested to the writers the thoughts, or subjects on which he desired them to express their personal and private sentiments, but also prompted their very utterance, the holy penmen of God speaking, not merely thinking, as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

"We believe, teach, and confess that the sixty-six books of the Bible are the final revelation of God to a sinner world; that they are true and inerrant in every part and particle; that they are the only norm by which Christian believing and Christian living must be determined; that they are sufficient for every purpose of the calling, justifying, sanctifying grace of God to sinners; that they possess inherent power, without the aid of human devices for rendering them effectual.

"We believe, teach, and confess that the central and cardinal teaching of all the Scriptures is that Jesus Christ, true God, begotten of the father from eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary, is our Lord; who hath redeemed us.

"We deplore and denounce the open and the covert attempts which are being made by misguided men, to question, or to deny, the plenary or verbal theopneusty of the Bible, or of parts of it. We abhor and abominate the irreverent schemes which unwise learned men have invented for producing a Bible which, in their opinion, will suit men better than the Bible of the prophets, evangelists, and apostles."

There has not been an age in the history of Christendom when people professed more faith in the integrity of the Bible than that language expresses. It is more explicit than the Confession of Faith of 1647. The Bible is true and inerrant in

every part and particle, the Lutherans say. In the darkest ages of faith they could have said no more. The Lutheran Church, through its preachers and its schools, has contrived to produce a generation in 1912 as blind and stupid religiously as the contemporaries of Martin Luther. In four hundred years that Church has not advanced one step in understanding of the Bible—a powerful testimonial to the stupefying effect of religion. Compared to the total number of Christians, there are doubtless as many of these blind believers as when Paine wrote his *Age of Reason*, and there is no reason for supposing that the proportionate number of unbelievers is any greater to-day than it was three hundred years ago.

There have always been unbelievers, for this age has no monopoly of men of sense and rational mind. The apparently greater number now is due to the world's having learned the value of free discussion, and taken from the Church the power to suppress it. In the past the unbelieving minority had to keep their heresies to themselves; now they don't, and that is why they appear more numerous—they can speak and publish their ideas without losing their liberties and lives. There must have been many Freethinkers in the days of John Huss, of Vanini, Bruno, and Galileo. If they spoke their thoughts, they lost their tongues; and if they printed them, their writings were destroyed. In the next century after Bruno was born Voltaire; and he is the first modern to have exposed the Bible and Christianity, and to have lived to an advanced age, and to have his writings survive him.

Give the Church to-day the same power over the courts that it exercises in society, and there would be as few Freethinkers among the people at large as there are among the politicians.

It is to be assumed that Church conferences and conventions that define the belief of their communions tell the truth—that Lutherans believe “the sacred writings of the Christian Church, both of the Old and the New Testament, not only contain but are the inspired Word of God,” and that the other orthodox sects share their faith. That being so, the beliefs combated by Freethinkers are no “phantoms of long ago,” but actual present-day delusions. If, on the other hand, these mouthpieces of the Church are not telling the truth, they are hypocrites and impostors, and for equally strong reasons they should be shown up. On either supposition they would discourage such a book as Mangasarian's. In the one case it exposes their belief; in the other case it exposes them.

The Church in the United States reports something more than thirty-five millions of communicants, which is about 35 per cent. of the population. We imagine there are more real sincere believers in the grosser things of Christianity outside of the Church membership than are included in it. The man you ordinarily meet is not on the rolls of any Church, and yet he is full of inherited superstitions. If he does not accept the Bible just as the Church prescribes that he shall do, he still believes it is the Word of God, that Jesus was something more than a man, and that religion is a matter too sacred to be discussed. If the Church should expel all who belong for other reasons than their belief in its dogmas, and could attach all the outsiders who believe more than most Church people do, they would have twice as many members as they have now.

In a pretended interview between Lincoln and Newton Bateman, words are attributed to Lincoln which parrot the utterances of the common, everyday non-Church member, incidentally revealing that they are the product of some common mind, and not of Abraham Lincoln's. Here Lincoln is represented as saying: “Mr. Bateman, I am not a Christian—God knows I would be one—I know there is a God. I know I am right, for Christ teaches it, and Christ is God,” and so on—mere incoherent rambling, indicating the presence of belief in a mind too indolent to systemise it or too ill-informed to express it.

The success of the “Billy” Sundays and “Gipsy” Smiths in inducing so many thousands to “acknowledge their Savior,” as the cant phrase has it, is another demonstration of the existence of belief among the unchurched crowd. These evangelists say nothing calculated to produce belief; they assume with safety that the belief is there, and their function is only that of stirring it up. Dr. Maudesley, writing of Luther's interview with the Devil, says:—

“When Luther saw the Devil enter his chamber at Wittenberg, and instantly flung the inkstand at his head, he seems to have been neither horrified nor greatly surprised, and to have resented the visit rather as an intrusion which he had expected from an adversary with whom he had had many encounters.”

Luther believed devoutly in the Devil, and, as Maudesley gives us to understand, was in a state of “expectant apprehension” previously engendered; otherwise, he would never have seen the apparition. So it is with the mob at revival meetings. They already believe; they have had the feeling of expectant apprehension aroused by the publicity given to the meetings, and they come forward. Freethinkers are never privileged to see the Devil or ghosts, and neither do they experience the power of the Holy Ghost and become converted.

The public teacher who ignores the mass of superstition latent or active in the common mind, and assures the indifferent that “nobody believes such things nowadays,” is fooling himself if he is sincere and is misleading those who come under his influence. Freethought, which is all that makes the world enlightened, progressive, and sane, is needed as much now as ever to keep it so.

GEORGE MACDONALD.

—*Truthseeker* (New York).

HER SECRET.

One day a pastor was calling upon a dear old lady, one of the “pillars” of the church to which they both belonged. As he thought of her long and useful life, and looked upon her sweet, placid countenance, bearing but few tokens of her ninety-two years of earthly pilgrimage, he was moved to ask her: “My dear Mrs. S., what has been the chief source of your strength and sustenance during all these years? What has appealed to you as the real basis of your unusual vigor of mind and body, and has been to you an unflinching comfort through joy and sorrow? Tell me, that I may pass the secret on to others, and, if possible, profit by it myself.” The old lady thought a moment, then, lifting her eyes, dim with age, yet kindling with sweet memories of the past, answered briefly: “Victuals.”

WHAT HE THOUGHT HE WAS GETTING.

The Sunday-school teacher had explained very carefully how Eve was created out of one of Adam's ribs and made the wife of Adam. Little Bobby was deeply impressed with the story, and when he went home he related it to his parents. The next day, after running around a good deal, a pain developed in his side, and when his mother found him, he was lying on the bed, sobbing bitterly. “Why, what's the matter with my little boy?” she asked. “Oh, dear,” was the response, “I'm getting a wife.”

ALWAYS PRESENT.

Jonah had just emerged from the whale. “Mister,” said the small boy who was waiting, “will ye please give me yer kewpon?”

It is unfortunate that we have no reliable record of the life of Jesus, and it is exceedingly strange that what he said and did was not regarded by the historians of his day as worthy of being recorded, which goes to prove that he did not say and do what is contained in the four gospels of the New Testament. No man could have performed the miracles attributed to Jesus without having every historian at his heels. The words put into the mouth of Jesus by his biographers might have been heard and forgotten, but the deeds which have been related as manifestations of his divine power would have compelled wonder from the intelligent and wise, and books would have been filled with his performances.—*L. K. Washburn, "Truthseeker" (New York).*

Acid Drops.

The London representative of the *Eastern Daily Press* (July 13) contributed a curious paragraph about General Booth, from which we make the following extract:—

"General Booth, who is now totally blind, has not ventured, so far, outside his garden at Hadley Wood, in which he walks a little each day, guided by his private secretary. He can feel his way about indoors by himself, as he is familiar with his domestic interior. Outside his own family no one sees him with the exception of two or three Salvation Army Commissioners. His hearing is exceedingly good, and, as one of his staff said to me, if things could have been so arranged that he could hear 50 per cent. less and see 50 per cent. better, it would, on the whole, have been a more satisfactory dispensation than the present one."

It is a pity that the Almighty did not consult this member of General Booth's staff some years ago. The "more satisfactory dispensation" might then have been realised. It is too late now. Perhaps the Almighty will see that this gentleman is consulted in future.

All sorts of good pious "ladies," from duchesses downwards, have lately been taking an immense interest in working people generally and "slavies" in particular. We see that at a meeting in St. James's Hall, Lynn, to protest against the Insurance Act, after the performance of "Britons never shall be slaves," the Chairman said that the Insurance Act would "alter the character of the whole nation by making people more selfish." "There would no longer," he said, "be that nice kindly feeling which had always existed between employer and employee." We defy the most Christian employer in the country to beat that.

Poor Mr. W. T. Stead! The Spiritualists are upon thee! Another exploiter of the famous journalist who went down with the *Titanic* is Mrs. Charles Bright, of Melbourne. Mr. Stead's ghost is represented as talking fluently to this lady about the wonderful buildings, flowers, scenery, etc., of the spirit-world in which he found himself directly his lungs filled with salt water instead of pure air. But it is all very vague. There is no approach whatever to definiteness. These "mediums" declare that earth-life is only the shadow of heaven-life, but it is obvious that the truth is exactly the reverse. Man's imagination is always, and necessarily, guided by his experience. He cannot fancy anything he has not seen. That is why even poets are always close observers. Shakespeare noticed and remembered everything.

The Rev. F. C. Spurr complains of the ingratitude of emigrants to Australia. They come to the Churches when they need all kinds of advice and assistance, and having got it, are heard of no more. "In Australia they appear to drop their religion." They "have nothing further to do with the Church or with any church." We do not think that Mr. Spurr should complain. Of course, if the advice to emigrants is given as a kind of inducement to get people to join the Church, Mr. Spurr has cause to be annoyed. He has made a bad investment, and the only way out would be to get some kind of a pledge before giving the advice. If, however, Mr. Spurr gives advice for the purpose of benefiting the emigrant, let him be content that the advice may help those who need it. Otherwise, it will look as though the Melbourne clergy are not really anxious about the welfare of the emigrants, but only to secure clients for their respective churches. The advice takes the place of the teapot with the pound of tea.

One expects, and one gets, queer views of history from a Christian, but in the hands of the Rev. Johnston Ross, Professor of Homiletics in Union Seminary, New York, things get "curioser and curioser." Thus when Mohammed said "Far be it from God that He should have a son," he "foredoomed the Mohammedan world to stagnation and slavery and the horrors of Absolutism." But there is not so much Absolutism in Turkey as in Russia; Turkey is no more stagnant than Spain; and slavery has only recently been extinguished in Christian America. Mr. Ross seems to find great beauty in the doctrine of the Trinity in the fact that there was no time "when God lived in dreary solitude." Apparently he was a family God. He was, as Mr. Ross says, "a social personality." Legally, two is a crowd; so we suppose, technically, father and son form a society, but the opportunities for jollification would seem limited. And as God was never solitary, but always had a son the same age as himself, Mr. Ross concludes that the doctrine of the Trinity has been the "bulwark of human liberty, the minister of human progress, and the charter of human

dignity from the earliest Christian ages till now." That settles it. We have no doubt that Mr. Ross would also demonstrate that the steam engine, the telegraph, and the printing press, are the direct outcome of a belief in the Trinity. To faith all things are possible.

The following pious anecdote appeared in the *Ladies' Home Journal*, Philadelphia:—

"NOT EASILY STUMPED.

"When the Rev. John McNeill was holding revival services at Cardiff, a young man one night, thinking to perplex the preacher, sent up a note to the platform, with the request that the following question might be publicly answered:—

"Dear Mr. McNeill, if you want to enlighten young men, kindly tell me who was Cain's wife?"

"Mr. McNeill read the note, and then, amid breathless silence, said:—

"I love young men—inquirers for truth especially—and should like to give this young man a word of advice. It is this: Don't lose your soul's salvation looking after other people's wives."

If this anecdote is a true one the Rev. John McNeill is a very barefaced shuffler. A joke is all right in its way, but it is a poor way of evading a serious and pertinent question concerning a book which you are presenting to your audience as the Word of God. And that the reverend gentleman's answer to this particular question is one that Christians seem rather proud of only shows that they are well aware that the question is really unanswerable.

Imitating for once the Christians who are so fond of speaking of "Tom Paine" we may state that our estimate of Johnnie McNeill, formed some twenty years ago, was that he was a Scotch bagman by nature, who had gone into the evangelising business as a better paying one than tramping with a knapsack of vendibles.

"Two men, walking through Wall-street lately, paused before the sub-treasury building, and one of them began pointing, gesticulating, and talking as though an object of special interest had attracted and excited him. It takes less than a minute to collect a crowd on a New York street. The man soon had curious listeners about him, to whom, addressing them through his friend, he proceeded to comment on the Washington-Prayer-at-Valley-Forge placque which disfigures the front of the building. First calling his friend's attention to the impropriety of putting religious subjects on government buildings, he went on to explain the falsity of the story told by the tablet. He said that to begin with Washington was not a praying man—probably never said a prayer after he reached years of discretion; was not a member of any Church, seldom attended, and always absented himself on communion Sunday. On the other hand, there was good testimony to the effect that he could swear with uncommon fluency for so taciturn a man, and anyhow, if he had had anything to say to God, he could have said it just as well indoors as out in the snow surrounded by trees. Washington, the man told the wondering crowd (still addressing his friend as an audience), was not relying on God that winter at Valley Forge, nor on prayers addressed to any deity. The power that was to lift the cloud at that time hanging over the American cause lay in the mind and pen of Thomas Paine, who was addressing himself, in his paper called the *Crisis*, to the American people. The speaker noticed that while approbation was manifested by some of his hearers, the faces of others whitened and hardened and were turned away. But they all got something to think about."—*Truthseeker* (New York).

School children are still crammed with the problematic dates of the imaginary "kings" of Israel and Judah. When will the clergy realise that cephalisation is not civilisation?

A special meeting of the Education Settlement Committee was held the other day to consider the outlook for religious education. We are pleased to see that all present agreed that the outlook was rather black, and that Secular Education looked nearer than ever. The chairman, Sir Thomas Acland, said the great question was whether they were prepared for England to withdraw Christian instruction from the schools. We do not see that the question of whether this Committee is prepared or not has anything to do with the question. It is quite a self-elected body, and the determination of the dispute lies beyond them. Mr. T. E. Harvey, M.P., said that "even though there might come a temporary form of secularism, in the long run they must have some form of religion inside the school." Evidently Mr. Harvey is inclined to be accommodating, so long

as some religion is there; but we venture to prophesy that, once religion is out of the schools, it will stop. Mrs. Sophie Bryant said that, with good lecturers going up and down the country, they could create an enthusiasm for Scripture study. This is rather a reflection on the clergy of the country; but we are not very apprehensive of Mrs. Bryant's body of lecturers. Professor Sadler confessed that the public as a whole was apathetic, and inclined to be sceptical of the *bonâ fides* of the demand of the parents for religious instruction; and a growing body of opinion favored Secular Education. "The immediate outlook is discouraging." This looks as though the only thing settled by the Settlement Committee was the Committee itself. Professor Sadler also thought that no Liberal Government could propose a thoroughgoing plan of Secular Education without endangering the electoral chances of its party. It might, however, bring forward a plan which, by putting religious instruction outside of school hours, would virtually secularise the schools. Altogether, from the point of view of the Secular Educationalist, the meeting of the Secular Committee, had a cheerfully hopeless tone, and manifested an inspiringly discouraged temper.

There is unconscious satire in a *Christian World* reviewer's remark that "for a hundred who revelled in the *Varieties of Religious Experience* of the late Professor William James, only one would be able to appreciate his posthumous volume of *Essays in Radical Empiricism*." (Some of the essays in this work we hope to notice at length, later). We are very strongly of opinion that ninety-nine per cent. of those who could really appreciate James's philosophical essays would put down the *Varieties* with a feeling of despair. The book has been highly praised by the religious press for the simple reason that it took so-called religious experience at its face value, and without any serious attempt at critical or scientific analysis, accepted the revivalistic interpretation of states of mind that clearly came within the sphere of the mental pathologist. The book is a mere catalogue of cases of hallucination, many plainly induced by self-abuse, others as plainly the outcome of neuropathic conditions, but accepted as the conditions of bringing man into touch with a "higher and deeper reality." It is no more than a piece of religious yellow journalism, and without the slightest claim to scientific or philosophic value. Naturally, the book was eagerly welcomed by the religious world; it gave the crude theories of religionists the sanction of a great name. And it naturally follows that those who "revelled" in that work would be quite unable to appreciate James's more valid and enduring work. One might as reasonably expect a rational endorsement of the Synthetic Philosophy from a Salvation Army meeting.

"Anyone who mocks at religion mocks at a great many other things," says the Rev. J. A. Hatton, of Glasgow. "He mocks at human honor, he mocks at chastity, he mocks at all ideal ways of apprehending life." There is nothing new in this; it is repeated in one or another fashion from thousands of pulpits, and is only given here as an example of the lie persistent. For the curious thing is that those who say it, and those who listen to it, must know that it is a lie. They know full well, and will admit as much, when directly taxed, that those who repudiate all religion value chastity and honor, and have as lofty ideals, as any religious person has. But the lie is repeated so frequently, and to people who have no tendency to contradict it, that in the end, by a curious psychological delusion, it is accepted as being true. It is one of the curious things connected with religion that its advocates will accept as self evidently true statements that most of them, after five minutes' serious consideration, will admit to be false.

It lies on the face of the facts that character has nothing to do with the acceptance of religious beliefs, except in the deeper sense that all we do is the expression of our character. And quite as obviously the rejection of religious beliefs is the direct expression of character. A man may accept religious ideas because they are a part of his environment, because he is too mentally lazy to bother whether they are true or false, because they offer a road to social ease or advancement, or for other reasons of no very lofty description. But it obviously requires some little strength of character to break away from accepted beliefs, and still more to confess that one has done so. Every Freethinker risks something for his Freethought; the Christian risks nothing for his belief. Mr. Hutton is in a well-paid job because he believes. Thousands of Freethinkers have risked, and lost, the means of a comfortable livelihood, and others have gone on cheerfully giving themselves—which was all they could give—to a cause they believed in. And Mr.

Hutton has the impertinence to talk of the Freethinker's inability to appreciate high ideals!

The average Christian humbug who lolls on his cushion at church on Sunday and confesses himself a miserable sinner, would start a libel action if called one on any week day.

It is a curious thing—or rather it would be so if one did not understand the reason of it—that English judges can generally be trusted to approve of the most brutal and degrading treatment of criminals. If they had their way, every prisoner would be morally worse on leaving gaol than he was on entering it. Yet nearly all these judges are Christians, and often bigoted Christians. The Lord Chief Justice, for instance, has no atheistical taint about him; his orthodoxy is, indeed, unimpeachable; and this head of the English bench, after the Lord Chancellor, has just been backing up the presentment of the grand jury at the Sussex Assizes that in cases of aggravated assault upon young persons and children, power should be given to impose flogging, in addition to other punishment. The Lord Chief Justice said he had received a similar presentment from another grand jury on that circuit, and "he had long been of opinion that flogging was the only cure for these aggravated assaults." Flogging a cure for such assaults! Facts and common sense are both against his lordship. The doctrine that violence is a cure for moral maladies is a relic of the ages of barbarism and superstition. Modern criminology has outgrown all that absurdity. The only way to improve a man is to appeal to what is best in him, not to what is worst. Flogging is not morally permissible in any case of crime. The worse the crime is the more the perpetrator suffers from moral insanity. Subjecting such criminals to gratuitous and humiliating punishment cannot raise them in the ethical scale. And if judges think otherwise it is because they are notoriously ignorant of human nature. Besides, as we have said, they are Christians, and are saturated with the savage teaching of the Bible.

Slymbridge Church was struck by lightning. A new lightning conductor had been put up not long before. This precaution against a mistake on the part of "Providence" was not the only one. The rector assures inquirers that "we are fully insured." The amount of the policy had recently been increased from £1,500 to £2,500. Just in time!

The Catholic Stage Guild has been holding a meeting at the Vaudeville Theatre. Sir Charles Santley, the famous singer, was one of the speakers. He told a very foolish story of how he became a Catholic. Miss Mary Rorke was anecdotal. Nobody explained, for the sake of those who remember the attitude of Bossuet over the dead body of Molière, how the Catholic Church came to patronise the modern stage. We should listen to such an explanation with interest.

Mr. Henry Seymour Trower, of Bridge House, Weybridge, Surrey, left estate of the gross value of £268 121. He desired in his will that his "body should be cremated without any religious ceremony." What a change is coming over human society! A hundred, or even fifty years ago, this would have been an incredible provision in a rich man's will.

The Northern Tour.

We commenced on Sunday, July 7, in Leeds, with Mr. Cohen's visit. This will already have been reported. The following places have been visited so far: Barnoldswick (July 8), Clitheroe (July 9), Accrington (July 10). In each town the meeting was well attended and orderly; and literature sales were good. In Barnoldswick there is a good prospect of a Branch. Mr. Charles Spencer, 16 Fountain-street, Barnoldswick, is collecting the signatures of those interested. In Earby (the next town) Mr. J. W. Gibb, 3 Cowgill-street, is collecting signatures with a view to forming an Earby Branch. In Clitheroe, Mr. Thos. Taylor, 33 Wilson-street, is setting about the formation of a Branch. In Accrington a Branch can easily be formed as soon as a local organiser can be discovered. The tour has opened in a promising fashion. There is a fine field for propaganda in the North.

THOS. A. JACKSON.

Mr. Foote's Engagements

(Lectures suspended until September.)

To Correspondents.

PRESIDENT'S HONORARIUM FUND, 1912.—Previously acknowledged, £160 12s. 11d. Received since:—Mr. and Mrs. Kerlake, 10s. 6d.; W. Hurst, 2s. 6d.

L. MARSHALL.—We had seen a local newspaper report and were dealing with the matter before your cutting arrived. Thanks all the same.

L. KOTHE.—You will see they are useful. Thanks.

W. AINSWORTH.—Glad you were so pleased with the meeting held by Messrs. Gott and Jackson at Accrington, and that you regard it as very successful. No doubt they will visit Accrington again as soon as possible.

A. A.—Thanks for "greetings from the birthplace of Heinrich Heine."

E. B.—Cuttings welcome.

W. HURST.—We note your satisfaction with Mr. Bates's lectures at Hyde.

T. HESKETH.—Glad you were pleased with your visit to Rochdale Town Hall on Sunday, and with what you saw and heard of the work of Messrs. Gott and Jackson.

F. L. BILLINGTON GREIG.—Next week—as we want to say something on the matter ourselves.

Some correspondence unavoidably stands over till next week.

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 Shop 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.

Mr. Foote is back from Great Yarmouth, where he has been spending a week (of fine weather) with his old friend, Mr. J. W. de Caux, J.P. He has just time to see this issue of the *Freethinker* through the press. The next issue, of course, will have more of his attention.

Miss Vance is holidaying just now, with her devoted friend Miss Kough. Unfortunately it is a good deal broken into by correspondence on the Rotherham "blasphemy" prosecution and the London County Council's attempt to stop collections at the N.S.S. lectures in the parks. Naturally the N. S. S. is showing fight, and the President is in close touch with the correspondence, etc. We may have to make a very important announcement on this matter next week.

Stephen Edward Bullock, the Rotherham young man who is being prosecuted for "blasphemous libel concerning the holy Scriptures and the Christian religion," has been committed for trial at the Leeds Assizes. We regret to say that we have not been able to get precise details of this case. Neither the defendant nor his friends connected with the N. S. S. Branch at Sheffield have supplied us with a copy of the "information" on which he was brought before the Rotherham magistrates. We have been nearly a fortnight trying to ascertain what he is really alleged to have said, and we are just as much in the dark as ever. Judging from references in the newspaper reports, the police are horrified at his declaring that God did not create matter. If that be so, the police and the magistrates have acted illegally. Mr. Bullock will be defended if the grand jury does not throw out the bill against him; and we shall do our best, if necessary, to carry the case up to the Court of Appeal.

Mr. J. W. Gott, who organises the meetings and sells the literature in connection with the new propagandist scheme under the auspices of the Secular Society, Ltd., and the National Secular Society,—Mr. T. A. Jackson being the

lecturer—informs us that he disposed of every copy of the 14 quires (364 copies) he had the first week, and that the second week's supply was going well when he wrote. "Jackson and I," Mr. Gott says, "are both pleased with our work, and I think the audiences are pleased with both the lectures and the literature."

A Birmingham friend writes with respect to our recent call upon the Freethought party to do their best to promote the circulation of the *Freethinker* :—

"You may be interested to know that, in my opinion, the *Freethinker* has already received a good push in this locality. Last week I bought the entire stock (five copies) from Messrs. Mapstone, High-street, Birmingham. This week I went to clear them out again, when they had only two copies. Then I tried Messrs. Smith & Son, and only obtained two copies there. An ardent Rationalist friend whom I have succeeded in getting greatly interested in the *Freethinker* orders three copies weekly from three different shops. His idea is novel. He orders the copies on the understanding that they each exhibit one for sale, and, if sold, they get another; if not, of course he takes it. My daughter types the enclosed, which I attach to each copy left on the tram or elsewhere. I trust you will soon feel the effect of such efforts on your publishing department, which would be a certainty if every *Freethinker* would heartily co-operate on the same lines."

We hope other friends will follow this correspondent's example.

A Welsh reader writes :—

"I only wish I could persuade all my friends to take your paper in regularly. I have already persuaded two who are now constant readers. I shall be glad to avail myself of your kind offer to send six copies free to the following address."

This correspondent, as a constant reader for the last six years, says, "I have read your articles with increasing pleasure and profit." He wishes that the *Freethinker* could be so printed that our own articles, with Mr. Cohen's, Mr. Lloyd's, etc., could be detached and sent to the binder's, as "they are too good to be lost." We sympathise with our correspondent in the matter, but his suggestion is really not feasible. Nor is it feasible (this time on account of the cost) to publish the *Freethinker* in a wrapper. Even papers like the *Spectator*, the *Nation*, and the *Saturday Review*, are not published in that fashion.

We cut the following paragraph from the *Liverpool Daily Post* (July 4) :—

"To-day is Independence Day—that is, the anniversary of July 4, 1776, the day on which the then thirteen United States of America declared their independence, and Congress passed the famous Declaration of Independence. When Thomas Jefferson was consulted in his own lifetime as to what inscription should be placed upon his tombstone after he was gone, he expressed the wish that, among other things, he should be remembered as the author of the Declaration. But this claim was not put forward by Jefferson until he was over eighty, and it is reasonably certain that the real origin of the Declaration is to be found in a pamphlet written by Tom Paine, and published some six months before independence was declared. Paine was the bosom friend of Franklin, and when the task of drawing up the Declaration was entrusted to Jefferson, Franklin handed him a draft already prepared by Paine, whose literary abilities were a hundred times greater than Jefferson's. Jefferson was told that he might use the draft, and that Paine would never claim its authorship, and so, with a few verbal changes, it was Paine's draft which Jefferson submitted to Congress."

It is pleasant to find this tribute to Paine in such a journal.

Here is an interesting extract from a soldier's letter :—

"I may mention that whilst stationed at this depôt I have encountered a very intelligent and well-read *Freethinker* named —, who appears to be doing a great deal to forward the cause of Freethought; in fact he may said to be the champion of the Secularist cause as far as the troops here are concerned. He has been the means of showing up the numerous fallacies which are contained in the doctrines of Christianity. All forms of Christian worship are on the decline in the army, and if there were a few more men like — to educate our men with a true recognition of facts as they actually exist, its decay would be more rapid still. I have read several of your pamphlets and articles and have always been very much impressed with the convincing power of your arguments. Unfortunately a number of our men are so badly educated that they are unable to grasp the significance of the matter contained in these publications, but I and one or two others are doing our best by means of quiet talks and common-sense conversations to teach them to regard religion in its true light."

The progress of Freethought is to be noted everywhere; and in our opinion it is the one great reformatory influence which will, slowly perhaps but surely, change the whole face of human society.

Religion in the Light of Science.

IN the preface to his valuable standard *Ethnology*, Professor A. H. Keane reminded his readers that the most formidable, and probably the most permanent, antagonism between supernaturalism and science is that which exists between dogmatism and the natural history sciences. The late Sir Douglas Galton, when speaking as President of the British Association at Ipswich in 1895, seized the opportunity to dwell upon the signal services rendered by Huxley in sweeping aside the obstructions of traditional and religious animosity which, in the earlier days of the association, had fettered freedom of thought. Huxley's activities were nowhere more beneficent in result than in the realms of anthropology. His immense array of argument and illustration largely contributed in establishing the truth of evolution, and in winning the right to discuss questions of science and theology without fear or favor. When the clericals are prepared to grant their critics a fair hearing, and when they are willing to declare that evolution, "rightly understood," will not "impair or disturb religious faith," we shall be within measurable distance of the time when, in Professor Keane's words,—

"that doctrine will take its place by the side of the Copernican and Newtonian teachings, as an elementary truth at the foundation of a rational conception of man and the universe. Then a way will also be found..... to reconcile the views of Science and Religion on the origin and evolution of the human species. But it would be idle to pretend that there can be any compromise on the part of science. Hence such a reconciliation must involve some concessions by the dogmatists, such, for instance, as enabled them to ultimately accept the Copernican view of the Solar System, despite the geocentric theory prematurely raised to a dogma on the strength of Biblical texts." *

Having won the right to inquire into the history of man's bodily and mental development, we may profitably consider the stages which have marked his religious evolution. In the absence of an understanding of the causes to which the genesis of religions can be traced; without some knowledge of comparative religion no one is qualified to form an opinion respecting the social or ethical worth of the particular creed he may happen to profess. No man, said Goethe, really grasps his own language unless he has some acquaintance with another tongue, and in much the same manner men fail to understand their own form of faith unless they possess some knowledge of alien beliefs.

Religion consists in the fear and worship of gods, or other supernatural beings. The term "religion" has been defined in various ways. But all those definitions which really do define religion as something apart from ethics are synonymous with the one just given. For example, Dr. E. B. Tylor defines religion as "a belief in spiritual beings." "By religion," writes Cardinal Newman in his *Grammar of Assent*, "I mean the knowledge of God, of his Will, and of our duties towards him." James Martineau, in his *Study of Religion*, frames a similar definition. "Religion," says Matthew Arnold in his *Literature and Dogma*, "if we follow the intention of human thought and human language in the use of the word, is ethics heightened, enkindled, lit up by feeling; the passage from morality is made when to morality is applied emotion." Of these four definitions, Dr. Tylor's is the more eminently scientific, and, in consequence, the best. Tylor did not exclusively consider the highest manifestations of religion, as Newman and Martineau did; unlike Arnold, he realised the wide distinctions between religion and ethics everywhere apparent, and he surveyed supernaturalism from its earliest and crudest beginnings in uncivilised man up to its fullest development in contemporary civilisation.

The etymology of the word "religion" is uncertain. The ancients themselves were at variance concerning

it, but of the thing itself we need not remain in doubt. It is futile to attempt to rightly understand man's religions unless we survey them from the standpoint of evolutionary growth. The Roman poet-philosopher Lucretius said that "Religion began in terror, by terror it lives, and with the death of terror it will die." This view has been controverted by Robertson-Smith, E. B. Jevons, and Andrew Laing, and their verdict has been accepted by many writers engaged in popularising the study of comparative religion. But, as Professor Westermarck judiciously observes in his important work on *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*:—

"Men are induced by various motives to offer sacrificial gifts to supernatural beings. In early religion the most common motive is undoubtedly a desire to avert evil; and we have reason to believe that such a desire was the first source of religious worship. In spite of recent assertions to the contrary, the old saying holds true that religion was born of fear. Those who maintain that the savage is little susceptible to this emotion, and that he for the most part takes his gods joyously, show ignorance of facts. One of his characteristics is great nervous susceptibility, and he lives in constant apprehension of danger from supernatural powers..... From all quarters of the uncivilised world we hear that terror or fear is the predominant element in the religious sentiment, that savages are more inclined to ascribe evil than good to the influence of supernatural agents, that their sacrifices and other acts of worship more frequently have in view to avert misfortunes than to procure positive benefits, or that, even though benevolent deities are believed in, much more attention is paid to malignant ones. And even among peoples who have passed beyond the stage of savagery, fear still remains a prominent factor in their religion."*

In tracing the genesis of those savage superstitions which form the foundations of all the higher cults, it is essential to consider the conditions which occasioned their birth. An eminent anthropologist, the late Robertson-Smith, has argued in his work on *The Religion of the Semites*, that primitive man was incapable of any clear discrimination between the living and non-living phenomena of nature. It is true that he furnished no evidence worthy of the name for this amazing proposition; but as his theory has been provisionally accepted by some living investigators, it demands a passing remark. That evolutionary thinkers should countenance so surprising an opinion is a matter of grave astonishment. It amounts to the assertion that aboriginal man possessed far smaller power of discrimination than animals far lower in the zoological scale. The most commonplace cat fully realises the difference between a toy mouse and one endowed with life. The most elaborate scarecrows are soon treated with the utmost indifference by the most timid birds. Before railway trains had become familiar, animals exhibited the utmost alarm when a train passed. But as soon as they became accustomed to the noise and rapid movement of this phenomenon they regarded it with unconcern. Live stock now go on grazing, and the shyest birds scarcely raise their heads. But when the movements of lifeless objects simulate the motions of a living creature, a combined emotion of curiosity and fear arises in the animal brain. Cats, dogs, horses, and goats manifest an interested alarm if an open umbrella be placed in an unaccustomed spot. And the alarm is intensified if the umbrella be caused to tremble in the wind. Broadly considered, the power to distinguish between the animate and the inanimate has been a necessary outcome of the experiences gained in the course of organic evolution. "Under penalties of death by starvation or destruction, there has been a constant cultivation of the power to discriminate the two, and a consequent increase of it."

It has been much too readily assumed that because contemporary savages, when brought into contact with the art products of civilised societies, are apt to regard them as living creatures, they therefore err as greatly in their classification of the natural phe-

* *Ethnology*, Preface xiii.-xiv., 1901.

* Vol. ii., pp. 613, 614.

nomena by which they are encircled in their native wilds. The Eskimo thought that Ross's vessels were alive—as they moved with oars, and it is asserted that the New Zealanders mistook Cook's approaching ship for a winged whale. The pocket compass and the watch are very generally regarded by savages as living things; and kindred misapprehensions have been, and are still, occasionally met with in Europe. After the Battle of Culloden, in the eighteenth century, a Highlander found a watch on the body of a dead English officer. The chronometer was ticking when he found it, but shortly afterwards it stopped. On the following morning the Highlander handed the watch to a clansman with the remark: "You may have her, but she's no good; she died last night." But interesting as these cases are, they in no way prove that savages or barbarians are much less appreciative of the differences between organic and inorganic nature than the lower animals are known to be.

We have every reason to believe that the laws of mind are the same throughout the animal kingdom. Dread of the unknown is a universal emotion. With the lower animals and with most men, stranger and enemy are synonymous terms. Feasts and famines are both common experiences with uncivilised peoples. According to Spencer, indigestion had much to do with man's primitive theologies. After an abortive chase and a prolonged fast, the savage hunter lies exhausted in sleep. In his sleep he dreams a vivid dream of a successful hunt—he eagerly prepares his repast, and suddenly awakes when about to enjoy his first mouthful. The savage has none of those concepts concerning mind and memory with which modern science has rendered the cultured man familiar. His psychology is not much above that of the lower animals. He remembers the scenes he witnessed and the deeds he performed in his dream, and he unhesitatingly accepts the testimony of his memory. Our savage is astonished when he finds himself alone; he is amazed at the disappearance of his vision-seen hunt, capture, and cooking of prey. On another occasion, the same savage, when lying gorged with food, is suffering from acute indigestion. Nightmare results, and the savage imagines himself vainly endeavoring to escape some dire calamity, and awakes with a terrified shriek. Though his squaw may be sleeping by his side, and assures him that she was unconscious of impending danger, she was nevertheless awakened and alarmed by his scream, and, like her brave, has not the faintest idea that an overtaxed stomach can conceivably cause such sensations and emotions. Their rude language contains no words which can suggest or express such an explanation. As a matter of fact, the belief that dreams are real occurrences is general throughout the savage world. As Spencer says, what more natural than that the sleeper, on regaining full consciousness, recalls and relates his dream experiences, so far as his imperfect language permits, to his fellows. In his dream he has journeyed; his companions are positive that he has never left his sleeping place, and this seems certain from the fact that he awoke on the identical spot upon which he lay down to rest. The only alternative is to assume that he has remained and been absent at the same time—that he possesses two personalities, one of which may wander and then return. The belief that the soul leaves the body during sleep, and that dreams are what it sees and experiences, is to be met with from North America to India and the Malay Archipelago.

Somnambulism undoubtedly serves to strengthen this savage interpretation, and tradition, with its ever-present exaggerations, makes such superstitions to appear in the robes of truth. Comparison also shows uncivilised man a relationship between his own double and the doubles of other objects. Precisely as other bodies cast shadows, so does the body of man. And the shadow which attends him in daylight disappears at night. It is only too obvious, he reasons, that this shadow which is his constant companion by day is that "other self" or "soul,"

which wanders and adventures through the night. To this very hour certain savages fully believe this to be true.

Developing Spencer's argument, we find that the state of insensibility which attends swooning, ecstasy, apoplexy, catalepsy, and other pathological phenomena has helped to establish the belief in the soul and an after-life. When an ordinary sleeper has rested he awakes, but in such cases as these the victim remains insensible for long periods of time. When a Fijian faints or swoons his fellow-savages shout his name, and his subsequent revival leads them to believe that his spirit has returned and re-animated his body. Our own language bears witness to this primitive belief. When anyone revives from a fainting fit we say that "he is coming back to himself," or "returning to himself." Even medical men occasionally mistake apoplexy, or even ordinary fainting, for normal sleep. With uncritical savages such a state of insensibility conclusively proves that the soul forsook the body during its entire period of quiescence. So late in the world's history as the Christian Dark Ages the phenomena of trance and catalepsy were regarded as proof positive that the soul could vacate its earthly tabernacle and afterwards return to it. With backward races a journey to the spirit world is assigned as a cause of the prolonged absences of the animating soul from its bodily dwelling; and Professor Tylor, in his *Primitive Culture*, adduces numerous instances from all parts of the Eastern World.

The savage fails to discriminate between such instances of suspended animation and death itself. Various observances gathered from every quarter of the globe imply the belief that death is a long-continued sleep. Some savages attempt to revive the corpse by ill-treating it. They reproachfully address it by name, and put pointed questions to it. They will sometimes try to feed it, or place food and drink in its grave. Facilities are afforded the dead for breathing, and care is taken to prevent pressure upon the body. It is furnished with fire for cooking or warding off cold. It is protected from the attentions of wild beasts, and attempts are made to arrest putrefaction. The resurrection of the body is an almost universal belief. Among ourselves this superstition is not extinct. In the Prayer Book of the Established Church bodily resurrection is plainly asserted. Many Anglican and Nonconformist ministers, and the entire Catholic Church, oppose cremation because of its tendency to undermine men's belief in this relic of savage religion.

T. F. PALMER.

(To be concluded)

Jeremy Bentham.

THOUGH known chiefly as a legal reformer and advocate of utility, the father of Utilitarianism and philosophical Radicalism was no less decidedly a Father of Freethought. Not only did his philosophy disengage morals from theology, he deliberately set himself to subvert the foundations of so-called natural and revealed religion, and in his influence on his disciples may be said to have carried over the results of eighteenth century thought and criticism into the present century.

Jeremy Bentham was born of a prosperous family in Red Lion-street, Houndsditch, London, on February 15, 1748. His father and grandfather were both lawyers. One of his ancestors was Thomas Bentham, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry (1513-1578), but Jeremy never traced beyond his great grandfather, who was a pawnbroker. A grand uncle named Woodward was publisher of Tindal's *Christianity as Old as Creation*. His family were Tory, and his education conservative. Like J. S. Mill, he was astonishingly precocious. When three years old he read such works as Rapi'n's *History*. His earliest recollections were, as he expressed it, of being "starved" for want of books. Fiction and poetry were prohibited. He tells, too, how one of his tribulations was learning Church collects—"they used to give me the colic; but my father insisted on my getting them by heart." At Westminster he acquired a reputation for Greek and Latin verse.

Bentham matriculated at Oxford June 26, 1760, becoming a gowned collegian under the age of twelve and a half years. On account of his age he was not at first required to take the oath—a ceremony for which, even then, he felt repugnance. But he was called on to subscribe the Thirty-Nine Articles, and the necessity led to an examination, with the result that they were found to be neither in accordance with reason nor with Scripture. One of the Fellows of the College to whom his scruples were submitted, reproved his presumption in showing his hesitation. He signed, but the impression made was painful and lasting. He learned little at Oxford, and gives his testimony: "Mendacity and insincerity—in these I found the effects, the sure and only sure effects, of an English university education." In 1764 he proceeded B.A., and in 1766 took his master's degree.

At the age of twenty he read Helvetius's *De l'Esprit*, and was convinced that legislation was the most important pursuit. He was intended for the bar, and entered at Lincoln's Inn, November 6, 1769. But the great law reformer was not cut out for a practising barrister. In his very first case he recommended the parties to agree and save their law costs, and the discovery that clients were charged for three attendances when only one was given was a blow which toppled over his reverence for the law, and led to many of his attacks on its abuses. As a student he listened to the lectures of the famous Sir William Blackstone, who did not enhance his respect for legal authorities.

The first work Bentham printed was a translation of *Le Taureau Blanc* ("The White Bull") by Voltaire. To this he supplied a long and very heretical Preface, showing that he was already a disbeliever in revelation. The translation was excellent, but he had not the courage to send a copy to the great Freethinker. This was in 1774. In 1776 he issued, also anonymously, an important *Fragment on Government*. This work is fannily catalogued in Leslie Stephen's *Dictionary of National Biography* as "A Fragment on Gout." This attack on Blackstone's praises of the English Constitution made some stir, and was variously attributed to Lord Mansfield, Lord Camden, and Mr. Dunning. It contained the germ of much of his subsequent work. It set up the greatest happiness principle as the test in ethics and legislation, showed the hollowness of the wisdom of our ancestors, and is a fitting prelude to Paine's *Rights of Man*. From this time he was engaged on his greatest work, which was not published until 1789, when it appeared as an *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*.

Bentham's works on legislation had the good fortune of being edited and translated into French by M. Dumout, who made them more popular on the Continent than in England. In 1792 Bentham—a stout Republican—was made a citizen of France with Priestley and Paine. With true practical mind he criticised their Declaration of the Rights of Man, and drew up for the Assembly a scheme for the management of their debates.

Bentham largely concerned himself with the rational and reformatory treatment of criminals, and proposed a Panopticon or building in which this should especially be carried on. He always held that it was the king alone who hindered the acceptance of his proposals, and as late as 1831 he published a *History of the War between Jeremy Bentham and George III. by one of the Belligerents*.

In 1814 Bentham removed to Ford Abbey, Devonshire, where he was accompanied by James Mill and his family. Here Mill wrote his *History of British India*, and here Bentham and he devised several important anti-theological works. John Stuart Mill, in his *Autobiography*, mentions this sojourn as an important circumstance in his education. In the same year Bentham advanced money to Robert Owen to enable him to carry on his experiment at New Lanark. Three years later appeared a pamphlet *Swear Not At All*, in which he exposed the immorality of oaths as used in the two Church of England Universities. This was one of his many decisive blows at the abuses of his day. In 1817 also appeared his *Plan of Parliamentary Reform*, in which he advocated universal suffrage and the ballot.

The *Church Catechism* formed part of his general design to show the mischief of religion and its establishments. It was written at Ford Abbey and was printed in 1817. It then appeared as "by an Oxford Graduate," but with no publisher's name. The work, it appears from a MS. note by Place, was submitted to Sir Samuel Romilly, who gave his opinion that Bentham would certainly be prosecuted and convicted for blasphemy and sedition. (Bentham says "he agreed with it in every tittle.") Francis Place, however, gave his opinion to the contrary, provided Jeremy Bentham's name, and the price twenty shillings, were printed on the title-page. James Mill, it appears, agreed with Place. For a while the work was distributed privately, but in 1818 Effingham Wilson's name appeared as publisher and Bentham as author. Wilson was to require the money to be paid first and then send the book in his

own way to the address of the purchaser. The result justified Place's view. The edition was sold and no one was prosecuted. An extract appeared in 1826 entitled "Mother Church Relieved by Bleeding." A new edition was issued in 1824, and the *Book of Church Reform* in 1831 contained its essential parts. The *Catechism* was reprinted by Thomas Scott (of Ramsgate) in 1868.

In 1822 appeared a small but important volume entitled *Analysis of the Influence of Natural Religion on the Temporal Happiness of Mankind* by Philip Beauchamp. This work had been compiled by George Grote, afterwards the historian of Greece, from MSS. of Jeremy Bentham's, which the venerable sage desired his young disciple to put into readable form. Professor Alex. Bain, who first revealed the secret of authorship after Grote's death says:—

"The MS. was handed to Mr. Place who employed Richard Carlile to print the tract: the reason being that Carlile was lying in Dorchester Gaol, and thus safe from further prosecution. At that period the London booksellers were afraid of having anything to do with writings wherein religion was in question. The original papers in Bentham's handwriting became the property of Mrs. George Grote under the author's will and are still extant, as well as the letter to G. Grote which accompanied the packet."

Professor Bain does not say, and perhaps did not know, that the MSS. show that the design of Bentham was to attack revealed religion no less than natural religion, and that what Grote did was only the easiest part of the task, which Bentham considered of the utmost importance. It is interesting to know that Grote's *Analysis* was issued privately as late as 1866, although kept on sale by Mr. Truelove, who afterwards reprinted it with the commendation of Mill. It was translated into French and published in 1875, with an excellent preface by the translator, M. Emile Cazelles. Previously to the publication of this work in 1822, Bentham had written to Carlile, sending him a handsome donation "as a contribution toward your support during persecution; and as a testimony of my respect for your persevering intrepidity and self-sacrifice, in the cause of what, in your eyes, is useful truth."

In 1823 appeared *Not Paul but Jesus*, by Gamaliel Smith, of which *A Summary View* had been published in 1821. Dr. Garnett's copy contains the following note by Francis Place: "The matter of this book put together by me at Mr. Bentham's request in the months of August and September, 1817, during my residence with him at Ford Abbey, Devonshire." Probably what Place did was simply to prepare the manuscript for the printer, the work being unmistakably the product of Bentham's mind. It seeks to prove that Paul distorted the primitive Christianity of Jesus, and tracks his career with the relentless acumen of a cross-examining counsel. Another work issued by the same publisher in the same year and entitled *The New Trial of the Witnesses, or the Resurrection considered.....with an inquiry into the Origin of the Gospels and the Authenticity of the Epistles of Paul*, also bears traces of coming, in part at least, from the same fertile brain.

The following year Bentham started the *Westminster Review*, so long the organ of Philosophical Radicalism. In one of the first numbers the youthful John Stuart Mill had a trenchant article on the Carlile prosecutions, in which we can now see the proprietor of the *Review* was deeply interested.

Of Bentham's services to legal science we have said little. Macaulay said "he found jurisprudence a gibberish and left it a science." Sir James Mackintosh observed that Bentham has done more than any other writer to rouse the spirit of juridical reformation. His *Defence of Usury* is recognised also as a permanent contribution to the Principles of Political Economy. Indeed, as Professor Holland well observes, "There are no limits to the good results of his introduction of a true method of reasoning into the moral and political science."

Bentham was no morose visionary. He regarded society dining and visiting as a waste of time, and looked on poetry us "misrepresentation," but he delighted in music, in which he was skilful, as in chess, the conversation of friends, and in making others happy. When comparatively young, he met a lady with whom he fell deeply in love, proposed, and was rejected. Sir John Bowring gives a letter which, in his eightieth year (over forty years afterwards) he wrote to the object of his early attachment:—

"I am alive—more than two months advanced in my eightieth year, more lively than when you presented me in ceremony with the flowers in the green lane. Since that day not a single one has passed (not to speak of nights) in which you have not engrossed more of my thoughts than I could have wished.....Every minute of my life has been counted, and I am plagued with remorse at the minutes which I have suffered you to steal from me."

It appears that what was lost to the individual and family was given to the race. The amelioration of life was his dominant desire. Indefatigable in his labors and sparing of

his time, he accomplished much. Writing for six or eight hours a day, he handed his voluminous manuscripts to his disciples to be redacted or used as they thought fit. For sixty years he labored without care of reward. When the Emperor Alexander of Russia sent him a packet containing a ring he sent it back with the imperial seal unbroken. He said truly of himself "in me, somehow or other, so it happens, selfishness has taken the shape of benevolence."

Sir John Bowring, who knew him well, says:—

"The predominant characteristics of Bentham's mind were: sincerity, or love of truth; benevolence, or an active desire to contribute to the happiness of others; investigation, or a reckless craving which could only be satisfied by thoroughly examining whatever attracted his attention in all its bearings."

The application of ideas to the production of happiness was the predominant trait of Bentham's life. It was illustrated by his dying words as recorded by Dr. T. Southwood Smith. When he firmly believed he was near his last hour, he said to one of his disciples who was watching over him:—

"I now feel that I am dying: our care must be to minimise the pain. Do not let any of the servants come into my room, and keep away the youth: it will be distressing to them, and they can be of no service. Yet I must not be alone; you will remain with me, and you only; and then we shall have reduced the pain to the least possible amount."

Bentham died on June 6, 1832. One of his last works was an anonymous treatise, afterwards printed for private circulation, entitled *Auto-Icon*; or, farther Uses of the Dead to the Living. Its object was to show how, if embalmed, every man might be his own statue and an object of enjoyment and instruction to the living. In accordance with this view he left his body to be dissected, and clothed in his usual attire his skeleton is kept in University College.

Bentham had a younger brother, who became Sir Samuel Bentham, renowned for mechanical invention and naval administration. Jeremy Bentham brought the same talent to bear on the art of life and the then little explored field of legislation. Whatever may be urged against his principle of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" on the score of ethics, there can be little dispute it forms the best practical test of human laws. The phrase "utilitarianism" Bentham took from an early work by Priestley, and no doubt the germs of his philosophy can be found in Hume, Helvetius, Gassendi, and Epicurus. But it is his logical and analytical application of his principles, his forensic astuteness in following up a clue and his mechanical faculty for adaptation of means to end, which gives him a separate place not only among the philosophers but among the benefactors of mankind. Upon his death Albany Fonblanque wrote in the *Examiner*: "In him the world has lost the great teacher and patriarch of his time; the man who, of all men who were living on the day of his death, has exercised and is exercising over the fortunes of mankind the widest and most durable influence." May not, indeed, the great work of the nineteenth century, the task of to-day, be summed up in the motto of Bentham, "Maximise morals, minimise religion"?

(the late) J. M. WHEELER.

Correspondence

A WOMAN'S PROTEST.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR.—The *Freethinker* I always thought of as a paper advocating freedom. It has been one of my favorite papers and I have read it with pleasure. This week I am more than sorry to see that, like a good many other men, one of the writers only understands the word "Freedom" when it applies to men. Under "Acid Drops" there are about fifty lines obviously written by a man who does not know and thinks he does. Did it never strike the writer of those few paragraphs that, for a Government like the present are, they would naturally be more bitter against a man fighting for women's rights, because they hope to frighten other men that should feel inclined to so far forget themselves and do the same—which would be very awkward for this Government? Also, another reason; it is so good to have a prominent case to point to and say: "See how good they are to the woman as compared with a man. All the men fighting for Woman Suffrage have had to submit to extra harsh treatment (I can give instances if you like) just for the express purpose of 'taking people in.'"

Another point. He states "The two Suffragette leaders who have been liberated while their followers are left in prison." He cannot understand, with only his man mind, that women like Mrs. Pankhurst and Mrs. Pethick Lawrence are not satisfied to accept merely for themselves, what, if they were entitled to, should be had also for the rank and file.

Yes; they resorted to a hunger strike "As a calculated move in their general policy as Suffragette leaders." We women are proud of such leaders. Next thing, such a writer will say "They are hysterical and do not calculate." That is how these Anti's contradict themselves usually. I should advise him not to talk about what men could do in the way of hunger strikes. One man has at least done it for Woman Suffrage; it is easy to talk. We shall not get nearer to the repeal of the Blasphemy Laws or Freethought by belittling a movement that is working for freedom of women, and then only the amount that men already have.

MADELEINE BACH (Atheist Suffragette).

[We are as much in favor of "women's freedom" as anybody can be, though we do not regard it as including the right to break other people's windows indiscriminately, merely as an advertisement of a cause in which they may be interested. We really wish some of these ladies in such hurried pursuit of the vote—which we happen to care very little about, one way or the other—would condescend to be logical, at least, when they criticise the *Freethinker*. As a matter of fact, the sentences on Mr. and Mrs. Pethick Lawrence and Mrs. Pankhurst were shortened before they began their hunger strike. They would have been liberated shortly in any case. Neither did we complain of their liberation. We complained of Mr. McKenna's treating the "conspirators" generously while leaving their followers to the full rigor of the law. It is well-known that the Home Secretary was got at by rich and influential upper class persons; and we object to that sort of thing. Discriminative justice is one of the worst forms of injustice. The point, therefore, is not whether "the Suffragettes are proud of such leaders," but whether they (or we) should be proud of Mr. McKenna. For the rest, it is highly possible that we have only a "man mind," and highly possible that our lady correspondent has only a "woman mind." May we suggest, then, as the lady, in no very flattering language, calls our attention to what she presents as the woman's point of view, that we may not be altogether wrong in calling her attention to the man's point of view, and telling her how so many men, and not the worst of their sex, feel that humanity itself is humiliated when women, whose freedom and welfare absolutely depend upon peace and order, challenge the arbitrament of violence.—EDITOR.]

SMOTHERING THE TRUTH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR.—In last month's *Musical Herald* the leading article is devoted to Mr. Ernest Newman, the musical *littérateur*, who is referred to as "one of the most widely experienced critics of the twentieth century." The whole gamut of his views and opinions is expressed, and among other things we are told that once upon a time "he wrote at considerable length upon religious matters." Heaven help us! I presume the writer meant *irreligious* matters. But, of course, it wouldn't do to shock the respectability of those who sit in organ loft and choir, for which the *Musical Herald* caters. One can imagine the pious horror of these delectable people if they had been told that this same Ernest Newman was an Atheist, and not many years ago one of the most prominent workers in the National Secular Society Branch at Liverpool.

Like our great poet, James Thomson ("B. V."), Newman began his literary career in the journals of militant Freethought, his earliest contributions being received by Bradlaugh's *National Reformer*. He wrote later for Mrs. Bonner's *Reformer*, the *Free Review*, the *University Magazine*, and Chapman Cohen's *Truthseeker* (Bradford).

Not a word is said about Newman's book, *Pseudo-Philosophy in the Nineteenth Century* (1897?), in which he took Balfour, Drummond, and Kidd so severely to task.

Why is it that these small truths are systematically "burked" in this free and glorious press of England, I wonder? Bah! "an ounce of civet, good apothecary."

H. GEORGE FARMER.

Obituary.

The funeral of the late Mr. Charles Eagle, one of the oldest members of the Leicester Secular Society, took place on Tuesday, July 9, at the Welford-road Cemetery. In accordance with the deceased gentleman's wishes, the body was cremated, and the ashes were enclosed in a casket bearing the inscription: "Charles Eagle, died July 5, 1912, aged 60 years." In addition to the family mourners, there was a large attendance of friends. Mr. F. J. Gould, of London (late of Leicester), conducted the funeral ceremony. He observed that they were met to record their sense of appreciation and gratitude for a life that was lived in honor and closed in honor. They were privileged in the opportunity of saying how highly they esteemed him, and how entirely they believed that he was a blessing to the family, the country, and the humanity of which he was a member.

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 Bandstand): 3.15 and 6.15, F. A. Davies, Lectures.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S. (Brockwell Park): 3.15 and 6, J. Rowney, Lectures.

EDMONTON BRANCH N. S. S. (The Green): 7.45, Miss K. B. Kough, a Lecture.

ISLINGTON BRANCH N. S. S. (Finsbury Park): 11.15, C. Cohen, a Lecture.

KINGSLAND BRANCH N. S. S. (Ridley-road, High-street): 11.30, R. H. Rosetti, "The Life We Know; or, A Posthumous Paradise."

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Parliament Hill Fields): 3.15, C. Cohen, a Lecture.

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (outside Maryland Point Station, Stratford, E.): 7, W. J. Ramsey, "Some Funny Bible Stories."

WOOD GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Jolly Butchers Hill, opposite Public Library): 7.30, Mr. Hecht, "Some Marvels of Silence and Supernaturalism."

COUNTRY.

OUTDOOR.

YORKSHIRE AND LANCASHIRE: Thos. A. Jackson—Bolton (Town Hall Square): Sunday, July 21, at 11, "When I Was in Prison"; at 3, "Philosophy of Secularism"; at 7, "The Dead Masters of the Living." *Openshaw* (Ashton Old-road): July 22, at 7.30, "The Devil and All His Works." *Wigan* (Market Place): July 23, at 7.30, "The Cause and Cure of Christianity." *Southport* (on the Shore): July 24, at 7.30, "What Would Jesus Do?" *Colne* (Dockery Square): July 26, at 7.30, "What must we do to be saved?" *Nelson* (School Yard): July 27, at 7.30, "Blasphemy and Profanity."

STOCKPORT (Town Square): Joseph A. E. Bates—Sunday, July 21, at 7.30, "The Birth and Death of Gods"; Monday, 22, at 8, "Religious Cupidity"; Tuesday, 23, at 8, "Cult of the Mysterious"; Wednesday, 24, at 8, "Royal Parasites"; Thursday, 25, at 8, "Paganism and its Survival in Modern Christianity"; Friday, 26, at 8, "Materialism in the Nineteenth Century"; Saturday, 27, at 8 (circumstances permitting), "Before the Dawn—and After."

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 VESKY STREET, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

BLASPHEMY.

A Full Account of the Trial and Imprisonment of
J. W. Gott, with Details of his Prison Experiences, can
now be had for 1s. 3d., post free. 172 pages.

FREETHOUGHT SOCIALIST LEAGUE,
28 CHURCH BANK, BRADFORD.

3 Guinea Suits to Measure for 50s.

FINEST GOODS. LOWEST PRICES.

Patterns free to any address.

J. W. GOTT, 28 CHURCH BANK, BRADFORD.

MARRIED COUPLE want Situations together in the
service of Freethinkers, aged thirty-two and thirty-four;
Cook and Man-servant. Man thoroughly domesticated,
can wait at table, handy man. Wife first-class cook.
Thirteen years in two families. At present in service of
religious family.—W. D., c/o *Freethinker*.

THE SECULAR SOCIETY

(LIMITED)

Company Limited by Guarantee.

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

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

Secretary—MISS E. M. VANCE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE CHURCH CATECHISM EXAMINED.

BY

Jeremy Bentham.

With an Interesting Biographical Introduction by the late
J. M. WHEELER,

Author of the "Biographical Dictionary of Freethinkers."

Bentham was the most drastic reformer of his age. He rendered financial assistance to Robert Owen and Richard Carlile behind the scenes. Macaulay said of him that "he found jurisprudence a gibberish and left it a science." Mill and all the most brilliant early Radicals were his followers. He was undoubtedly an Atheist as well as a Republican, although his biographers have sought to hide the fact. His motto was "Maximise morals, minimise religion." His *Church Catechism Examined* is strong, racy, and merciless. It was written and published in 1817. Bentham's great name, and the price of 20s. on the title-page, alone saved it from prosecution. The Church of England still exists, and this little book of Bentham's should also be kept in existence.

EIGHTY PAGES. THREEPENCE.

(POSTAGE 1d.)

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

An Important New Book for Freethinkers.

Penalties Upon Opinion.

Some Records of the Laws of Heresy and Blasphemy.

BROUGHT TOGETHER BY

HYPATIA BRADLAUGH BONNER.

Issued by the Rationalist Press Association.

PRICE SIXPENCE NET.

BOUND IN CLOTH ONE SHILLING NET.

(POSTAGE 2d.)

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

THE POPULAR EDITION

(Revised and Enlarged)

OF

"BIBLE ROMANCES"

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

With a Portrait of the Author

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

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

SIXPENCE—NET

(POSTAGE 2d.)

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

Pamphlets for the Million.

FIRST ISSUE (120,000 COPIES) READY JULY 20.

1. WHY I LEFT THE CHURCH.

By JOSEPH McCABE. 48 pp. and cover, with Portrait; 1d.

2. WHY AM I AN AGNOSTIC?

By Colonel R. G. INGERSOLL. 24 pp. and cover, with Portrait; ½d.

3. CHRISTIANITY'S DEBT TO EARLIER RELIGIONS.

By P. VIVIAN. (A Chapter from *The Churches and Modern Thought*.) 64 pp. and cover, with Portrait; 1d.

4. HOW TO REFORM MANKIND.

By Colonel R. G. INGERSOLL. 24 pp. and cover, with Portrait; ½d.

5. MYTH OR HISTORY IN THE OLD TESTAMENT?

By SAMUEL LAING. 48 pp. and cover, with Portrait; 1d.

6. LIBERTY OF MAN, WOMAN, AND CHILD.

By Colonel R. G. INGERSOLL. 48 pp. and cover, with Portrait; 1d.

Booksellers, Societies, and Outdoor Lecturers will be supplied at the following special rate for quantities, assorted if desired:—

250 pamphlets published at 1d. ...	0 11 6
500 " " " ½d. ...	0 11 6
500 " " " 1d. ...	1 2 0
1,000 " " " ½d. ...	1 2 0
1,000 " " " 1d. ...	2 1 8
2,000 " " " ½d. ...	2 1 8

Packing will be charged in addition at the rate of 2d. for each 250 copies. Carriage extra. All prices strictly net.

The Set of Six Pamphlets Post Free for 6d.

LONDON:
WATTS & CO., 17 JOHNSON'S COURT,
FLEET STREET, E.C.

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY.

President: G. W. FOOTE.

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

Principles and Objects.

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

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

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

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

Membership.

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

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

Name.....

Address.....

Occupation.....

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

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

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

Immediate Practical Objects.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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