

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

REPORT OF A PUBLIC DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

DAVID KING,

*Of Birmingham, Evangelist, and Editor of the
BRITISH HARBINGER, and*

CHARLES BRADLAUGH,

*Of London, President of the National Secular Society, and
Editor of the National Reformer,*

HELD IN THE

CO-OPERATIVE HALL, BURY,
LANCASHIRE.

—: 0 :—

UMPIRE—J. DUCKWORTH, Esq.

CHAIRMEN—For Mr. King, Rev. W. R. THORBURN, MA.; for
Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. T. SLATER.

Mr. DUCKWORTH: —Chairmen, and ladies and gentlemen, —When I was solicited to accept the position of Umpire for this evening, I was more than reluctant; in fact, I felt quite incompetent to discharge so important a duty: and on meeting with the secretaries of the joint committees I expressed that opinion, but they informed me that my duties here would be simply as to questions of order. I said that in any questions arising out of the various readings, or ultimate appeals, I deemed myself quite incompetent to decide. Therefore, gentlemen, you will at once perceive how I stand betwixt the two chairmen and this meeting; but I will further observe that I said to the gentlemen then, that I am opposed to all wrangling—that I do not wish to be mixed up in anything that would tend to such an affair; therefore I thought that if each disputant would endeavour as far as possible to keep good temper, and avoid as much as possible personalities, and above all to study the great question that each of them has undertaken, the most satisfactory result would be attained. On the part of the chairmen, I believe that both of them will do their duty, and that they will find me little if anything at all to do.

Mr. SLATER: —Mr. Umpire, ladies, and gentlemen, —Previous to Mr. King being introduced to the meeting, I may just say a word as to the origin of this debate, and I hope the parties on the other side will not blame me for what I am going to state. You will bear in mind, those of you who attended a lecture delivered about nine months ago by Mr. Bradlaugh, that a challenge was then thrown out. It was repeated at a second course of lectures, and this debate is the result of those challenges. I hope that none will regret that this challenge was accepted.

BIRMINGHAM
MOODY BROTHERS, PRINTERS, CANNON STREET.

—
1870.

P R E F A C E .

THE agreement for this Debate embraced Nine Nights, and Five Subjects. Six Nights only were occupied, owing to Mr. Bradlaugh refusing, weeks before, to fill the other three, on account of throat disorder. By the agreement he was under obligation to revise his speeches for the publication of the Report by Mr. King. Accordingly he was informed that the six nights' Debate was about to be put to press, and requested to say where proof of his speeches should be forwarded, that he might revise and return each sheet within four days. This he declined to do, though it was pointed out that the Printer would forward them direct to any place he might be staying at. Proof of the first section was sent to his London address, and waited for eight days. It has not been returned, nor any address forwarded. Under these circumstances the Report is printed, certified by the Reporter, to whom proof of each sheet was submitted.

DAVID KING.

We duly forwarded to Mr. Bradlaugh's London Address proofs of the first part of his speeches. We waited some eight days before going to press, but they were not returned, nor have we received any communication from Mr. Bradlaugh.

MOODY BROTHERS, PRINTERS.

Rev. W. R. THORBURN: —We are about to commence to night a serious discussion. This discussion regards very great things, —truths, some of us call them, others might designate them by another name; and we have the assurance that this discussion is to be conducted by expert and experienced disputants. Therefore, listen in a serious and thoughtful manner. It would be very unbecoming in me to occupy your time after what has been said by the Umpire on the one hand, and the Chairman for Mr. Bradlaugh on the other.

Mr. King: —Respected friends, —The question for this evening does not embrace the origin, results and truth of Christianity. On the third and fourth nights, we enquire as to its origin—whether divine or human. On the two evenings following we investigate its effects. An attempt, then, this evening and to-morrow, to deal with those portions of the enquiry, would obstruct our proper business and render the investigation difficult and unsatisfactory. It is, then, so far as our present question is concerned, of no consequence whether Christianity be of God or of man; *none*, whether Christ is an historical person or a myth; *none*, whether the Bible is the work of inspired men or a mere romance; *none*, whether the effects of Christianity are good, bad, or indifferent. These questions, important in themselves, are of no importance during our discussion of this first of the five questions. Our work is, so long as we are upon this question, to show *what Christianity is*, without reference to what it *has* done, or *can* do, or from *whence* it came. I trust then, that we shall keep to the appointed question by leaving *over* for later stages all matters which do not belong to this. *What, then, is Christianity?* I answer—*That doctrine recorded in the New Testament as taught by Christ and His Apostles.* In that New Testament we have the only life and teaching of Christ which Christians are bound to receive. It is there we have the history of the immediate preparation for, and planting of, the Church of Christ. It is there we have its conditions of membership and installation, rules of life, worship, and discipline. In those sections commonly called Gospels, we have chiefly the life, teaching, death, and resurrection of Christ; together with His calling, preparing and authorizing His apostles, for the purpose of founding His church and kingdom after His return to heaven. In the "*Acts of Apostles*," we have an outline of the history of the setting up of that church and the organizing of that kingdom for the setting up and organization of which they were chosen by Christ. In the Epistles instruction is given for ordering the church and kingdom of Christ, during His absence and until He come again. In the Book of Revelation there is an outline of a dire apostacy—a picture of a church, not of Christ, but claiming His name and persecuting His church. The book ends with the entire destruction of that false system, the termination of the dispensation and the introduction of the final glory. The New Testament then, is not a volume of detached sentences, any one of which may be used apart from the rest and interpreted as though it were an independent scrap. It is needful to perceive that whether the book be true or false, fact or fiction, there is a plan running through it, and that the system which it unfolds, and which we call *Christianity*, cannot be understood by any mere *scrap-doctor* who takes a text here and another there without regard to the whole. Thus, then, the sayings of Christ (when doubtful as to import, or susceptible of more than one meaning) must be interpreted by His words and deeds recorded in other parts of the book, and by the signification

attached to them by His apostles. In putting it thus, I deal with the New Testament as we are bound to deal with the works of authors generally. But there are opponents of Christianity who insist upon separating Christ and His apostles. They say that Christianity, *proper*, is the doctrine of Christ, distinct from that of His apostles. They say that the doctrine of Peter and Paul and James and John is a distinctly different doctrine, and that Christianity is what Christ taught, personally, and *that* only. Now I beg to *prove* that those who *so* teach are *wrong*, and that the doctrine of Christ and the apostles is presented in the New Testament as *one doctrine*. I have, then, to make clear that Christ is responsible for the doctrine of His *apostles* and that *they* are responsible for *all* that he taught, and that, therefore, Christianity consists of the doctrine of Christ and His apostles; every single passage of which is to be interpreted by the general tenor of *their* sayings and doings. I start with the postulate—that *Christ's own teaching must be included in Christianity*. This I presume no one will deny, and this being self-evident my point is proved; for Christ himself taught concerning His apostles, precisely what I here affirm. To Peter he said (Matthew xvi), "And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this *rock* I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven (not *heaven*, but the kingdom appertaining to heaven which was then shortly to commence on earth); and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Here then legislative authority in the kingdom and church of Christ was given to Peter. To the whole of the apostles, Jesus said,—"As my Father sent me so send I you," (John xx. 20), and also—"He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me," (Matthew x. 40). He plainly told them of his approaching death and of the official work they were to accomplish. In doing so He promised to send them an *advocate* who should abide with them all their days. The Holy Spirit, thus promised to dwell *in* them and speak by them, was to guide them into *all* truth, to *show them things to come*, and to bring to *their remembrance*, and *right comprehension*, all things that he had said unto them," (John xiv. to xvi). So then Christ made himself responsible for *their* doctrine—marked them out as the expositors of his own words—declared that *they* stood for *Him* as he stood for the *Father*—that those who received *them* received *Him*—He endorsed for *them*, as Mr. Bradlaugh did for Mr. Slater, when he wrote concerning this discussion, "What Mr. Slater agrees to I agree to," thus enabling us to hold him accountable for whatever Mr. Slater (his apostle in this matter) has done. I then respectfully demand that Christianity shall not be held as wholly exhibited in the words of Jesus. But that his apostles shall betaken as united with himself in developing, till the end of their days, a church, kingdom, system, doctrine, which He did not claim to complete during His stay on earth, but which He called them to complete, in His name; and, that consequently, we shall interpret His words, when they admit of two or more applications, according to the precepts and examples of the apostles. Having thus guarded against a too restricted interpretation of Christianity, I must protest against error in the opposite direction. As Christianity contains all that the apostles officially taught, so it ends with their last words. The *latest* communication of the *last* of the apostles completes the Christian system. Add to, or take from, what they and He thus presented, and neither Christ nor His apostles, nor Christians, are responsible for the working and effects of the system thus altered. B. Owen pro*

pounded a system called *Socialism*. Wherever that system is taught and practised as he gave it, he is responsible for the results. But when you change it he is no longer responsible, and were you, after thus changing, to designate it by his name, you would supply a misnomer and an injustice. But this wrong is constantly committed by the opponents of Christianity. In my debate with Mr. Holyoake, he persisted in attacking Romanism, and thus charged upon Christ teaching and doing the exact opposite of His plainly declared doctrine. Recently the acts of the French Emperor have been held up as illustrative of what can be done by a Christian government and nation. But he appertains to the papacy, and stands opposed to Christianity. True he claims for himself and for his church the name "*Christian*," but just as well might one claim to be the Prince of Wales, because, without authority, and in defiance of right, he took upon him the name of the prince. Everyone, knowing anything of the doctrine of Christ and His apostles, must know the utter impossibility of perpetrating the worse than brigand-like atrocities of those who sought to make and who proclaimed the war, without violating all the great principles of the doctrine of Christ. The *New Testament* distinctly foretells the uprising of a carnal organization, in the form of an apostasy from Christianity, yet bearing its name. That organization has long since been developed, and if we wish to ascertain what Christianity is, we shall be careful to distinguish between the thing itself and the counterfeit—between the doctrine of Christ and the doctrines of the apostasies. If this is not done, it will not be because it is not understood, but because of unwillingness to follow truth. Both sides understand this point perfectly well. I cannot cite Christian writers who set it forth more clearly than do certain prominent scribes in the *National Reformer*. Secularists, then, can and do distinguish between Christianity and the systems which usurp its name and place. They do so whenever it suits their purpose, and it is only just to demand constant recognition of a distinction so important. To show their complete recognition of the position now urged, I shall cite a few passages from the *National Reformer*, all of which are written against Christianity. On page 5 of the vol. for 1867 we read concerning the progress of Christianity—"A century passed, and the only people who possessed the knowledge of the Incarnate God were still an obscure and despised sect. The Christian religion, however, increased, as hundreds of false religions have increased, or, as it would be more correct to say, an *ecclesiastical despotism, founded on the ruins of the ethics taught by Christ, established itself.*"^m A few lines lower down we read—"Then began a new and singular empire. The high priest of the religion called *Catholic*, which had *erected itself on the ruins of Christianity and civilization*, undertook to fill the throne of the Roman Empire, to be a king as well as a priest, and in the name of three gods to rule, not only over the venerable seven-hilled city, but over the world." In the leading article of the same number of the *National Reformer* we have the following:—"There are at the present time hundreds of different sects, all more or less persecuting each other as infidels, all the while forgetting that they themselves are infidels to each other. And if we appeal to the New Testament, we shall find that all these sects are infidels to true religion. It teaches us that essential saving religion, or true Christianity, wholly consists in doing good to each other—nay, that self-sacrifice for the good of others is the very spirit of Christianity: it inculcates a love of truth, justice, and liberty, and denounces that corrupt, hypocritical, and time-serving lip-worship which is so generally imposed upon the meekness and credulity of humankind as

the religion of Jesus. If we were to judge from the effects of *this falsely denominated Christian religion*, we might be led to suppose that it was designed to stupefy the human intellect, to foster and encourage fraud and hypocrisy, to plunder the poor, to enrich the affluent, and to engender hatred and ill-will amongst all classes of the community. "Omitting a few lines, we read—"I am fully persuaded that in the real religion of Jesus, as taught in the New Testament, there is no essential part of it that the humblest individual could not understand by himself alone. It is said of Jesus that the common people heard him gladly; but English priests, like the priests of old, 'bind heavy burdens grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers.'—Matthew xxiii., 4; 'they teach for doctrine the commandments of men'—Matthew xv., 9. " From the *March* issues of the *National Reformer* (1867) I take the following from another writer. His article is headed—"Dialogue of the Dead—between a Christian of the 1st and a Professing Christian of the 19th Century. " The supposed talkers are *Dr. Ritual*, a clergyman of the English State Church, and a *Christian* of the apostolic time. After hearing *Dr. Ritual's* description of certain matters appertaining to his church and system, *Christian* (who is supposed to have come from the dead and to know Christianity, only as it was known in the 1st century) says—"You confirm my conviction that Christianity has died out of the world, and that the lapse of time has obscured and totally misrepresented our religion. I do not know what you mean by Pope. Peter never was at Rome. How could he be the chief of the apostles in deliberate defiance of Christ's command, that all the disciples should be equal? 'Neither be ye called masters, But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant.' Do I understand that you, whom I take for a pagan priest, actually profess to be a believer in Christianity? " Further on *Dr. Ritual* says—"What do you mean by teachers who deny Christ? Such expressions applied to a bishop—a successor of the apostles!" To which *Christian* answers—"A successor of the apostles—of the poor fishermen who wandered about subsisting on alms, who obeyed to the letter the commands of the Divine Master! Do you jest on sacred subjects? Is it not enough to have abandoned Christianity, but must you also turn it into ridicule, by calling a wealthy, titled bishop, who attempts to defend his own choice of Mammon-worship by preaching Jewish doctrines against the explicit commands of Christ, a successor of the apostles? " Lower down *Christian* addresses *Dr. Ritual* thus—"For the first time you speak like a *man*—not like a *theologian*. If the thought has ever flashed across your brain that there is another world—where each shall appear in his true colours—you must have turned with loathing from the contemplation of what you are—a political priest—a thing of compromise—the tool of statesmen—the mercenary hireling of a State Church—trading on a superstition reared on the ruins of the religion taught by Jesus. You have deceived man, not God. If amid the rubbish of the vain learning which you call *theology*, the nummeries of pagan ceremonies, the man's heart of you has preserved enough of the religious sentiment to thrill at the still small voice of conscience, you must have known that you are no more alive than dust can be—that you are doubly *dead*. " Now, in quoting the foregoing from Mr. Bradlaugh's paper, I am not to be supposed to accept every sentiment. I bring it forward as proof that that important distinction between the doctrine and Church of Christ and His apostles, and those systems, organizations, and despotisms which bear the Christian's and oppose the doctrine

of Christ, is well understood by the advocates of Secularism. I then insist that *that* Christianity, concerning which we have met to inquire, is correctly described as "The doctrine of Christ and his apostles, as recorded in the New Testament." I demand, then, that we *alloy*—Popery to the Popes; Lutheranism to Luther: Protestant State Churches to the monarchs and parliaments which make and control them; and Christianity to Christ and His apostles. Now I wish it to be distinctly understood that I commit myself to all that Christ and His apostles present, that I accept nothing else, and that if anything I propound, as part and parcel of Christianity, is shown to be of more recent origin than the time of the apostles, then I give it up at once. Only for that which has the authority of Christ and his apostles am I here to contend. It will be convenient here (as early as possible in the debate) to state what I gather from the teaching of the apostles, with reference to certain prominent points of the doctrine of Christ. I shall not be able to present them entire in this speech, but I hope to resume at the point at which I leave off. I may, however observe, that in the New Testament we have no one passage or chapter, which contains a complete outline of Christianity. There is a comprehensive statement in Eph. iv., containing (what is there termed) the Unity of the Spirit, which consists of seven units, as specified by Paul, viz.: *One Body, One Spirit, One Hope, One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism, One God.* Particularizing somewhat, we say: —1. *One God*, the Father; *Almighty* (Rev. xii. 7); *Who only hath Immortality* (1 Tim. vi. 16); *Creator* of all things (Rev. ii. 5); *Who has made known His will by prophets and apostles, and by Christ.* (Heb.) 2. That in the beginning was the *Word* and the Word was with God and was God; that that Word was made flesh and dwelt among us, as the Christ, the Son of God (John i.); that He died as a propitiation for the sins of the whole world (1 John ii. 2); that He rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, from whence He will come again in like manner as He ascended. (Acts i., ii., iii.) 3. That all the dead shall be raised and judged, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of condemnation. (John v.) That the principle of this general assize is that of righteous judgment, in which God will render to every one according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honour, and immortality, *eternal life*: but to them that do not obey the truth but obey unrighteousness, *indignation* and *wrath* (Rom. ii. 6); so that, as stated by Paul, we shall all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that each may receive according to that he hath done, whether good or bad. (Rom. ii. 10.) Not only so, but the standard of requirement is not the same in all cases, but varied according to ability and opportunity, as declared by Christ, "For unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall much be required." There are distinctly the many stripes and the few, recording to the measure of criminality. (Luke xii. 47.) The punishment awarded will not be *purgatorial*, but simply *punitive*, and in its final element *eternal*—"Everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power." (2 Thes. i. 9.) Who is able to destroy both body and soul in *ge-enna* (Mat. x. 28.) 4. That the Church of Christ consists of those inducted ones who have so believed the gospel of His death for our sins and His resurrection from the dead, as thereby to be turned to God in that true repentance which consists in determination to forsake sin and eventuates in reformation of life—that all members of His church, thus qualified, *possess* the salvation promised to those who

believe and obey the gospel; that is, pardon of sins committed before conversion, adoption into the kingdom of Christ, and all the present privileges appertaining thereunto, with the promise of eternal glory at the coming of Christ, if they continue in right living and bring forth fruit to the good of man and the glory of God: while, on the other hand, they are warned, that every branch (or member) that bringeth not forth good fruit, shall be cut off and cast into the fire. (Mark xvi. 16., Acts ii. 38, John xv. 2.) 5. That the church in its glorified state will occupy, next to Christ, the highest place in the eternal kingdom and glory; but it will not be the only saved—companies of saved ones, forming nations or tribes, will enjoy the glory of the new earth and heaven and drink of the water of the river of life, over whom Christ and His church will be supremo for ever. (Rev. xxi. xxii.) My time having expired, the remainder of this outline must stand till I again address you. (Applause.)

Mr. SLATER:—I now beg to introduce Mr. Bradlaugh to this meeting.

Mr. BRADLAUGH:—Naturally in a debate of this kind every advocate pursues the course that he thinks will best support the cause he has in hand. I presume that my opponent thought that the *National Reformer* was the best authority he could read to you. I cannot quarrel with his taste. Naturally, and as editor and proprietor, I must thank him for the goodly advertisement he has given to it. It would, however, have been rather more fair had he told you, that instead of these being the views of Mr. Bradlaugh as to what Christianity is, that the *National Reformer* was as free a platform as was this, where every person is permitted to say his say, so that one man may be defending Christianity in one article and another attacking it in another; and if my friend had looked at the foot of the article he would have found some signature or initials identifying it, and it was not quite fair to put it forward as a leading article, because the only leading articles are written by myself, and I never wrote anything of the kind he has quoted. I shall not trouble you with the *National Reformer* any more, though it is good reading at any time, but will pass on to the subject. My friend says that by Christianity he means the doctrines recorded in the New Testament, as taught by Jesus Christ and his disciples. Well, I don't quite accept that definition, if it is meant to limit the debate to the New Testament, and I will explain why at once. In the New Testament I find both Jesus and the apostles referring to the Old, quoting and recommending examples from it, and, therefore, by its teaching I have liberty to go to the Old Testament to find out what it says as to the examples to which they allude. Nay, I declare as a point of fact that the teaching of the Old Testament is renewed in the New. Jesus said, in words as to which there is no mistake (and when I use the words "Jesus said" don't understand me to mean any admission of authorship; because as Mr. King says, that question may come up in another part of the discussion, and I only use the words for the purpose of showing where I profess to be quoting from), in Matthew v. 17 and 18 verses, Jesus said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law and the prophets; I am not come to destroy but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." And I say, that there is nothing I can quote from the Mosaic law, which is not in direct terms repealed and annulled by Jesus, that is not part and parcel of Christianity. It is part and

parcel of Christianity by the law of the land. The 9th and 10th William III., which has never been repealed, makes it part and parcel of it; and I say, therefore, that I have the construction of the highest authority, that of the State and of Jesus himself. Nay, it would be utterly impossible to make out a Christian system at all unless you took in the Old Testament. What do you find if you refer to Corinthians? You will find a statement of this character: "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead." Now are you not to look to the Old Testament to see how Adam did die? Are you not to study the history of Adam? If not, I cannot understand the utility of referring to the Old Testament at all. If you turn to Hebrews xi., on reference to it you find Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthae, David, and Samuel, all held up as examples to us of faith, and their conduct put before us for our guidance. Now, surely I am bound to look to the Old Testament to see what sort of lives are set before us for approval, and all this surely shows it to be part and parcel of Christianity. Then our friend says that in debating what Christianity is, that to-night it is of no consequence whether Jesus was a real existence or a myth, or whether the books of the Bible are true or a romance. Permit me to say I think he makes a great error there, if it is true, as he himself put it, that it is one of the essential doctrines of the Christian faith that a man who believeth and is baptized shall be saved, because he quoted from Mark (xvi. 16): "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." All that I say is that it is of importance to examine everything in order that you may believe it. We do not believe the "Arabian Nights Entertainment," or "Jack and the Bean Stalk," and it is necessary to examine into the truth of any sort of story that you may be required to believe as part of Christianity. Our friend says—and I agree with him for the purpose of debate—that there is a plan running through the Old and New Testaments, and that that must be taken into consideration. Surely if there is a plan; if by Adam's sin in the Garden of Eden some sort of mischief was introduced into the world which Jesus' life and death, separately or combined, was to be the remedy for—if that be so you cannot deal with the redemption without dealing with the fall. And if Genesis, the basis, be untrue, it is simply impossible that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, the superstructure, can be well built on that which is a rotten foundation. I am not discussing whether Genesis is true or not, but I am just putting it as a justification for the line that I shall take. Then he says—and this I confess seems to me a fair specimen of his heterodoxy breaking out—that we are bound to deal with the words there as with the words of authors generally. Now, what does that mean? Does it mean that you are to reject things that are unpleasant to you as you would in the writings of authors generally? Because, if it does not mean that, then the sentence is a round phrase without meaning; and if it does mean that, who is to judge how much is to be rejected and how much accepted? Is Mr. King to judge the writings of Jesus and the apostles? Is it to be Mr. King, or the Church of Rome, or the Church of England? Mr. King says it is not to be him. He repudiated Kingism, he equally repudiated the Church of Rome and the Church of England. How then is the standard of criticism to be applied? Then our friend put it—and I admired the clearness with which he put it—that Jesus was as responsible for all that the apostles said and did, and for their sayings and doings, as Mr. Bradlaugh is for Mr. Slater in this debate. He was good

enough to tell you that I wrote a *carte blanche* to my friend Mr. Slater, agreeing to be bound by whatever he did, and our friend says that Jesus is as much bound by his disciples as Mr. Slater is by Mr. Bradlaugh. Now, I ask, was Jesus bound by Peter when Peter, with a curse, said, "I know not the man." Is Peter an illustration? He was that disciple to whom was entrusted vast power, and he said he did not know Christ, and cursed and swore. If our friend says Jesus was bound by the doings as well as the sayings of the apostles, then Peter's unfaithfulness is part and parcel of Christianity. However, I confess I don't understand it, though I dare say our friend will make it all clear. He will tell you that it is part of Christianity in spite of this, but it is clear that he did not mean that there was the same responsibility as in the case of Mr. Slater and Mr. Bradlaugh; and it was a very unfortunate illustration to say the least of it. Now, I had thought of occupying you by a little further illustration of what Peter said, but I will save that till a little later on in the debate. Then he said—and it struck me as coming from him with peculiar force—that if we add to, alter, or take away from what In the New Testament is represented by Jesus and His apostles, that is not Christianity. Now, I heard my friend read out of his paper a word that I could not find in the authorized English version. But he might say—oh, I read from the Greek, but here is the difficulty—you must not add to, you must not alter, you must not take away, but do you not set out by saying that that is not a reliable version of what Jesus and his disciples did. Evidently you think so, because in at least three instances you have substituted words of your own for words that are in the authorized version. I don't trouble to say this is part of my argument—I don't trouble to say whether your translation is right or wrong—but I simply say it is not what is given in this book; and if it is not, who is to be the judge as to what is a true translation. Are we to go to the Greek version instead of to the English version? Where is the evidence of that particular MSS. you got your particular word from? Don't quote some Greek word without at least cautioning me, without at least telling me when and where you saw the MSS., and what is the evidence as to its superiority; and I object to any man standing up and discussing Christianity, and saying to an audience, "I am discussing that which is taught in the New Testament," leaving the audience under the impression, without a word of caution, that he accepted it, while still quoting from another version than the authorized version, in order to anticipate points that he thinks may tell against him presently. Then my friend has been good enough to tell me something about the Emperor Napoleon and the war. I suppose it was to fill up the time; but I don't see any particular object in my friend's argument. He says that war is not Christian. If that be so, how does he interpret Matthew?

"Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I come not to send peace, but a sword." Again, how does he interpret the passage in Deuteronomy?

"When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it: And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be that all the people that is found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee: And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it: And when the Lord thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword." Then it provides for the sparing of the women, and little ones, and cattle, but "of the cities of these people, which the Lord thy God did give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt Save

alive nothing that breatheth. ” Now, our friend says war is not Christian. I say it is Biblical, whether it is Christian or not, that it is enjoined in the Old Testament, and that Jesus and his apostles quoted from the Old Testament; and if our friend says that the doctrines of Jesus were contrary to the Old Testament, then he will make out that the Bible is a book that contradicts itself on its own teachings. But I shall not be content there, because if he chooses to say that the doctrines were prohibitive of war, I shall show that they are not so prohibitive of war as he supposes. Then our friend, after he found that the *National Reformer* did not fill up a full half hour of the time, commenced by referring you to Ephesians iv. I presume he thought Ephesians one of the most important books he could quote from, as he began with it, and if he had selected it purposely for its looseness, then I could understand why my friend went to it. But, curiously, he quoted one or two different verses and chapters to support the doctrines which he had enlarged upon, and he put as part of the Christian’s belief, God as the Creator. Then I say, if we believe in God as the Creator, on certain texts in the Old Testament, we are justified in going to the Old Testament for the theory and words by which the Creation is taught, and to ascertain whether the picture is true or false that is drawn of God as the Creator; and I utterly object to be shut out from books which teach one of the most important points which my friend refers to. Then he has told you something about final judgment. He quoted from Romans ii., and I was struck by a phrase which he used. I cannot imitate our friend’s effective style. He spoke of the scrap doctor, who scratched out text³ here and there. Now, if our friend had wished to give us a specimen of himself, he could not have done it more effectively than he did. I don’t suppose the phrase to have a personal reference, and I use it in the same parliamentary sense that he did. He quoted Romans ii., 6, “Who will render to every man according to his deeds but why couldn’t he go on reading a little further? You find that the writer there, being a Jew, or wanting to please them, put the Jews first and the Gentiles after. “But glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile. ” You find that Jesus’ doctrine was originally limited to the Jews alone, for we read he commanded his disciples in these words, —Go ye not into the way of the Gentiles; and it was not until after his death that that command was revoked or altered, and they were ordered to—Go into all nations and proclaim the gospel to every creature; and if you talk about scrap-quoting, you had better not break off in the middle of a paragraph. I ask my friend, don’t you believe in eternal torments? Yes or no? Do you believe that there is a lake of brimstone and fire, where people will be burnt for ever and ever if they come within the penal consequences of this book, or do you not? Don’t let us play at words, or make a show of learning. You have used the word *ge-enna* instead of hell. You did not tell the audience why you substituted one for the other. I suppose so learned and able an advocate had a purpose in it. Will you kindly tell me what it is? And now I will tell you what Christianity is so far as I can judge it. I first put it that the essential governing Christians is the doctrine of faith—that without faith in Jesus, as taught here, you cannot have Christianity at all—that is Christ’s test question about it. Why, in Romans you find it as explicitly put as anything can be. Was it existing then? Has it been excluded? By what: the law of works? Nay, but by the law of faith. We conclude that it is not man’s conduct, but faith; and you can have nothing clearer or more

distinct than the passage from Mark—"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." And I submit to you that means that he that believes in the history and teachings of Jesus Christ, and everything appertaining to them, as recorded in the gospel, shall be saved, and he that don't shall be damned. Now, if that be an unfair construction, I ask my friend to tell me how much it means, or what is the limitation of it; and if it is not unfair, then I will show you the application. But it is clearly not unfair, because in Hebrews xi. you have a very long and able disquisition on the merits and advantages of faith, and you are told that without faith it is impossible to please God. The faith of Enoch, of Noah, of Abraham, of Jacob—all these are put as matters in which they were blessed. Clearly it was Jacob's faith and not his conduct that was held up as an example, for he was a liar, a cheat, a trickster, and a thief. It was Jacob's faith only that is referred to. Clearly Abraham was blessed for his faith and not for his conduct, for he was a liar, and a man who turned his wife out into the desert. And there are several other instances not necessary to enlarge upon that come within what I should not define as coming within the region of good works, and I put it to you here that faith is recorded as the saving element, and nothing else. What is it you believe in? That as by one man (Adam) sin and death came into the world, so by one man (Jesus) they were removed. I don't urge it for a moment that by Jesus came redemption from that sin; I put the atonement theory apart, but I have the fullest right to any advantage that may arise out of that theory. I put it next that the consequences of not believing is eternal torment, hell fire that is never quenched, pains that never cease, for persons who bring themselves within the penal consequences of that text. I contend also, that the doctrines of Jesus are doctrines—to sum them in the few words in which our friend puts them—It is of very little consequence indeed the life here, but that it is the life hereafter in which you are to enjoy an eternity of happiness, or misery, to which your attention must be completely directed. I put it that He teaches the doctrine, and that He and His disciples taught that it was the duty of the mass of men to submit themselves to whatever is the ruling authority of the time, even if it be perverse and wrongful, for that the redressal and reward rest in the hands of God—that if a wrong be done it is neither our right nor duty to resist it, nor to prevent it, but that the matter is to be left in the hands of God himself. I put it to you that the theory is, that however wicked a man may be, —if he be a murderer, a liar, a thief, or be guilty of every imaginable crime, and if at the last moment he repent and believe, he goes to heaven as readily, if not more readily, than the man who has been perfectly good the whole of his life. That I am prepared to prove text by text, but I don't take the time to prove it at this moment, until I see that my friend disputes it in some way; and it will be on that theory of Christianity that I shall have to address you. Now, gentlemen, in presenting you with this definition, I would say that I should willingly have avoided so much of this debate as may turn upon manuscripts, or the value of texts of scripture or non-scripture until the latter part of the debate, but when I find my opponent, without a word of warning, substituting words for the text which are not in it, relying on my non-acquaintance, I suppose, with them, I think it right to ask him, whenever he does vary from the text, to state why he does it. If the authorized version is not reliable let us know it, and let us have authority for the variation; but don't let us hop skip and jump about without saying one word as to

the grounds for it. I feel indebted to the Umpire who presided, and to the Chairman who introduced me, for their kindly words in commencing this debate, and I never probably needed more, that the kindness shown in those speeches should be as kindly preserved. You have come here not simply to hear your own views, but to hear them countervailed. I shall choose my own course. It may not be the best; it may be too rough, too coarse; it may not be true; but I leave all that to the other side, and then, whether victory be on one side or the other, at any rate we shall have this great victory—a demonstration that men of opposite opinions have learnt to meet in each other's presence, and to listen to each other's views with advantage, hoping for each other's deliverance from error. (Applause.)

Mr. KING:—I shall at once return to the outline of the doctrine of Christ and His apostles, to which I was directing your attention when my time expired. I had specified five particulars, and now I resume with the sixth, which relates to justification and salvation by faith. 6. The doctrine of justification and salvation by faith is truly apostolic; but justification by faith *alone* is only named by the apostles to be repudiated, —faith *alone* is declared dead and worthless. The faith demanded in order to justification is not merely assent to dogma, but a principle of action which is only deemed complete, and counted as existent, when perfected by right feeling and doing. (1 Cor. xiii. 2, James ii. 17-26.)

7. Having said that those who believe and obey the gospel are not the *only* saved people, it is scarcely necessary to add that the declaration, "He that believeth not shall be damned" is not applied to all who have been, or who are without faith in the gospel. In every instance where condemnation is announced as the result of not believing, the presence of testimony and evidence sufficient to produce faith (if examined and not improperly resisted) is presupposed and, therefore, persons *unable* to believe, because without testimony and evidence, or from physical inability—as in the case of infants and idiots—are not included among those condemned for not believing. 8. That the institution appertaining to the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, and therein made known to us as THE CHURCH, is neither national nor provincial, and is not governed by popes, cardinals, councils nor parliaments. 9. That priests, altars, and victims have no place in the church and doctrine of Christ, —that Christ alone took the place of the priest, and by his one offering for ever did away with priesthood among his followers, making every Christian as much a priest as any other; thus giving to every man full access to Himself, and through Him to every ordinance of worship and service, without the aid or existence of priests or clergy, thus abolishing, priesthood by constituting every member of the church his own priest. (1 Peter ii. 5, 9, Rev. i. 6.) This anti-priestly feature of Christianity is admitted by its early enemies, avowed on the pages of history, and declared by modern unbelievers. In proof of the last assertion, I quote again from *National Reformer* articles, of the dates before mentioned. *Christian*, in conversation with *Dr. Ritual*, says: "Jesus instituted no priests. He hated priestcraft. His word? were, 'Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so it shall not be among you; but whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister, and whosoever of you will be the chiefest shall be servant of all.' Which of the apostles was called Lord, or lived in a

palace, or wore the robes of a pagan pontiff? A true Christian fraternity could know no distinction of laity or clergy." From the other *National Reformer* article before cited, we read—"Jesus exhorted the people to think for themselves, saying, 'Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?' (Luke xii. 57.) And Paul exhorts us to 'Prove all things and hold fast that which is good.' (1 Thess. v., 21.) The New Testament likewise prescribes the means by which we can become fully acquainted with the religion of Jesus, —by 'free inquiry and mutual instruction.' The primitive Christians did not set up an *exclusive* order of priests, their assemblies and congregations were conducted on the principle of *mutual instruction*; for (1 Cor. xiv., 31) we read—'For ye may all teach, one by one, that all may learn and all may be admonished.' No doubt, Paul had a strong presentiment that the small seed of pure and genuine Christianity, when it is watered by the fertile showers of civil emoluments, would soon grow up into a large and spreading tree; but that under the shelter of its branches the birds of prey and plunder would not fail to make themselves comfortable habitations, and thus deface its beauty and destroy its fruit, and that under such conditions the religion of Christ could never become the national religion of any country upon earth. But the religion of Jesus, as taught in the New Testament, proclaims—'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, and goodwill toward men.' (Luke ii. 14.) It is a plain, practical, and benevolent religion, unpolled with mysteries, unencumbered with priests, and eminently fitted to implant in the human breast a love of truth, of liberty, of justice, and brotherly affections." Thus you have from the *National Reformer*, and from an infidel pen, a clear statement of what Christianity, in this important particular, really is, and you perceive that, notwithstanding the fact that Secularists frequently charge upon Christianity the wrongs of priestism, that they know as well as I do, and that their own organ proclaims, the completely anti-priestly character of Christianity as given by Christ and His apostles. I don't know that I shall read anything more from the *National Reformer* on this subject. What I have read is certainly the best piece of reading I have seen in that paper. (Hear, from Mr. Bradlaugh.) I did not present these quotations under the supposition that Mr. Bradlaugh had written them. It was not my intention to imply anything of the sort. What I say is this, —that the statements cited are not those of Christians, writing either in explanation or defence of Christianity, but they are made by persons opposed to Christianity, who, notwithstanding their opposition, discern in these particulars what Christianity really is. They are the statements of men who wrote as Secularists, in their own paper, and for the purpose of opposing Christianity. Returning to my outline of Christian doctrine, I say—Note the requirements of Christianity with reference to *love* and *brotherhood*. He who hath faith without love is declared worthless (1 Cor. xiii.); he who, seeing his brother in need, shuts up his feelings of compassion, is declared without the love of God and therefore obnoxious to Christ. (James ii.) Every disciple is required to look, not to his own things or welfare only, but also to the welfare of others (Phil. ii. 4); to seek not to please himself merely, or mainly, but to please his neighbour, for his good to edification—the strong are required to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please themselves. (Rom. xv.) All are commanded to return good for evil, blessing for cursing, and when one disciple commits trespass against another, the wronged one is

required to see him alone for the purpose of winning him back to rectitude. If that fail, two or three others are to be taken to dissuade him from persisting in wrong, (Matt. xviii.) The ready forgiveness of those who wrong or offend us and who repent of the same is not only commanded but our own trespasses against God are held as unpardoned while we forgive not our repenting brother. (Matt. vi. 15.) If conscious of having wronged our neighbour, we are told to go to and do him justice before attending to the ordinances of the church. (Matt. v. 23.) Whatever we would (in these matters of just dealing) that others should do unto us we are required to do unto them. (Matt. vii. 12.) In a word, we are to put away every evil and follow every good, to put off wrath, malice, railing, lying, and to put on mercy, kindness, humbleness of mind, and long suffering, and over all to put on love as the perfect bond. (Col. iii.) Lastly, in this epitome, let me notice the weekly church service instituted by the authority of Christ for His church, in all time. On the first day of the week His disciples are required to assemble, and to attend to the apostles' doctrine, the fellowship, the breaking of the bread, and the prayers. (Acts ii. 42.) This is to be done steadfastly, or unremittingly, in accordance with the command—neglect not the assembling of yourselves together as the manner of some is. (Heb. x. 25.) Observe, this is not a Jewish Sabbath, not a slavish Sabbatarianism, but a Christian festival, a time of *rest* and *peace* and *joy*. They are called to assemble, not to witness a useless ritualistic performance; not to listen to a dead language or a foreign tongue; not to gain access to God by the intervention of human priests; nor to obtain absolution by auricular confession. It is a service rather *man-ward* than *God-ward*, designed to serve *us* rather than *Him*. It is exactly what man needs, and it meets requirements of his nature. The apostolic order spreads the Lord's table every Lord's day, that the symbols of broken bread and poured out wine may speak, through the eye to the heart, and thus deepen gratitude and love to Christ, whose love and death they show forth—that thus His disciples may be impelled to consecrate themselves increasingly to the doing of his will; which can only be done as in love to God and man, they seek to benefit both saints and sinners. Mutual exhortation and prayer and praise meet the emotional wants of our nature and tend to inspire us with longings for a *higher* life now and a more *glorious* one *hereafter*. Love flows out in attending to the fellowship, which implies money contribution for the requirements of brotherhood; so that those who have little of this world's goods may not lack, but find help from the abundance of others. This service is as philosophic as it is philanthropic: it is known to be a mighty power, tending to the steadfastness, joy, purity, and peace of thousands. They find these blessings through Christ, and by this means, and their feeling ever says—

"Jesus, peace and joy art Thou,
 Joy and peace for ever;
 Joy that fades not, changes not,
 Peace that leaves us never.
 Joy and peace we have in Thee,
 Now and through eternity."

Now let me put Mr. Bradlaugh right with regard to my appeal to the New Testament. I did not at all intend to intimate, that in this discussion my opponent and myself are absolutely confined to the New Testament. My friend puts before us the statement, that the whole of the law of the Old Testament is adopted by Jesus. That is not correct. Jesus came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it. He said, that not one jot or tittle of it

should pass away until all was fulfilled. Does not that imply a time when it would be fulfilled and pass away? Christ came to fulfil—His coming, His work on earth, His death, fulfilled that law, and thus abolished it. (Applause.) The law and the prophets contained clear indication of the coming of the new dispensation, of the making of the new covenant, and of the passing away of that old covenant. Therefore Christ, (who lived and died under that old dispensation) did not, while living under that dispensation, break or destroy the law; He did not teach the people to do so; He taught in defence of that law which He came to fulfil. The very words quoted by Mr. Bradlaugh clearly imply a time when the law would pass away. (Hear, hear.) He uses the text as if the law would never pass away, but the teaching is, that it should not pass away until all was fulfilled. (Applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —Our friend has not been good enough to tell me which version of the Bible he relies upon, nor to tell me why he quoted from another instead of from this, and he has left me in doubt as to which I am to answer instead of this. He seems, in consideration of the exigencies of debate, to have read a speech prepared beforehand. He has not told me whether the definition of Christianity which I gave him was the right one or the wrong one, so that I do not know whether or not to persevere in that definition. He has been good enough to answer one point, and one point only. And if I am to be answered in the same way as I have been answered upon this point, this discussion will assume the form of a one-sided debate. My friend says that in this New Testament justification by faith is only named to be repudiated. I utterly and emphatically deny that faith is thus named only to be repudiated. I say that the person who has spoken that, either never read his Bible or did not remember what he read, or had made the statement knowing it to be untrue. I think I have put the issue as plainly and as directly as I can. Will my friend be good enough to give me the verse or verses as well as the chapters he quotes from, because I can't pretend to the same efficiency as a biblical scholar. He first quoted Corinthians 13th chapter. If he means the first Epistle and the 13th chapter, I have looked through all the verses in the chapter, and I confess I have not been fortunate enough to find the quotation he refers to. I would like him to make his quotations sufficiently precise to enable me to detect. He told us that justification by faith is only named to be repudiated. Well, I read 1 Corinthians xiii. through to endeavour to find the passage which supports this doctrine. But I have not the same intimate acquaintance with Scripture as my friend, because he finds things in it that I don't. Therefore I am placed in a difficult position, not having a sufficiently clear clue to the text, so that I might neither misrepresent him nor mislead myself. My friend again puts forward some statements from the *National Reformer*, which he says are not the statements of Christians. I don't know that that matters much, but at any rate they sound very much like it. They are either statements written by Christians themselves or statements representing the Christian view of the matter. But what earthly view has my friend to enforce these statements upon me? The columns of the *National Reformer* are open to all correspondents. If my friend means that the writers in the *National Reformer* try to understand the subject they write about when writing in the columns of that journal he is quite welcome to it. Our friend says that a certain morality of character is Christian. And he read from Colossians iii. —I presume from the 8th and 9th

verses, although he did not give the verses—he read amongst other things that one was to put off lying. But how am I to deal with that as Christianity? I find Jacob in the New Testament is held up as an example of faith. Why, Jacob didn't put off lying. And if Jacob didn't put off lying—Jacob, a man who was specially beloved of God, am I to take that text which recommends him, rather than look at the entire conduct of Jacob, who was a liar! I only want some theory to guide my criticism. I should like to know what it is; and I must say that I admire the very brilliant method in which our friend deals with the Old Testament. He does not say that he will not deal with the Old Testament, but he looks to the New. Now, what the----- I was going to be profane, because I was rather startled, but let us know what it is. If it is to be a mere word jingle, this debate, let us know, and I can take my part in it as well as another. If it is to be our friend's heresy, let me at least know what I have to deal with. Frankly state your heresies; I am not responsible for other people's orthodoxy. Now, let us see how he gets rid of the Old Testament. By the construction of Matthew v. 17 and 18, (which is certainly worthy of notice), we have this:—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy but to fulfil: for verily I say unto you, till heaven and earth do pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." He had not come to destroy, but to fulfil; but Mr. King said that meant that in coming He did destroy it! When He did come it was completely done with! But then would it not have been much plainer if Jesus had said, Think not that I come to destroy the law or the prophets; the purpose and end of my life is to give a new covenant which replaces them, and my death gets rid of these injunctions. What I said was, that we should take the Old Testament where it was not precisely repealed in words. I say let our friend be answerable for the Old Testament, except where it is specially repealed. I took our friend to the creation and fall and showed the connection of it with the redemption and, instead of replying, he reads papers. If this is to go on it ceases to be a debate on Christianity at all. Now, let me press the matter further as regards our friend's speech, and I come to the only thing in it that I may refer to jocularly. He said something about involving money contributions for the brotherhood. Now really I thought that ridiculous, for I am one of the brotherhood, and you are to starve me. You stipulate that I should not have any money contributions at all. I suppose he meant to say something funny, and I deal with it in the same good temper. Now I put a question which he did not answer, and I intend to press it—what is the difference between *ge-enna* and hell, and why did he substitute one for the other? He carefully avoided that, so that I have not the opportunity of replying in this speech as I ought to matters that should be cleared away. It is useless dealing with text-scrapes unless I know what I am to do with the main features of the Christian scheme. Does he believe that Jesus Christ came to save the world from the sin introduced by Adam? If yes, will you kindly state texts from the book to trace it; also whether the coming of Jesus saves all mankind from the sin of Adam or only those who believe? If you say only those who believe (as the book says), what becomes of the five hundred million of Buddhists, who never heard of it? I don't want to make any comment on it. I only want to know whether they are to be saved or damned if they never heard of it. If they are saved then the element of faith don't apply in their case, and if they are not saved then it may be a fair matter of enquiry when we come to

discuss what are the legitimate effects. You may have noticed that I carefully avoided following my friend in his speech as to what this or that apostle said, but just before sitting down he put to you the famous golden rule. "Whatever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them." Now, I ask in the case of one of the apostles how does he reconcile these, and what is Christianity, judging the two together? "And when ye come into an house salute it: and if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you. And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust off your feet. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city." Now, I want to know if it is doing unto others as you would be done unto, if, because you go to the house of a person who will not listen to you, you shake the dust off your feet, knowing that the consequence will be that a worse punishment will be inflicted than that which Sodom and Gomorrah received for the worst of crimes? If I obeyed the text "Do unto others," &c., I should not do anything of the kind. How am I to collate these texts together? And to what sort of conclusion must I come as to the doctrine taught by them? It is for our friend to explain it, and I beg him, if this debate is to go on, to reserve his already prepared copy for some other occasion, and apply himself to what I have to say, instead of to something which he thinks more interesting. (Applause.)

Mr. KING: —Of course I have no expectation of exactly pleasing our friend in the course I pursue, and I have no very great desire to make much effort to do so. I shall endeavour, as fully and fairly as I can, to bring the question in dispute before you. The question for the evening is, "What is Christianity?" What I have presented to you, the whole of it, is in answer to that question. My first speech ended before I had got more than half way through the outlines of Christian doctrine which I thought desirable to give. My opponent completed his speech and sat down without dealing with it, and I thought, therefore, that I would proceed to tell him what I find in the New Testament concerning faith, and certain other points of Christian doctrines and practice. I proceeded immediately to deal with faith, in answer to his demand, but I think he will need to supply me with a couple of the talking machines, such as are at work, I think, in London, because, though I pursued the course he indicated, he complained that I had not been attending to the particular statements which he made in another part of his speech. But, if I had done that, and left the other undone, he would have complained on that head. I shall, therefore, take my own way, and endeavour to deal with his objections (so far as time will admit) in due course. He objects to my intimation that we are bound to deal with the words of the New Testament as with the words of other authors. He says, "How so? We reject certain parts of the writings of other authors as wrong and accept other parts as true! Does Mr. King mean this? And if not, what does he mean?" I mean, that in ascertaining what the writers of the New Testament mean by the sentences they give us we must treat those sentences by the same rules of interpretation we apply to any other book. It is not a question of the truth of what we read. It is a question of what the writers mean; and in order to ascertain that, it is not what I say they mean that must be accepted by you, nor what Mr. Bradlaugh says they mean that must be thus accepted. We are to test the words as to then:

meaning by the recognised principles which we apply to other authors. Having made that point clear, I observe that the Bible does not profess to describe more than one perfect man. The apostles are imperfect, the prophets are imperfect, the worthies of the Old Testament are all imperfect. The book itself professes to present but one perfect man—Christ himself and, therefore, the apostles are not submitted to us as examples otherwise than as they follow Christ; nor are their doings endorsed by Christ, further than their official action is concerned. What then, they, as apostles of Christ, instituted in His kingdom and in His name, He has made Himself responsible for. If, outside that line, Peter, under temptation, took to swearing and denying Christ, he did not do so in the exercise of any apostolic function. Indeed he was reclaimed from that fall before he received that final commission which pertains to the now-existing kingdom and Church of Christ. He, with others, had been previously commissioned to go and announce to his Jewish brethren the near approach of Christ's kingdom, and it was after that previous commission that he fell into sin, and his doing so was foretold by Christ, and it took place before he received that baptism in the Holy Spirit which was to fit him for the work he was to accomplish after his conversion; and, therefore, we have simply to look to the apostles as commissioned by Christ to act in setting in order His kingdom for Him, as He did not remain here to order it Himself. For this work He promised them the Holy Spirit to guide them into all truth, to bring to their remembrance whatsoever things he had taught them, and to shew them things to come. This authority was conferred upon them, and in view of it He had said to Peter prospectively (and substantially to the rest of the apostles), "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." We have, then, simply to distinguish between their conduct as private individuals, and their official action as the apostles of Christ. I have said that nothing is to be added to Christianity as left by them, whereupon my opponent asks, how we are to be bound if I quote from some other translation and give you what is not in the common or authorized version of the Bible; and I am requested, if I do so, to say to what extent I accept the English version, and why I refer to anything exterior to it. I have simply to say, that I am not bound to the common version, and that I do not know any Christian who holds himself as so bound. That version is, of course, avowedly a translation. What did the translators translate from? I ask only the liberty to change their translation when it can be shown that that translation is not in accordance with the document from which they professed to translate it. And if I find occasion to change the translation (I don't know that I shall need to do so), I shall not do it on my own authority; you shall have authorities who by their very names shall command respect. (Hear, hear.) Now with regard to the Old Testament, I wish we understood each other; because I do not want the time wasted. The Old Testament contains the account of the creation; the New Testament recognises it as true. The Old Testament contains an account of what is sometimes called the fall; and the New Testament recognises it as true. We don't propose to set the Old Testament aside, but we take the Bible as a whole. But then, what have we? We have in that book three distinct dispensations—the patriarchal, up to the time of the giving of the law by Moses; the period of the law, and you know from the New Testament that the law was added on account of transgression, till the seed (as Christ is called) should come. We have, then, the dispensation of the law (the old covenant) and the prophets under that

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY?

covenant predicting that God would make a new covenant, and that, consequently, the one then existing would pass away. Accordingly you have, at a later period, the new covenant and dispensation instituted—in a word, Christianity. Now what we want is, that it should be understood—and it would save Mr. Bradlaugh trouble both here and elsewhere, if he were to understand the bearing of one institution upon the other. For instance, under the old covenant which was mediated by Moses, you have circumcision. The law of that dispensation declared that the soul which is not circumcised shall be cut off; the uncircumcised was to have no place whatever in the privileges and immunities of citizenship. But, when you come down to the new or Christian dispensation, circumcision is no longer binding, but, on the contrary, you are distinctly taught, that if a Gentile is circumcised Christ shall profit him nothing. You may tell me this is a contradiction, if you please. You may say, that according to one part of the book men will be condemned if they are circumcised, while according to another part men will be condemned if they are not circumcised. But there is no contradiction, you have simply two periods—two dispensations—one to which circumcision appertains and one to which it does not. What was binding in one case is forbidden in the other. Now, what I want to be understood is this, —what belongs to the Jewish system and what belongs to the Christian system. The Jewish law was never given to any nation except the Jews. It was never designed for general application, and you have in Christianity a dispensation entirely different. Its commission is—“Go ye unto all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.” There is no restriction, none whatever, but the apostles were to preach the gospel to every creature. I want you to distinguish the difference between these two widely differing dispensations. I do not think there is very much probability of Mr. Bradlaugh quoting from the Old Testament anything I shall object to, if only he keep in view that distinction. I am not seeking to exclude any part of either the Old or the New Testament, but only to distinguish the Jewish and the Christian dispensations. The one is typical of the other—the one is preparatory of the other, the one was set up until the other should come; and he who confounds the two only deceives those who listen to his interpretation. Hence, then, with regard to war. If we are referred to Deuteronomy, we find that it appertains to the national system given to the Jews. It does not apply to the Christian dispensation. The Christian is told to put up his sword. He is given to understand that the use of the sword is contrary to the will of Christ. I say there is no contradiction in this, —the one thing belongs to a dispensation passed and gone, and very different indeed from the Christianity which has now taken its place. My friend asks me why I used the word *ge-enna* in place of the word hell. I had simply this reason for so doing—as he no doubt very well knows, there are two words in the Greek New Testament both translated by the common word hell. The one word means a place or condition of punishment, the other does not; but having these two Greek words translated by one English word, we find there are some passages in which the meaning is obscured. Simply, then, to distinguish between the two, I used that word. (Applause.)

MR. BRADLAUGH: —I suppose my opponent, who kindly gave you some quotations, had not time for quotations as to justification by faith being stated only to be repudiated. Then he says, it is not worthwhile wasting time about the version. He says he will quote to you authorities. Aye! For what? For the “particular document” from which the translators

professed to translate this book. Now, I would like to see that particular document. I remember a good many documents, and I have a good many in my own library, but I do not remember any particular document from which the translation was made. And it is no waste of time, it is unfair and a waste of time to refer to some other authority without telling the people what he refers to. He has not told you what sort of reliance he places on the version, and how am I to know whether any objection I take may not be met by him in this way, —“Oh, that is not correct; that is not the version?” How am I to know that we are not misled as to what he considers the correct version of Christianity, because you have not always the benefit of Mr. David King’s learning to explain to you how much of this book is true or is not true, unless we have some guide in this particular document. If we are only to take what is supported by some great authorities, I am afraid our investigation of what is Christianity in the Book will not be a very satisfactory one. Why, I hold in my hand a little book written by an authority who says, that the more the matter is investigated by these documents, the more crude and unsatisfactory it is. But when I hear what the document referred to is, it is possible, with my limited reading, I may raise objections to it. I object, however, to any appeal to an unknown document to correct a known book, and I deny that there is a particular document from which the translation is supposed to have been made to which our friend can refer as an authority. Well then, we will go step by step, and I must say that I was very much amused indeed with the skill with which he draws his distinction with regard to Peter’s official and his non-official action. He told us that in some commission given to Peter, and substantially to the other apostles, —“Whatsoever ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,” and so on, and my only reason for asking him the question was, because he tells us that this special commission was given after the offence and repentance for it. It is possible that I read the Bible wrongly, perhaps I do, but I want to know precisely the state of the case, because my calculation is, that Peter turned out a thorough rascal after he had been entrusted with the mission of binding and loosing. Of course I may be wrong in it; I shall be glad to be set right; it may be found in the “particular document,” for it is not to be found in this version. There is a difference, I am told, between Peter’s official and non-official action. What is the difference between official and non-official action? Non-officially he denied his Lord and Master; officially he was Peter the good; non-officially he was Peter the rascal; and all I can say is, that if we are to distinguish between official and non-official Christianity, I give up this debate at once. If that is the way the matter is to be dealt with, and the demand for explanations met, I do not understand the value of this debate. But is it a fair argument, even taking it in my friend’s point of view? He says we must test the words as we would the words of any other writer. **On** what principle, in the works of any other writer, would he introduce the word official? What standard of reading would authorize him in introducing the word official there? But he says Peter did this outside his official action. Oh, then, we are to split him in two, and say that he was rascality outside and goodness within! Is that the principle on which answers are to be given in this debate? Are we to turn Christianity inside out? Really, it is monstrous to discuss in this way. Now, what was the temptation of Peter? Suppose it was an infidel who had forsaken his master, who had **Been** him do wonderful things. Would it not be a sad temptation to

escape punishment, and say that his creed was not strong enough to hold him as against the fear of that punishment? Was there any other principle, and if so, what? And if my friend says I must read the book as any other book, what particular text contains the principle? What God fore-knows He ordains and predestines, and *had* He fore-ordained and predestined that Peter should deny Jesus; and if so, what He fore-knew and predestined, is that to be pronounced un-official? Why was it not as official as anything he did? Then our friend puts it to you that there are three distinct dispensations the patriarchal, the law and the prophets, and the Christian; and he says there will be no difficulty so long as I don't confuse them together. Now, I will ask him where in the book one is separated from the other. I don't say that he separates them; he does not perfectly separate them. I should like to know the particular chapter or text that divides the patriarchal period from the dispensation of the law and the prophets, and that of the law and the prophets from the Christian dispensation. And I will further ask him how it can be possible that there can be any separation, for in the Epistle to the Hebrews, when speaking about the teachings of Jesus and the apostles, reference is made to both the law and the prophets? Does it not resolve itself again into what I said at the first—that where there is not an absolute repeal of injunctions in the New Testament, that there we are entitled to quote the Old Testament as part of Christianity. But then our friend says there is a repeal in the case of war. He says the injunction about war was repealed. Let us try the effect of that argument. Supposing it were, was the original command good or bad, according to our friend's view? If it was bad then it is equally bad for the patriarchs, or any persons succeeding them, as for other people. But is it repealed? What does the text mean then (Luke xix. 27), which says "But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me." Our friend may tell you that that was part of a parable. But it was not, and I make that answer so that he may be able to deal with it. He may say that it was not correctly translated, and I shall wait for that answer till it comes. Again, take it according to our friend's doctrine that I may quote any part of the Old Testament except such parts as are not repealed, I must take it with that restriction or repeal that the New Testament puts on it, therefore I must not take the Old Testament texts with regard to war, if the New Testament negates war. I am not to quote a barbarous principle if the New Testament negates it. Now, I ask my friend to refer to Deuteronomy (xiii. 6), as to persons seeking to entice others away from their religion. "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which has thine own soul, entice thee secretly saying, Let us go and serve other Gods which thou hast not known, thou, nor thy fathers: namely of the Gods of the people which are round about you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shalt thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him; but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones, that he die; because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage. And all Israel shall hear, and fear, and shall do no more any such wickedness as this is among you." I ask whether that is part of

Christianity? If it is not, then, having referred to the text which I read from Matthew x., which my friend probably has not had time to deal with, I ask whether it is not very much a continuation of the same persecuting doctrine, with the exception that the punishment is to continue for some longer period. I ask you whether our friend has dealt with the question of punishment in the same frank spirit that I have answered him. He said something about *ge-enna*, but he did not go on to answer the question, "Do you believe that hell is a place of eternal punishment?" I want to know what he repudiates, and what he does not. He repudiates part of this book; will not be fettered with it; and I want the whole benefit of this. Don't let him tell us that it is a waste of time. It is no waste of time to understand each other. It is no waste of time to plumb an antagonist, and ascertain how much is real and how much is pretence, and I shall go on with the time until I ascertain the way this stands. (Applause).

Mr. King:—With regard to the distinction between official and non-official action. I see no reason why we should have any difficulty with regard to the apostles when we can all perfectly well understand the thing with regard to any other class of officials. Can we understand what are the official acts of the government of this country? Unquestionably we can. Can we not distinguish between the merely personal acts of Mr. Gladstone and the official acts of Mr. Gladstone? Unquestionably we can. Is not the government responsible for the official acts of its agents, and at the same time non-responsible for unofficial life? The members whom you send to Parliament are responsible to you for their official acts, but not responsible for the acts appertaining to them as men. When we talk of the official action of the apostles, we are not talking of the good Christian acts of daily life, but of the work of the apostolic office which they were called to perform in setting in order the Church of Christ, completing the Canon of Scripture, and in giving the statutes, institutions, and laws by which that church shall be governed. What I have said is, that Christ made himself responsible for what the apostles did in these matters and for "all they taught in reference thereto; and that thus Jesus was responsible only for the official action of His apostles. Next we are asked with regard to Peter's commission. I said not that the words addressed to Peter by the Saviour in Matt. xvi., (where He gave to him the keys of the kingdom)—"Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven"—were given after the sin and reformation of the apostle. I was referring to the final commission under which the Church that now is was to be set in order. The commission under which the apostles were commanded to preach to every creature was given after Peter's restoration, but he received a previous commission to go to the Jews and to tell them of the near approach of the new institution. I distinguished between the two commissions. The binding and loosing commission was not committed to him for immediate exercise, but had reference to the work which would devolve upon him when fully commissioned. And even when the apostles received that subsequent and complete commission, they were required not to do anything in execution of it until endowed with power from on high. They were to act only as apostles of Christ, with regard to that commission, when they had received that promised baptism of the Holy Spirit which they received at Pentecost, and which was to result in their being guided into all truth and fitted for apostolic work. Where, says our friend, are these dispensations separated in the Bible? How are we to distinguish the one from the other? What verses

are there that distinguish them? What are the portions of the history of France which tell us where to separate the action of the former Republic from that of the Empire, and the action of the Empire recently brought to a close from that of the present Republic—if Republic we can yet call it? We have to examine when each came into existence. The Empire which followed the Republic marked out its own position by enabling us to know when it originated. The laws of the previous Republic do not apply necessarily to it and, therefore, when you come to the New Testament dispensation, which was only near while Christ was on earth, and find that after He had ascended to heaven and the apostles had declared the setting up of His church, that men were said to have been translated into it, then you have clear intimation of the change of dispensation, and the setting up of the new manifestation of the kingdom appertaining to God and heaven. You have at once a distinct line drawn between the two. The patriarchal dispensation stands out before you. You have the patriarchal dispensation until the giving of the law by Moses, and then comes the last, the present dispensation, as inaugurated by the apostles. Thus you have a distinct line drawn in the case of each. With regard to the question of war, we are asked whether the declaration in Luke, "Bring forth those who will not that I should reign over them and slay them" is not war. We answer—No. We insist that it is part of the parable, and that in the common version it is so. But I care nothing as to whether it is part of the parable or not. For, what is it? You must have something taught by the parable. You have there a king whose subjects will not that he shall rule over them, and they are slain on account of their rejection of him. But what is the application of the parable? It is that Christ Himself will, by and bye, come in judgment, and that those of his subjects who would not that He should reign over them will then receive the punishment referred to in the "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels." Here, then, you have a very distinct reference, which no reader of the passage should fail to perceive. We cannot conclude that the punishment was to come then and there, because the whole teaching of Christ was opposed to that idea. The disciples did not yet understand His teaching, and they had not received his doctrine in its fullness, and on one occasion when the people would not receive Him, they said, "Wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them?" What was His answer? "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not' come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." Therefore, so far from teaching that men should be then slain because they did not receive His testimony, He taught that nothing of the kind should take place, but that they should proclaim the truth, and leave the punishment of those who rejected it—supported by undeniable evidence, demonstrated as that truth was and would be—to the future judgment of Him before whom eventually all must stand, whose judgment in every particular will be just. Our friend referred to the requirement of the law that, certain persons should be put to death who entice others from their religion, and we are asked—is that part of Christianity? Of course it is not. Mr. Bradlaugh represented me as admitting what he formerly put before you—that those parts of the Old Testament which were not repealed by some immediate declaration on the part of Christ are to be allowed to stand as law to Christians. I simply say that the Jewish law was given to none but Jews. They alone were under that law—no others were. The Church of Christ was not, and is not. It is a widely different institution. According to the Bible, I never was placed under that law. I have nothing to do

with any of its particulars. There may be certain of its prohibitions binding on me, but not because they are in that law, but because they are re-enacted by Christ and His apostles. I hold my myself under no obligation to obey any part of the Jewish law. No Christian is, unless that part is re-enacted by Christ or His apostles. If then I am asked to whom the law was given, I answer to the Jewish people and to none other. It is no use talking of repealing the law bit by bit in this case, as we are not under it. We might have come here to discuss quite another question, and it is not impossible that before Mr. Bradlaugh quits this life he may hold a discussion upon it. He might appear on a public platform with a Hebrew, or Jew, and the question in debate might be, "What is Judaism?" It would be no use his quoting Christ and His apostles against the Jew, as Judaism, or the Mosaic system. It is the old law as given by Moses. We of course account the prophets under that dispensation as of God. The question to-night is not "What is Judaism?" but "What is Christianity?" and those portions of the Jewish law only are part and parcel of Christianity which have been directly adopted, or re-instituted, by Christ or His apostles. That is the real position of the case. Our friend has appealed to the common version of the Bible. I am not aware that I have submitted anything to your notice to-night which is not sustained by the New Testament in the common version; and until something is alleged by Mr. Bradlaugh, as appertaining to Christianity, the statement of which in the common version I reject and propose to amend, there can be no need to trouble ourselves about manuscripts, documents, versions, translations, and the like. I have no idea that I have departed, during this discussion, from the common version in a single instance. But Mr. Bradlaugh seems anxious to get me away from it. Why I cannot say. Nothing of the kind has been attempted by me. I simply used the word *ge-enna* in place of *hell*, for the reason assigned. I used it in the sense of fiery punishment—the very idea that, I presume, he attaches to the word *hell*. At present all I have presented to you as Christianity is found in the common version. When I depart from it will be the time for me to show the reasons why I do so, and I shad be quite prepared so to do. (Applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH:—Our friend departed from the common version in his first speech, —I didn't. He read the word without the slightest intimation that it was not in the common version. He says I am anxious to get him away from it. Nothing of the kind. I am only anxious to know what he considers the standard authority, and he is only anxious to avoid giving me a direct, answer to my question. He says that he used the word in the sense of fiery punishment. Was it to last for ever? Yes or no. Perhaps, also, he will supply the quotation from Corinthians that I have twice asked for, and say whether he adheres to his statement, that justification by faith is only named to be repudiated? Perhaps he will tell us why he referred to a "particular document" which he knew did not exist. Why make a parade of learning as to a document which does not exist. I am probing the questions still further home. It is no waste of time; it is only a fair subject of enquiry. I have been content to wait so far. Now, a man who pretends to so much learning as to correct translations, has no-business to say it is a waste of time when you press him on a certain point. Then, my friend, speaking of acts official and non-official, referred us to Mr. Gladstone. That is not the question. I referred him to an act of Peter's, particularly to the act of Peter's denial of Christ, and our friend said, —

and the report will show it, —that Peter did not receive his special commission until after then. Now, curiously, the commission Peter received was: —“Thou art Peter: on this rock is built my church, and to you belongs, the power of binding and loosing,” and that was the most special commission that Peter received, and he received it long before his denial of Christ. But how does the matter resolve itself now? First you go to the Old Testament, then you accept some of it; and how much does he accept now? Just as much of the Old Testament as the Jews believe of the New, —that is, not a word. That is very satisfactory! Our friend does not repudiate it; oh, no! But you are not bound by it, except it is re-enacted. I am afraid our friend is too clever in this debate. I appeal to him not to deal with me in this debate as if I were a child. I appeal to him, though I know he is in a position to give pain to his friends by showing his own heresy. I want to know what I have to deal with, and I won't let him chop and change to unknown versions. I will get at what is a satisfactory version to him, but I won't permit him to go to unknown versions. He may go to some that I can't read, and then see what a difficult position I shall be placed in; or he may go to some other that he can't read himself, and then see the difficult position we shall both be placed in. Then he says with regard to Luke (xix. 27), that that is part of the parable, but he did not care whether it is or not. Then, for the purpose of the argument, we will treat it as if it were not. But I am afraid he has not read it. He says it did not apply to anything to be done then, but to the future judgment, when Jesus comes to judge the world and punish them. Now, I say if our friend read the text before he uttered that, then he directly misrepresented the entire sense of it. That is taking it on his own admission that it is not part of the parable. I will read it to you: —“For I say unto you, that unto every one which hath shad be given; and from him that hath not even that he hath shall be taken away from him. But those mine enemies, which would not I should reign over them, bring hither and slay them before me.” Our friend says that does not mean bring them before me and slay them, but that it means, bring them before me at the last day and I'll punish them. I say that it says nothing of the kind, and that it is a wilful misrepresentation of the text. I come here to debate fairly, and I will not submit to wilful misrepresentations, or to jugglery in debate; I will have a fair, candid, and upright advocacy of the matter in hand. He must not go back, and say that this was part of the parable; I bind him to his own admission, and deal with him on that. Then let us see how far our friend and I have progressed. We began with a doubtful position as to the Old Testament, then we had it swept out of Christianity, and we have now only the Old Testament, where it is re-enacted. Is the fad re-enacted? Then I can go into the Old Testament. Is the story of Abraham and Jacob re-enacted? Then we can deal with them as part and parcel of Christianity. He says, and it is a very unhappy illustration, that there is just the same difference between the patriarchal and Christian dispensations as between the Empire and Republic of France, inasmuch as the laws of the Republic did not apply to the Empire. I thought the *Code Napoleon* had gone through the laws of the old Empire and the new Republic, and did still. Do you mean, by the illustration, that they apply just as much, —did you mean that the Old Testament applies to the New just as much as the old Republic applies more or less to the new one? If you have used an illustration which you know nothing about, I will not rebuke you for putting it. The history of France must be

sufficiently understood to prevent his misleading you. What is Christianity according to our friend's point of view? Is it the Old Testament? No. Is it the new? No. It is those portions of the Book which suit our friend, and it is a waste of time to discuss how much of it belongs to Christianity. If it is a waste of time to discuss our authority, then this discussion is a waste of time altogether. Do you tell the people, whom you called together here that it is a waste of time to go into these matters? If this is to be a debate in which we are to understand one another, let me know what book it is I am to take as the standard of appeal or else let him at once confess that he has none or that his book is so full of blunders and errors that he dare not appeal to it. If there is no difference between *ge-enna* and hell, why change the one for the other? Mr. King made a show of learning by referring to a "particular document" which he says the translators used, but which I told you did not exist, and yet challenged by that he don't refer to it. Then again as to justification by faith alone being only named to be repudiated, I ask you to read Romans iii. 10, Acts iii. 20, and Galatians vi. 16, and I ask if he still believes in that doctrine, though I don't hope to convince him. If my friend had not professed to be reminded of Mr. Holyoake, and how he, the great gladiator in this debate, had been concerned in a former controversy, I might have been content to suppose that some of these things to which I refer had been, the result of unacquaintance with the subject, but when I remember that in John Street nineteen years ago, my opponent was debating with Mr. Holyoake I cannot come to any such conclusion. When challenged to this debate, I told him that I did not want to meet him. I only wanted to meet one who was honest, fearless, and frank, and I did not want to meet a man who shuffles from one document, and from one doctrine to another in order to evade the truth. (Cheers and cries of "Shame," and "No personalities.") Well, my friends you must leave me as I told you in my first speech, to conduct this debate in my own way. In the first speech which I delivered, there was not the semblance of an attack on our friend. In my second, I supposed that the replies to my questions had been in the hurry of debate accidentally omitted. In my third, I was more struck with their continued omission. In my fourth, I have nailed down the thing, because it is utterly impossible any longer to believe that he has blundered out of it. And from this time forth I refuse to accept any document without clear reference to the page quoted from, and I refuse to accept any reference to any portion of the Bible without distinct reference to chapter and verse. I was driven into this debate for nine nights, and I knew what would happen in it. I have come not for any pleasure to myself for these nine nights, I have had my toil from my desire for truth, and I am determined that so far as possible the truth I will have. My friend has promised to starve me, and I have promised to shame him off the platform as one who dare not defend the truth. (Applause, and cries of "Shame,")

WEDNESDAY EVENING, SEPTEMBER 28, 1870.

The UMPIRE took the chair at a quarter to eight o'clock, and the chairmen for the evening were—for Mr. King, the Rev. G. SCOTT, D. D., and for Mr. BRADLAUGH, Mr. BLACKER, of Darwen.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —The subject for to night is a continuation of the subject of yesterday evening, "What is Christianity?" My opponent told you that Christianity consisted alone of the teachings of Jesus and His apostles and their examples, as recorded in the New Testament; and he told us that Christians had no more to do with the Old Testament than the Jews have to do with the New, and that it is only where the Old Testament is re-enacted in the New that Christians are in any way concerned in it. If Mr. King be right in his contention, then the Bible in its present state—that is as we have it here—is clearly an improper book, because the Old Testament and the New Testament are bound up together, without any sort of distinction, any sort of mark between them, to show that the Old Testament is unconnected with the New. Besides, the analogy he gave was entirely faulty, because the Jews, by no possibility, repudiating Jesus as the Messiah, base anything upon the New Testament, while Jesus and the whole of the apostles are repeatedly spoken of in the New Testament as referring to the Old Testament in support of particular matters which they think supported by such references. In the schools (the ordinary Christian schools of the country) the Old and New Testaments are handed together to the children without any such stipulation being made. In the churches and chapels the lessons are taken out of both the Old and New Testament, and it is only when they have to be debated on a platform that we find it convenient to throw the bulk of them overboard. Is Mr. King right in his construction of Christianity? Do ad the great Christian bodies—do the Church of England—do the 39 Articles of that Church, which are, at the present moment, the Christianity which I am forbidden to deny—do these declare that the Holy Scriptures—meaning by Holy Scripture the Canonical books of the Old and New Testament—stand in the relation that Mr. King says they do? On the contrary the Articles of the Church of England are explicit. By the Holy Scriptures, meaning the Canonical Scriptures, of the Old and New Testament these Articles teach and contain God's relation to man of ad things necessary to salvation. However, for the purpose of this discussion, it is a matter of no importance to me. It is more to those who sustain Mr. King and surround him as to the view of Christianity he chooses to define here; but for the matter of this discussion, I will take Christianity as defined by himself—that is, that where in the New Testament any portion of the Old Testament is re-enacted that there the Old Testament forms part and parcel of Christianity, but that wherever it is not re-enacted in precise terms, or terms equivalent to its re-enactment that there it forms no part or parcel of Christianity. I do not know where he gets his new and novel doctrine; if it is Bury Christianity, I don't complain; I only want to discuss the

Christianity of the Old and New Testament, and as my object is to get rid of the whole Bible, I have no objection to get rid of a great piece of it at the beginning, and I am quite content to let that be. But understand that I want to be quite clear what we are discussing. Well, then, taking Mr. King's own definition of Christianity, is it in the ordinary authorized version circulated by the Church of England? Is it in the Rheims version, circulated by the Church of Rome? Is it in the Unitarian, or in what version? And I am obliged to put this question; it is no waste of time to put it, because my friend alluded to the matter in his first speech. Is his definition to be found in the new version by Tischendorf, published by Tauchnitz? Or does he accept any version whatever, or has he got some version in which there is some better evidence which enables him to rely upon it as a matter of authority? Will he also be good enough, as he last night spoke of it, to tell us something more about that particular document which he said the translators used. * Does he mean by that document, the Received Greek text as printed? Because if he means that I shall have to trouble him with the opinion of the Rev. Dr. Irons, a clergyman of the Church of England. In his work on "The Bible and its Interpreters," commencing at page 12, Dr. Irons declares, that "in point of fact the Received Greek text was made up from documents or books that could not be carried back beyond a very few centuries; that these were full of inaccuracies; and that the further back you go the greater difficulty you have in finding anything reliable about it." I won't trouble you at this stage of the evening with reading the whole of Dr. Irons' remarks upon this point. It will be sufficient for him to dispute the writer's position. I do not rely upon Dr. Irons myself, I am prepared to prove his statement from independent sources, and I only give it as coming from a man of high repute in the Church, and as being better worth while to notice than if coming from myself. In spite of the 9th and 10th William III., cap. 32, I may reject the authorized version in any place, where am I to find a reliable account of the teachings of Jesus and His apostles? because Mr. King has defined to you the teachings of Jesus and His apostles to make up the totality of Christianity, teaching either by word or example. And I want to know, if this be not good enough, where I can find something good enough to stand the test. For my own part in this debate I shall hold myself at liberty to confine myself to the ordinary authorized version in this debate. I consider myself bound by no other. If I reject the ordinary English version, the Act 9 and 10 William III., cap. 32, subjects me to an indictment and severe penalty for its rejection, and that is the version almost invariably in use among all the English Protestant Trinitarian bodies. By the way, our friend did not tell us whether he thinks fairly from the teachings of Jesus and his apostles, the doctrine of Trinity in Unity is deducible. I do not wish to take something he does not hold, and if he is one who does not believe in the Trinity, far be it from me to press it on him. Probably he does, believe in it. There are one or two points that he has not yet explained. He has not told us if he believes in eternal torment yet, (laughter), although I have asked him several times. Probably he will tell us that in his first speech, and let us clear up these matters, so that I may go on. Now, I will submit the teachings of Christianity from the New Testament as I find them, and I say that the first and most important of the teachings is that of faith. Take for example Mark xvi. 16, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." John iii., 36, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life,

* See *Appendix* No. 1.

but the wrath of God abideth with him" Acts xvi., 3, "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shall be saved." Now, I submit to you that faith is a most important feature of the Christian teachings, and not only that faith is, but faith to the exclusion of works, and that is a point upon which I must challenge my friend, for you will remember that he most distinctly stated last night that faith alone was never mentioned except to be repudiated. And I will read to you from Romans, iii., 20, "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh, be justified in his sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin." And the 27th verse—"Where is boasting, then. It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay, but by the law of faith." (iv. 4-5). "Now to him that worketh is the reward, not reckoned of grace, but of debt; but to him that worketh not, but believeth in him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Galatians ii., 16, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law, for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Galatians iii., 11, "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God it is evident, for the just shall live by faith." I do not pretend to say that my friend may not quote some text exactly opposite to that; I admit he may. My contention is not that the Bible is contradictory, but that he was utterly wrong when he said that faith alone was never mentioned except to be repudiated. In the 18th Article of the Church of England it is declared as expressly as anything can be in these words: "Of obtaining eternal salvation only by the name of Christ. They also are to be had accursed that presume to say that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professes, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature. For Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved." Our friend may say he has nothing to do with these Articles. I don't want to bind him by them at all. I only want to show that the construction of Christianity as deduced from the New Testament is by no means an unfair construction by persons in the Christian body at least as competent to form judgment as our friend. Well, if faith is an important feature of Christianity, what is it that makes up the Christian faith? You are to believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and surely at the very least that must include belief in the exact truth of the life of Jesus and His teachings, as recorded in the New Testament. Then in order to ascertain what is Christianity, we must see what is the life, and what are the teachings of Jesus, as recorded in the New Testament. Turn to the New Testament, and let us begin at the very beginning, and what do we learn? We will begin at the very place and date of the birth and parentage of Jesus, because, clearly if belief in Jesus is to be the basis of Christianity, and the belief in Jesus Christ alone, surely it must be belief in the entire history of Jesus. You have no right to knock out that history, or any portion of that history, and say it is not important. If the history of Jesus, tis recorded in the New Testament, is to be accepted, it must be in its entirety. Now, the very first step in it—the place of the birth of Jesus—is uncertain, as may be seen by careful reference to the text. According to John vii., 41, 42, and 52, the Jews, in the very presence of Jesus, reproached Him that He ought to have been born at Bethlehem, and we find Him making no remark to get rid of that reproach. The Rev. James Cranbrook, in his work on "The Men and Circumstances that originated Christianity," page 122, regards Nazareth as the birth-

place of Jesus. He says:—"In fixing upon Nazareth rather than Bethlehem as the place of His birth, I am influenced by the fact of His having received His designation from the former place. By the fact that it is acknowledged on all hands that He and His parents lived there all the early part of His life; by the inconsistency, contradiction, and worthlessness of the tradition which mentions Bethlehem as His birth-place; and by the unhistorical character of the fact by which the presence of his parents in Bethlehem is explained, since there was no such enrolment at the time to which the tradition refers. The Rev. Dr. Giles, a clergyman of the Church of England, in his "Christian Records," page 114, has a very long chapter headed "On the Uncertainty of the Birth-place of Jesus." Matthew, who records that Jesus was born at Bethlehem, bolsters up the story with three pretended prophecies, in verses 6, 15, and 23 of Chapter ii., which are all improperly and inaccurately quoted. W. R. Greg, in his "Creed of Christendom," page 93, says:—"In this place we must notice the marked discrepancy between Matthew and Luke as to the original residence of the parents of Jesus. Luke speaks of them as living at Nazareth before the birth of Christ, Matthew as having left their former residence, Bethlehem, to go to Nazareth, only after that event and from peculiar considerations. Critics, however, are disposed to think Matthew right on this occasion." Oh, but I may be told that Christianity does not concern itself about the birthplace of Jesus. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." Well, I ask, if there be an uncertainty about the place of birth of Jesus, how can you have a saving belief in it. But follow it out further. Take the time of His birth. We do not know from the Gospels either the day, or hour, or month, or the year in which He was born. The only thing that the Gospels do is to make Him be born in the life time of Herod, and after he was dead. I ask you, if you believe the time of birth to be of any importance at all, how can you take His birth as being in the reign of Herod and at the same time as not happening until after the death of Herod? On this point the Rev. Dr. Giles says in his "Christian Record," page 120:—"If Christ was born in the reign of Herod the Great, no Roman census or enrolment could have taken place in the dominions of an independent king." And Dr. Giles, accurately or inaccurately, expresses confidence that the two dates are decidedly opposed. But I don't wish to rely only upon Dr. Giles. I make the statement prepared to demonstrate from the Gospels, that the Gospel of Matthew fixes His birth in the reign of Herod, and that the Gospel of Luke precludes the possibility of His being born until after Herod died. Now as to the parentage of Jesus. His descent is traced by absolutely contradictory genealogies to David through Joseph, who was no relation to Him whatever. There are two genealogies—one in Matthew and one in Luke and in the points where room for comparison is afforded by the Old Testament, those genealogists contradict each other. The genealogy of Matthew is self-contradictory, counts thirteen names as fourteen without explanation, and omits the names of three king³ without apology. Matthew says Abiud was the son of Zorobabel (i. 13). Luke says Zorobabel's son was Rhesa. The Old Testament contradicts both, and gives Meshullan and Hananiah and Shelomith their sister (1st Chronicles v. 19) as Zorobabel's children. Well you may tell me these genealogies are of no importance, "He that believeth and is baptized shall -De saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." Why if they are not put there for our belief why are they put there at all P If we are to

cast them out as so much waste and rubbish where is the process of casting out to begin and where is it to end? To be a Christian, then, you must believe each of these incredible or contradictory accounts of the birth and parentage of Jesus. We are told that the birth of Jesus was miraculously announced to Mary and to Joseph by the visits of an angel, but they so little regarded the miraculous annunciation that they marvelled soon after at things spoken by Simeon, which were much less wonderful in character. According to Matthew (ii. 13) an angel warned Joseph to flee with Him and Mary into Egypt. And Joseph did fly into Egypt, and remained there with the young child and his mother until the death of Herod; and this was done to fulfil a prophecy. On referring to Hosea,

xi. 1, we find the words have no reference whatever to Jesus, and that therefore either the tale of the flight is invented as a fulfilment of the prophecy or the prophecy manufactured to support the tale of the flight. The Jesus of the third gospel is never recorded as going into Egypt at all in his childhood. We find no proofs of it at all, and the thing seems absolutely fictitious. William Rathbone Greg, in his "Creed of Christendom," page 91, says that "either there are two different accounts of the same thing or two separate annunciations were made—the one to Joseph and the other to Mary, but either of these suppositions is attended with difficulty." I do not quote Mr. Greg as an authority, because I am prepared to prove it from the book itself. I name it lest my friend should say I am only repeating such and such a writer, and I save him the trouble of that. Passing from this point to the next one, the point of baptism. When Jesus was about thirty years of age He was baptized by John in the river Jordan. Now, John, according to the Gospel of Matthew, knew Him before he came to him, and forbade him, saying that he was not worthy. According to the other Gospel of John he did not know Him until after the baptism, and had therefore no occasion to forbid Him, so that according to Christianity you must believe in Jesus and believe the whole of His history, and believe that John did know and did not know Jesus at one and the same time. If you won't believe it you must reject one or the other, and I want to know on what principle you will reject either. In Colossians (i. 15) we are told that Christ "is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature." In John (i. 18), it is stated that "no man hath seen God at any time and in Exodus (xxxiii. 20), it is said that "no man can see God and live." We are told that God is an invisible Spirit, and yet John, who was a man, saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove on the head of Jesus. We are told of God's omnipresence, and yet at His baptism the heavens opened and God spake, "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased." I do not urge these as matters of contradiction, I only want to know whether you are entitled to believe that an invisible God was seen, and how an omnipresent God was in one place, and not in the other. The next feature of **Christianity** is the baptism of Jesus. Jesus was led by the Spirit into the wilderness, and He fasted there forty days and forty nights. This account **is** given by the whole of the Evangelists, except one, and that one is John. Jesus was immediately led into the wilderness after His baptism. He fasted for forty days and forty nights, yet on the third of the forty days Jesus was at a wedding feast in Cana, which does not appear to be in the wilderness at all. There **is** no statement that He did participate in the good things, but I want it explaining how Jesus could be in the wilderness with no one but the devil, and yet that He was taking part in the marriage festivities at Cana. I will take you now to what Jesus himself has given the full text of. In Matt.

xii. 39 and 40—"But he answered and said unto them, an evil and adulterous nation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given to it but the sign of the prophet Jonas. For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, so shall the son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." By the Christian creed you must believe the story of Jonah as well as that of Jesus. Is that portion of the Old Testament re-enacted or no? You must believe that Jonah was charged with a message from the Lord, which he did not like to deliver because he believed that the Lord was changeable. You must know that Jonah wanted to fly from the presence of the omnipresent God, and that the Lord caused a storm to arise. You must believe that in consequence of that storm the ship in which Jonah was was in danger. You must believe that Jonah was flung into the sea, and that the Lord prepared a big fish to swallow him. You must believe that Jonah lived in the belly of the whale three days and three nights—singing psalms and hymns or something of that kind, and that at last Jonah was vomited on dry land. You must believe, in fact, that the story of Jesus is just as true as that of Jonah. But what is the text? As Jonah was three days and nights in the belly of a whale, so the Son of Man shall be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. Jesus was buried, and, according to the apostle, it was sometime on Friday evening when Joseph of Arimathea begged the body of Jesus. We are further told that Joseph wrapped the body in a clean linen cloth before he interred it, so that it would probably be late on Friday night before he had interred it. We are also told that "in the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week," came women to the sepulchre, and an angel of the Lord, who was at the grave, informed them that Jesus had risen. Now the Jewish Sabbath is well known to be on the Saturday, and the first day of the week would be the Christian Sunday, so that I want to know how any one—perhaps my friend can inform me—how we can make it three days and three nights from Friday night to late on Saturday night. I don't say that it is contradictory, but I want to know if the Christian is to believe it. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." The theory of the atonement will form the subject of my next attack, but at present I have put to you that the principle doctrine of Christianity is faith; and I have shown what faith is required. I have exhausted now my time, and I ask our friend, in addressing you, not to miss the points to which I have again called his attention, and which he forgot last night.

Mr. KING: —There has been a certain stale trick played upon us to-night, and it has been played on all discussions upon this question, or nearly so, that I have heard or read. It is that of throwing in, in the briefest form possible, by far more alleged discrepancies or objections than can be touched upon in double the time allowed to the speaker. (Hear, hear, and applause). Not only so, but instead of reading each passage and demonstrating the alleged contradiction, merely affirming it, and leaving the other side to open the book, and show that there is no apparent contradiction, or else that it is only apparent. I have carefully looked over certain debates and certain speeches (some of them delivered by my opponent), and I find this kind of thing thrown in frequently, page after page, at the rate of one alleged contradiction to two and a half lines throughout. Now what is the result of this? What is intended by it? Why this is

intended—the intention is that even granting that all the points could be answered without difficulty (granting that argumentatively), then an opponent would not have time to notice one half of them, however closely he might devote himself to the work. Now we are in this position to-night, and, therefore, as my opponent is aware of the impossibility of taking up one half of the topics he has crowded in he is prepared to be down upon me in a moment, and, in regard to whatever I leave from sheer want of time, to say—“Oh, you see, he couldn't touch that.” That is the standing trick in his line of business. (Laughter and cheers). Now allow me to reply to some of the statements made at the beginning of this debate. I have not said, as he put it, that Christians have no more to do with the Old Testament than the Jews had to do with the New. That is Mr. Bradlaugh's—mine is quite a different statement. I intimated that the Old Testament Economy is only of force so far as re-enacted. I spoke of the Jewish law, I did not speak of re-enacting the Old Testament. I spoke of the law—the law given to the Jews—the ordinances and requirements given to them as their national polity. I insisted that those ordinances and statutes are not binding—not one of them—upon us—that is upon Christians. That is to say, not unless re-enacted, and then they are binding, not by the force of the old law, but by the fact that they are given to us in the institution under which we live. That, then, is a very different statement. (Hear, hear). Then you were told that I had abandoned the common version of the Bible, last night. I am not aware of doing so, and I am not aware that in any particular I did so. I have most certainly argued for nothing that is not contained in that version. I made no quotation from any other version. I merely made use of a Greek term instead of an English one, but it did not affect the argument before us I did not abandon the meaning commonly attached to the common English word. The authorized version, therefore, was not abandoned by me last night, nor will it be to-night. (Hear, hear, and applause). If in anything I have to say I should have occasion to dissent from the common version, I shall be ready to give my reason for doing so, and it will then be my opponent's opportunity to advance whatever objections he may choose, to the version or text I may quote. Next in reply to citations made by Mr. Bradlaugh, from works written by clergymen. I am not going to call the clergy of the Church of England Secularists; but my opponent, when in Newcastle, told the people that there were even infidels on the bench of bishops. (Laughter). And certainly if you take some of the books written by clergymen, it would seem that there are infidels among the clergy, who are not bishops, but who, for anything I know, may be passive members of the National Secular Society, for Mr. Holyoake intimates that there are Secularists who keep up a connection with the church for personal gain and for the advantage of their relations, and I suppose that if such men hire pews they would not object to fill pulpits. (Hear, hear). So that the authority of these statements is of very little importance. What if certain clerical passive Secularists in the Establishment give us views in accordance with those of my opponent? (Applause). Now we come to faith. Faith is the next item which stands upon my paper. I quite agree with the statement made by ray opponent last night, and repeated to-night—that faith is a most essential element in Christianity. I have not the slightest objection to use the definite article—the most essential element—and will now give this matter some little attention. I think my opponent was a little too hard upon me last night; so severe that I did not know whether I shouldn't

feel almost afraid to come here to-night. (Laughter). But be that as it may, he has played off a trick which I do not think a desirable one. I have had it put upon me before, and I have seen it played upon others. It is very clever, and exceedingly taking. Now men tolerably conversant with the New Testament, called upon to answer a statement, suddenly presented, are liable to make some trifling mistake in the hurry of debate. But supposing I did make a slight mistake last night, our courteous friend, with his usual candour, puts it in this form—"Either you knew what you said was not true or you didn't." Well, that is very logical. "If you knew it was not true, you are not exactly honest, and if you did not know it you pretend to know, and assume that which you do not know." How very taking! Very clever! And it answers the purpose; and no doubt he has put down in this way many a poor simpleton who has got up for ten minutes at the close of his lectures. (Hear, hear and laughter.) But what if it should turn out that my statement is true? Well, then, I must just turn the language back on my opponent. I do not take the liberty to say that he is either a knave or a fool, and I shall not address him in the way in which he alludes to me. My statement in regard to faith I will repeat. "Justification by faith alone is only named to be refuted." But Mr. Bradlaugh refers us to certain passages on justification in which faith only is mentioned. Now, the phrase "faith alone" is not found in any one of them. It occurs only once in the New Testament and, therefore, in spite of all his sharpness the error lies on the other side of the table. (Applause.) Now, there are some things, in order to grasp this great subject, which I must look at. I am not going to confine myself altogether to questions which Mr. Bradlaugh may choose to put. He has apparently lost his way in this debate. He treats the subject as if it were my business to tell you what Christianity is and his business to dispute what I say. It will be my business to give evidence as to what Christianity is and to defend my statements; but it is as much Mr. Bradlaugh's business to do the same thing. We are in the position of two men sent by a Company into a mine to bring up minerals, in order that the Company may determine what the minerals are worth. (Hear, hear.) He should have said what he thought of my presentation of Christianity, and then have presented his own views. I do not know why he did not do that, unless he wanted the time to crowd in questions so that I might have no time to answer his queries, nor even an opportunity to look at them. But in reference to this matter of faith. If my opponent's interpretation of the scriptural teaching of faith in regard to salvation be correct all I have to say is, that I have no longer a wish to be a Christian; and, therefore, on that point, my opponent and myself can join issue. If he could prove that, his interpretation is the right one, then the doctrine would be so repugnant to my feelings that I would willingly discard Christianity. What is his argument? He would have us to believe that all the human race are damned on account of Adam's sin. He had something to say about my heterodoxy on that point, but neither my heterodoxy nor my orthodoxy have anything to do with the question at issue. I am here to defend Christianity, and in the outset I told you that Christ and His apostles taught it in its entirety, and that is comprehensive enough. We are not discussing as to what Mr. King or any other body may say Christianity is. The subject for discussion is, "What is Christianity?" and not what does Mr. King think it is. (Hear, hear.) My opponent seems to be particularly attached to the Thirty-nine Articles. He longs, after the

clergy, so that one might conclude that he would even like to be kicked by a bishop. (Laughter.) But I do not see what we have to do with the clergy or their churches, not even with the church to which I myself belong, in this debate. What I contend is this—that the most popular denominations do not preach certain things which my opponent calls orthodox Christianity. They do not preach that all non-believers will be eternally damned for Adam's sin, and they do not preach that all who do not believe will be damned at all. Why so? They preach infant salvation, which is salvation where there is no faith. They limit salvation, under certain circumstances, to those who believe; but where the Gospel is not known, and where there is not ability to believe they do not preach—do not assign condemnation. Now my opponent is very fond of putting it, that if you only assent to certain dogmas of Christianity you may be as wicked as Nero; that if you have only faith you will be saved. That doctrine is not held by any popular denomination, nor is it preached from any pulpit in the land, that I know of. (Hear, hear) I am sure that my friend on my right (Rev. Dr. Scott) is in the habit of preaching to many people who believe the gospel facts—who hold them as true—who never doubted them—who were taught by their parents—and who have never yet allowed themselves, to lie under their influence so as to become subject to their power, and who therefore are not in possession of that repentance which eventuates reformation of life. Now, neither the worthy Doctor in the chair, nor any of the ministers upon my side of the platform, nor any church in the land, can be cited as holding that such mere belief—which is faith alone—ever did or ever can save any one. Dr. Scott is continually preaching to such persons that their belief will only condemn them, and that they must be born again. Looking then to the apostolic testimony, we are brought to those verses in the Epistle to the Romans, which my opponent says contain the very thing which I said was not named in the Book, except in one paragraph, and there condemned. Well, now, my opponent appears very warm, or almost offended, because last night I made use of the term “scrap-doctor. ” I did not then apply the phrase to him. I simply used it in reference to a faulty mode of interpretation; but after hearing him to-night—quoting texts without regard to the context—I must say he is the most consummate scrap-doctor I have ever heard or read, and I therefore now give him his diploma, to which he is quite welcome. (Laughter and applause.) In citing from Romans, my opponent altogether lost sight of the fact that the apostle Paul was engaged in proving—not anything about an abstract, justification, irrespective of any act arising out of faith—but was engaged improving that under the Christian dispensation God had a system of justification, which is by faith, irrespective of the works of the Jewish law: The Apostle says (Rom. iii. 20)—“Therefore by the deeds of the law (Jewish law) ”there shall no flesh be justified in his sight, for by the law is the knowledge of sin. ” In the 28th verse, carrying on the argument still further, he says—“Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. ” I might cite circumcision, the sacrifices of animals, and numerous other requirements made binding by the law, some of which certain converts from the Jews were for making obligatory upon the Christians, but none of which have any place in the scheme of justification which God instituted for the Christian dispensation. So far, then, as the deeds of that old, and now abandoned, law are concerned, justification and reception into God's family are quite irrespective of the whole of them. So that the Gentile, if he were

circumcised, would profit nothing thereby. Therefore justification by faith in Christ is irrespective of the works of the law. We pass now from this passage to a somewhat similar illustration in the Epistle of James. Now, Mr. Bradlaugh said that Mr. King would doubtless present passages which contradict the passage he quoted, and he added that he did not contend that the New Testament is in harmony. But I contend that on this point the New Testament is in perfect, harmony. I take the entire testimony in reference to the subject. When we have the whole before us, and see what the whole means, there is no contradiction, but, on the contrary, the whole is harmony. Therefore, mine is the true method of interpretation. But this kind of interpretation is a business which my opponent is a child at, which he doesn't practise, and knows nothing about. In the Epistle of James we read—"What doth it profit though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him?"

* * * * * "Even so faith, if it hath not works is dead being *alone*"

That is the only passage in the whole book which names faith alone. And the context says: "Yea, a man may say, thou hast faith and I have works; show me thy faith without, thy works, I will show thee my faith by my works." Is there contradiction between Paul and James? Not necessarily—not real. Their two statements are reconciled and brought into perfect harmony. Illustrating faith, as a principle of action, the apostle adds—"Was not Abraham justified by works when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar? Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect. Ye see, then, how that, by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Now there is the great truth coming out with regard to the matter of faith. The faith meant is not that of mere assent to dogma, but, as the apostle expresses it—"that which works by love and purifies the heart"—that which is a principle of action—which produces repentance and eventuates in reformation of life. And the mere assent to certain doctrines, which does not affect the heart and which produces no repentance, is not the faith which justifies—is not the faith which saves. Don't, if you please, understand that I am teaching that justification is partly by faith and partly by works, I am not. To be justified by works the works must be absolutely perfect. Justification by faith comes in where the works are not thus absolutely perfect and the faith is counted for righteousness, "—but that faith is only counted when it is there, as I have said, a principle of action, producing good fruit—as when James refers to the perfecting of Abraham's faith by Works". We may here turn to 1 Cor., xiii. —"Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." There is nothing here which is contradictory of the words of the same writer in the Epistle to the Romans, and if you put the two together you have them in complete harmony with all the teaching of Christ and His apostles upon this great subject. Now, my opponent, I dare say, will tell you that I have not answered his questions; but if I had alluded to others I must have passed over his demand to have this subject attended to, and he would have then pointed out the omission as proof that I could not have grappled with the subject. So, whatever I deal with I must be wrong, because at the same time I do not attend to something else. (Laughter and applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —What I shall tell you is that I have asked four times, three times last night and once to-night, and our friend has not yet told you whether he believes that the doctrine of eternal torment is part and parcel of the doctrines of Christianity. If I am to discuss Christianity I must know whether he holds that. He has not yet told us what the “particular document” is. I did not ask him to quote from I Cor., xiii., but to quote the passage that faith without love is worthless. He says he did not tell us last night that the Old Testament was to us what the New Testament was to the Jews. Will he tell us how much of the Christianity of the Old Testament he does recognise and how much he does not? Our friend says I have been guilty of a stale trick, but surely a great man like Mr. King, a man so able in dealing with the subject, ought to be prepared to answer these questions. With regard to crowding in too many points, he was good enough to tell you that it was not my duty to press my objections but to agree or disagree with the views he expounded, and that was to last all through the debate? If this debate is ever published, however, it will show the points I have contradicted. I don’t know whether it is worth going into, but Mr. King seems to have been guilty of a trick. Our friend said several times last night, that justification by faith alone was only named to be repudiated. Well, I read the texts he gave, and they did not hear this out, and then it was said that the word “alone” only occurred once? and there it was repudiated. But faith was mentioned alone, contradistinguished from anything else. We are told in distinct and express terms that it is by faith, and not by works, that men are justified, and if our friend meant that as an argument which reasonable men, reading the debate are to pay attention to, I can only regard it as a trick which has not the merit of subtlety. Then he says that the Church of England does not teach this doctrine of justification by faith. Curiously enough, one of the most striking Articles of the Church says: —“It is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit, and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God’s wrath and damnation.” Now you could not have a more clear and explicit declaration of doctrine on the part of the Church of England at any rate. Then he quoted clergymen, and he says that perhaps some of them are Secularists. Well, perhaps they are, for the more sensible they were, the more heterodox they got. He puts it that possibly even some of the bishops are Secularists. It is very likely, for as they become more sensible, they become more infidel, and the only tiling is that they have not the honesty to acknowledge it. Our friend said that I should like to be kicked by a bishop. Would he give evidence of any instance where I have been, and have expressed my Eking for it; or if it was a mere vulgar impertinence I’ll beg him not to repeat it during this debate. My opponent told you of an old trick played upon himself. He was in the gallery at the Oddfellow’s Hall, at Birmingham some years ago, when I put a question to him, and challenged him to prove that Christ was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth; and he has never answered it till now, so that he ought to have been prepared with an answer long ago. Well, there is little else in his speech. He says that the Epistle of James is not a contradiction to Romans and Galatians. But what does James teach? And by the bye my opponent did not give you chapter and verse—I presume he meant James ii. 26—but I give you chapter and verse, and I at least expect my opponent to take the same course. He says there is no contradiction, but

let us see whether there is or not. Take in the first place Gal. ii. 16, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified." Well, then, as against that you read "Even so, faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone;" and I ask von, if faith without works is dead, whether it is not a precise contradiction to the text which says that faith saves without regard to works. What I read from Romans is still more striking, and what does my opponent say now? He says, that faith saves which produces repentance and eventuates in improvement in life. Now the faith of David is praised in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and I will ask Mr. King where the faith of David is stated to have produced repentance and eventuated in improvement in life. I will ask whether he did not die as confirmed a rascal and as blood-thirsty a man as he had lived. The faith of Jacob is praised, and where is he said to have repented of lying, cheating, trickery and knavery? When was improvement in his life produced by that faith? Then I am told it is a trick to crowd so many things together. Is it my fault that I put more into one speech than can be answered in another? If he knew that, it was known before the debate was begun, and if it was one of the things he could not prepare for in the debate he ought not to have sought it. I knew that he could not answer them, and I shall not trouble to comment on things unless my opponent commits himself to something extremely foolish or something extremely unwise. Then he talks about scrap doctoring, but is there any case in which he quotes the whole of a chapter or of a context? Not one. The texts he has taken by scraps to suit his purpose. I am indebted to him for the diploma he gives me, and it shall not be my fault if I do not give him back before this debate is over more than I receive. Well, then he urged the atonement theory as a binding portion of Christianity—that, as put in, 1 Cor., xv. 21, and Rom. v. 12 and 14, by the sin of one man (Adam) sin and death came into the world, so by one man (Jesus) there shall be redemption and atonement for that sin; and I say that that involves a belief in the story of Adam's fall, as recorded in the Book of Genesis, and that belief you are told to practice in order to be saved. The Christian belief involves the same belief in the history of Adam and his fall as in any other portion of the Gospel. You must believe that God made Adam and, on the same day or about the same time, Eve; that he put them into a garden and forbade them to eat of the fruit of one tree, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, saying that "the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die;" that God made the tree pleasant to the eyes and good for food, —a tree to be desired to make one wise; that He made a serpent, more subtle than all the beasts of the field, who tempted the woman who gave the fruit to the man who ate of it; and that for that disobedience the man was punished by God, and death and sin were brought into the world. Is that Christianity? Are you to believe that because Adam took of the fruit of the forbidden tree on the temptation of a woman who was tempted by the serpent which God had made—are you to believe that because of that, death and sin came into the world, from which man was only to be saved long afterwards by the coming of Jesus? Is that Christianity? It appears to me to be so, and if it is then I urge to you that Christianity represents that God made the Garden of Eden as a sort of damnation trap for the human kind, baited by the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, which he knew the man could not help partaking of, and that the moment of his taking it God cursed Adam and the whole human race yet to be bom for a sin they had

no share in whatever. But is it true, as appears from Rom. v. 17, 21, that until Jesus all were damned? Is it true, more than this, that we are to believe in Jesus as the atoning Redeemer, when we find that Jesus did not believe in himself, for when on the cross he cried out in the agony of human pain "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Now is it part of Christianity to believe that Christ was forsaken, or that he was mistaken, or that he was not mistaken at all, but that in the pain and despair of the moment that that cry came from Him. I want to know if I am representing the belief of Christians correctly. Unless I be contradicted on this and matters which were in my earlier speech I shall leave them as arguments as to the legitimate effects of Christianity, which is set down for another night. I always look for nothing short of fair, honest, manly adherence to the truth, and that I do not conceive our friend treated us with in his effort to escape from the dilemma he had got into as to faith alone being only mentioned once to be repudiated. If you have a statement of Charles Bradlaugh being in a room, and don't speak of his being by himself, you presume it until you have something to make it more distinct. What does our friend say? That you are to judge the Bible as you would any other book. Therefore, we conclude, as stated in Rom. iii. 10, that men are to be justified by faith alone without the deeds of the law. (Applause).

Mr. KING:—I heard a man to-day speak of Mr. Bradlaugh as in a certain place, and he said nothing at all of any other persons being present, and I did not infer that Mr. Bradlaugh was there alone, and I should have been a simpleton if I had. I find that in the New Testament salvation is attributed to various causes, and I find those causes named, first one and then other, not with the word "alone," but without the mention of any other of them, and yet the absence of the other is not implied. For instance, we read that men are saved by faith, we read they are saved by hope, without the mention of anything else; also by the blood of Christ, without naming faith or anything else—by baptism, without mentioning anything else, &c. Now, does any man conclude when he reads—"Baptism doth now save us," that men were to be saved without faith—without repentance? No one would say, or could say, that such would be a fan conclusion. There are a number of items to be taken into account, and the book sometimes specifies one and sometimes the other. You don't run over the whole in each instance, but you must clearly understand that reference to the one implies the existence of the other in every instance where the Divine system is referred to. James, it was alleged, contradicted Paul; but what do we find in the Epistle to the Hebrews? Our friend has given no reply to my comments on the passages from Galatians and Romans. The apostle is speaking of justification by the deeds of the law, and his argument is, that justification is without the deeds of the Mosaic law. He is not speaking on any other subject, and it is an abuse of the case to bring in any other matter. In Heb. xi. 4, we read—"By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it he, being dead, yet speaketh," and so on. Now he re faith does something—faith is that by which he offers a more excellent sacrifice. This faith is a principle of action and, as James puts it, faith is made perfect by action, consequent upon and growing out of it. Further down we read—"By faith Noah, being warned of God of things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving

of his house; by the which he condemned the world and became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. " He built his ark by faith; but was it by faith alone? Had he sat down with folded arms his ark would not have been built; but faith, active, nerves the arm and heart for the work they have to accomplish, and through its mighty power we do that which in all probability we could not otherwise accomplish. (Cheers.) The Epistle says again—"By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went. " Here, then, Abraham is doing something—sacrificing something—and in so doing his faith was perfected by its corresponding action. Further, at the 17th verse, we find—"By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac, and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son; " and James says that by that offering his faith was perfected. Here, then, you have the matter settled. We will just notice in the next place the extraordinary assertion of Mr. Bradlaugh in answer to his own question as to what makes up the Christian faith. Now, all the alleged contradictions which he has put before you are, so far as regards this particular part of the question, so much time wasted. The Saviour told His disciples to preach the gospel to every creature: that he that believed their preaching would be saved, and He required them to wait until endowed with power from on high. As recorded in Acts ii., there came the endowment with power—the promised baptism of the Holy Spirit—and then the apostles commenced to preach. What did they preach? What did they tell the people, that they must believe to be saved? That they must believe the four gospels, of which not one was written? All the Book of Revelation? Not a line of which was penned. They told them nothing of the sort. Did they tell them that they must believe all they found in the New Testament? Nothing of the sort—it was not written. When they were preaching to the Gentiles did they require them to study and understand the contents of the Book before then—confession of faith was accepted, on which confession they were enrolled in the Church of Christ? Why, the supposition is perfect nonsense. The very nature of the case shows that it could not be so. The Book of the Acts of the Apostles is filled with accounts of conversions showing you Christianity as preached by the apostles, and that this absurd measure or extent of belief was not required in any instance, and could not have been required. Further than that, we have evidence as to what was required. We shall find it by turning to Rom. x., where the matter of faith is introduced, and where we read—"That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. " That was the great Cardinal proposition to be preached to sinners—all that was presented for their belief—and when that was so believed as to eventuate in that repentance which secures a reformed life, then was there that faith which is counted for righteousness and by which they were justified. In 1 Cor. xv., Paul (who had planted the church in Corinth) writes as follows:—"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures. " Here you have the facts just mentioned embodied in the statement that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God. This is the gospel—not the whole of the Bible. I am not now saying that the Bible may be dispensed with, that the Bible

is to be rejected. I am only now stating what must be believed in order to reception into the Church of Christ and to obtain that pardon and adoption which constitute the salvation which appertains to the kingdom and Church of Christ, established by Him on the earth. Here you have the effects of what was done in the preaching of the gospel, and a definite statement of what was required. Take an illustrative fact from apostolic history. You have the conversion of the eunuch by Philip, and who, when he came in sight of certain water, asked why he might not be baptized. The answer is recorded in Acts xiii., "And Philip said, if thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." The eunuch was not sent away until he was baptized, which was done immediately, and he went on his way rejoicing, recognised from that moment as one of the brotherhood of Christ. This, then, is the New Testament answer to Mr. Bradlaugh's mistake as to what a man must believe in order to be saved. The Church of England, in her Articles, does not declare that all persons are to be damned who cannot believe, as my opponent is in the habit of putting it. His statement of it amounts to this, damnation is resting on every member of the human family because of Adam's transgression, and only those who believe all the Bible says about Christ can be saved; and, therefore, all who do not and cannot believe are left eternally damned. I say that there is not a popular church that teaches that doctrine. The Church of England does not teach it, as applying under all circumstances to all people, nor does any other church. My opponent asks whether it is a fault on his part that he puts too many questions. It was a very innocent inquiry that—exceedingly innocent. I answer, yes it is a fault, and a great fault too. He knows very well that it takes far longer to answer a question than to ask it, generally. (Hear, hear.) I can put ten inquiries to you and ask for explanations which you are perfectly able to give, and while it takes me two minutes to put each question, it will occupy you ten minutes in every instance to give the information required. Mr. Bradlaugh forgets this, and goes on piling question upon question without giving a chance of reply to them all, and for the purpose of rendering such reply impossible. I say that if a man thus crowd in his questions and then say you have not answered them, and you cannot answer them, he is playing the part of a trickster, and this matter shall be fully exposed. We shall teach them better methods of conducting controversy, and see that this kind of thing in discussions shall come to a close. (Applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —What does this principle in debate mean? Does it mean that I am to measure out beforehand, such things that I know my opponent can answer? If it means that, it is the veriest nonsense and trash. If my opponent does not think nine nights sufficient for the purposes of the debate, for the consideration of questions that must necessarily arise, why did he enter into the debate at all? Am I then to be told that I am utterly incorrect in saying, that damnation is taught by the Church of England as resting on all mankind in consequence of Adam's sin, unless they come to Jesus. Mr. King says that's wrong. I say 'tis right. And I say it on the strength of the Article in the Church of England Prayer Book: —"They also are to be had accursed, that presume to say that every man shall be saved by the Law or sect which he professeth. So that he be diligent to frame his life according to that Law, and the light of nature, for Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of -Jesus

Christ, whereby men must be saved. " I do not know what is the use of discussing matters of this kind, unless some sort of attention is paid to the argument. How did he answer the question as to "faith alone" being only named to be refuted or repudiated? He did not give a fair or clear construction of the passage. On the contrary he said something about his having heard some one speak about Mr. Bradlaugh being in a certain place, and it was not to be presumed that I was there "alone. " But that was not a fair representation of the argument I gave him. Even now he has not answered my question, whether he believes in eternal torment being part and parcel of Christianity. (Laughter). He has not told us, and I will know before I am done with the debate. (Applause). Nor has he told us how much of the Old Testament he rejects, and how much he accepts, and what part is to be our guide. Nor has he said one word about the "particular document, " or that he had made a blunder in referring to it. He has made an extraordinary statement however. He read the Scriptural assertion "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned. " And he then told us that Christ told His disciples to tarry. I will take my opponent to an authority on the matter, and see if he is correct. Now neither Mark or Luke say anything about tarrying. In John xxi, 22, we read. "Jesus saith unto him (Peter), If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee. Follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren, that that disciple should not die: yet Jesus said not unto them, He shall not die, but if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? " Our friend audaciously characterized me a scrap doctor, but he seems to practice the trick to a remarkable extent himself. But stranger yet. What are we to believe? Not the Gospels? Not the Epistles? Then I want to know what Christians are to believe. Oh, he says "turn to 1 Cor., xv., and there you find the matter made clear to you. " And to this chapter I turn, I was certainly much astonished that a man who should have known better should leave right off in the middle of a sentence. This is what you are required to believe. "Moreover, brethren I declare unto you the Gospel, which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand: By which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain. For I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures. And that he was seen of Cephas, then one of the twelve: And that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep. " Now I want to know what Scriptures you are to believe in? I want to know what Scriptures Paul referred to, and where they are. What persons are required to believe in them, and what persons are not required to believe in them? How are we to learn about Jesus Christ at all without the Gospels and the Epistles? First our friend pitches overboard the Old Testament, then takes back part of it, then he follows up by hearing over the Gospels. But he says that it is a stale trick of a clever infidel to put more questions to him than he can answer in nine nights. Why if he believes in the New Testament he should have been prepared for the stale tricks. But I have to complain still much more. Mr. King told you of justification by faith alone, that the declaration that man was not justified by works applied to the deeds of the law, and not to ordinary works. Why if he had read Rom. iv. 4-5, he would have found a different doctrine. "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt. But to him that worketh not, but believeth in him

that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. ” My opponent not only did not trouble himself to answer the points I brought forward, but conveniently forgets them, and proceeds to reply to matters I did not deal with. Let us look at the position we are now in. We are referred to Rom. x. 9, as putting the matter clear to you, and permit me to ask, why if one portion of the Book is directly opposed to another it is any sort of evidence in its favour? For at the most, giving the greatest scope to what my opponent puts, it will only come to that. Permit me to ask him in regard to the passage in Rom. x. 9, “That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved; ” what belief he has in that passage. I would like him to state when he rises again, if he believes that Christ was three days and three nights in the heart of the earth, and that He was raised from the dead by God, and to make apparent to me the text upon which his faith, in that doctrine, is founded. But he will in all likelihood characterize it as a “stale trick, ” but how for one moment, could I practise such tricks before an intelligent audience. What becomes of the professedly practised debater—the man of learning—the man who attempted to confute Mr. Holyoake—the challenger of this debate—making the condition, that I am to come here day by day without bread and cheese, except so far as I proude out of my own pocket, if he is not prepared with at least some semblance of an argument. I insist that Mr. King, when he rises, state deliberately the Scriptures he refers to—what Scriptures Christians are required to believe, and whether they are to believe or disbelieve in the Epistles. If not, why not? Let us have no shuffling about—no playing at shuttle-cock and battle-dore from the Old Testament to the New—now repudiating, and now taking up. (Applause). Let him substantiate his argument after a legitimate fashion. What was his argument on faith? I take Abraham. He instanced Abraham in offering up his son Isaac through faith. Now, let us see what is Abraham’s faith. God tempted Abraham to offer up his son Isaac for a burnt offering. And when they were journeying to the place chosen by God for the sacrifice, Isaac, who seemed to be quite ignorant that he was set down to be murdered, asked his father “Where is the lamb for a burnt offering? And Abraham said, My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering; so they went both of them together. ” If Abraham knew that God would proude a lamb the whole thing is a sham, and if God would not provide a lamb, Abraham induced his sou to go out and be killed. (Applause). There is the illustration Mr. King himself gave. I will not complain further, not having time, as to his shifting from one argument to another, and from one text to another, but leave the printed debate to speak for itself. But when Secularists come to read it they will perceive that notwithstanding my opponent was repeatedly asked, he declined to give his views on eternal torments—that he did not talk of a “particular document, ” although asked again and again—that he quoted Greek in show of learning—that he shuffled from the Old Testament to the New, backwards and forwards taking such portions as suited himself—that he was the commonest trickster in debate, making charges against a man which he can’t substantiate, and exhibiting some little indignation and warmth when he is found - wandering away from the truth in this discussion. He has not informed me whether L represented the atonement theory correctly, or whether those who believe in Jesus will be saved, or whether those who believe in the Bible will be saved. If so, is there any authority for that in the Book. Upon what Scriptures do Christians take their stand for salvation, and how is it that there are 60 many

contradictions. Then I put it further—and more distinctly—are Christians required to believe that God is Christ? What is Christ? Does it mean God or man? If God, why did He deem Himself forsaken by Himself. Does it mean man? If man, was he liable to error? Was it part God, and part man? If part God, and part man, was it possible for Him to deem Himself part forsaken? My friend will doubtless pretend that I put these questions in the way of a trick: you are bound to answer, and if you are not capable for such infidel tricks you ought never to have put down the gauntlet for the infidel to take up. (Applause).

Mr. KING: —The question has been put, “What Scriptures did Paul refer to?” Unquestionably to the Jewish Scriptures. (Hear, hear). “Does Mr. King believe that Christ was three days and three nights in the bowels of the earth?” Yes, he does, but he does; not believe Mr. Bradlaugh’s assertion, that he went into the grave on Friday night. He repeats what he affirmed in Birmingham some years ago. Then I rose to ask for evidence that Jesus went into the grave on the Friday night. I listened to my opponent’s reply then, and called for proofs, but I was not allowed to make any comment thereupon. He next tells us, that surely I have time enough in nine nights to answer all the questions and alleged discrepancies he crowds into this one subject allotted to to-night and last night. I am not at liberty to refer to them on subsequent nights, when other subjects are to be discussed. This subject, and his questions and assumed contradictions, are confined to last evening and to this—to-morrow night we shall have an entirely different subject and, therefore, he is simply deluding the audience by his cry about nine nights for answering the questions of these two nights. Then we are asked, whether we are to believe the Gospels as Christianity? What are we to believe as Christianity? He tells you, that Mr. King says we should believe, as Christianity, only the passages he had quoted with regard to Christ. I have told you nothing of the sort. I have not been talking to you upon what we believe as Christianity, but upon what those who are not Christians are required to believe in order to be saved, in order to obtain pardon, and in order to introduction into the Church and Family of God. The Saviour commissioned His apostles, and what did He tell them to do? To go and teach (or disciple) all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Now in executing that commission, they made disciples, and taught them, and they learned the things taught; and abided therein as Christ’s disciples and members of Christ’s Church. What had the apostles to do subsequently? To teach them all things that Christ had commanded. This after teaching them was not to make them Christians, but more fully to instil them in the things of Christ and of God; and the simple question before us, is not what we are to believe as Christians, but what are the things laid down as absolutely necessary to believe to obtain pardon and adoption, which in the commission given to the apostles when told by Christ to go forth and proclaim the Gospel, is called salvation. We have had the doctrine of the atonement pressed upon our attention, and also that of future punishment. I have only time briefly to say a word upon one of these, and whichever I take, my opponent will come down with a complaint that I did not take the other. But as he has most frequently called for information as to future punishment we can very fairly present a few thoughts on that topic. He, however, needed not to have wasted his time, and yours, in reiterated demands for my views. His duty was to tell you what is the New Testament teaching upon future punishment, and it

would then have been my duty to deny his statement or admit it. It is as much his business as it is mine to unfold the thing. The reiterated demand for my opinion on the nature of future punishment then is uncalled for and changes the question under discussion; which is not "What is Mr. King's belief in reference to eternal burning?" but "*What is Christianity?*" But I believe all that Christ and His apostles say upon the subject, and if I did not so believe, I should (having defined Christianity to be that *whole* doctrine taught by Christ and His apostles) be bound, in this discussion, to accept all they teach thereupon. Of course I am not bound to take every text as a literal statement of the case—some texts are figurative, and others are not. Of course if it suit my opponent to insist that such verses as Mark ix. 44, are to be taken in their strict literality and that, consequently, human bodies are to burn for ever in literal fire without being consumed, and that literal worms are to feed for ever upon those burning carcasses without eating them up, and without being themselves burned up and destroyed, he talks sheer nonsense. If he say that the text means not that the bodies will burn for ever without being consumed, but that the *souls* will continue to be tormented by literal fire after their bodies are burned to ashes; and that literal worms will eat the spirit and not the flesh, then he only repeats the nonsense in another form. I demand that these texts be interpreted according to the obvious meaning of similar sayings in other parts of the Bible; as in Isaiah xxxiii. 10, where of a certain doomed country it is said, "That the land thereof shall become burning pitch. *It shall not be quenched, night nor day; the smoke thereof shall go up for ever.*" As also in Jude vii, where the writer describes the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah as "*set forth*" for an example, suffering vengeance of *eternal fire*. Not that the cities had continued burning for centuries, and until then, but that their destruction was complete, their restoration never to be effected, and the example of their punishment enduring. Precisely after this manner did Victor Hugo write, a few days back, when in appealing to the German people to stop the war and save Paris, he said, "Burn our edifices—these are only our bones: their smoke will assume shape and will rise even to heaven, and there it will be seen, for ever on the horizon of nations." Now did he mean to say that the houses of Paris are literally the bones of Frenchmen, and that if those bone-houses were burned by the Germans the literal smoke thereof would be visible through all eternity? What ridicule would you not cast upon the man who would seriously tell you that he so understood it? If then we can distinguish between the figurative and literal in the address of Hugo, why can we not discriminate in like manner when we deal with the words of Christ, which come to us from a time and country abounding in metaphor? Now it is well known that men of piety, merit, and mark in the leading orthodox denominations clearly see and avow the figurative in the texts under notice and, therefore, *teach* that the fire will burn out and the bodies be consumed, in agreement with various Old and New Testament allusions to the punishment of the wicked as—They shall melt like wax—burn like tow—consume like thorns—burn up like *trees, chaff, tares, &c.* Now, I say, that men of repute and standing teaching thus are found, not as outcasts from orthodox society, but in the most popular denominations; and I say that this teaching is not of to-day, nor got up to dodge modern infidels, but that it comes to us from of old, and is found in the earliest writings of Christians of which we have any information. The persons who thus hold are divided in opinion on one point; some understand that with the destruction of the body the whole being will cease to exist, but others of them understand that the spirit, or soul, will continue to

suffer, *not from fire*, but such further punishment as God in justice and in mercy shall inflict. Now if either of these *final results* be admitted by my opponent, as the doctrine of Christ, I defend it as being just and good, and perfectly compatible with that admitted principle, which demands that that shall be done, and declares that best, which secures the greatest good to the greatest number. I am, therefore, prepared to defend eternal punishment, even eternal conscious punishment; but I am not prepared to admit that that punishment will consist of torment by eternal fire, that will for ever burn and always torment, yet never consume that which is committed to it. We may now have time for a remark or two on the other great matter—I mean the atonement; though it has scarcely come before us under that designation, the question having rather been concerning the death of Christ. The question has been put, “Does Christ’s death save all men from the punishment consequent on Adam’s sin, or does it save believers only?” First I reply—it supplies a result beneficial to all the descendants of Adam? God can forgive now that the death of Christ stands out—God can now forgive without affording room for the sinner to conclude that he may henceforth sin with impunity. I say that this one great difficulty in the way of bestowing pardon is met by the death of Christ:—namely, the difficulty of pardoning without encouraging crime. I have not the slightest doubt but that when a strong appeal was made to our Government to pardon certain Fenian Convicts, the Government would have been better pleased to pardon them than not, but they could not see how it could be done without encouraging further crime and repetition of the wrong-doing. Now in the death of Christ we see at least this difficulty met in the Divine dealing with the sinner. Therefore, I say, it supplies a result beneficial to all the descendants of Adam; more than that, the one universal result of Adam’s sin is met, and that for the whole of the human family. We read in Rom. v. 18: “Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.” Thus you find that one transgression brings the whole of the descendants of Adam into the grave, but you are also distinctly told, that in consequence of the righteousness of one there comes a justification unto life upon all those who enter the grave in consequence of Adam’s transgression. But that justification to life is from death and the grave merely, leaving each resurrected one to be judged in regard to his own deeds and condemned or blessed according to the deeds done in his own body, whether good or evil. Thus all who die by reason of connection with Adam and in consequence of his sin, are restored to life by reason of the work of Christ, and, therefore, we have a direct and universal benefit from the death of Christ. (Applause).

Mr. BRADLAUGH:—That is very pretty, and would have been prettier if you had given us the text that bears that construction.

Mr. KING:—Rom. v. 18.

Mr. BRADLAUGH:—Then it will not bear the construction put upon it. The passage says—“Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life;” and there is nothing said about it being limited from the grave merely, leaving them to be judged then by their deeds. I’ll follow you step by step now in the

speech which you have delivered. You say that when Cor. xv. 2, was quoted, Paid spoke of the Scriptures of the Jews. But in what Jewish Scripture is it recorded that Christ died for our sins? In what that He would rise again on the third day? Where is it—in which one of the Scriptures of the Old Testament? In what part, of the Jewish Scriptures is there any such record given? Why there is no such statement, that I am aware of, in any one of them. There is a statement in which what has happened to Christ is recorded, and that is all, and if it is not in the Jewish Scripture it must be in some other. He told you that he does believe that Jesus was three days and nights in the grave; that it is not true, as the Bible says, that he was buried on Friday night. Well, I'll refer you again to Mark xv. 42, —“And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the sabbath, Joseph of Arimathea, an honourable counsellor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus.” The Jewish Sabbath is, and always has been, Saturday, so that the day before the Sabbath was Friday, and it was on the eve of that day that Joseph craved the body of Jesus. And it must have been late in the evening, because after that Joseph “bought fine linen and spices.” It must have been far advanced in the Friday evening before Joseph of Arimathea buried the body of Jesus. And now, when did Jesus rise from the grave? Take Matt. xxviii. —“In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre” So that they came some time before the Saturday night was completely over, and it began to dawn on the Sunday morning; and when they came the body was out of the grave. The body was buried sometime on Friday, and was out sometime before the Saturday was complete; then I ask Mr King, where are his three days and nights? If they exist I should be glad to have them, and I will not trouble Mr. King to say it was not true that Jesus was buried late on Friday evening. Then comes the declaration as to future punishment, and he set up a most extraordinary doctrine. He said it was not for him but for Mr. Bradlaugh to tell what the gospel taught. I thought the question for discussion was “What is Christianity?” and that he opened it last night. I thought, he professed to explain the Christian teaching to you, and that at least I was to ascertain from him his supposition as to what Christianity was. I am quite willing, and I have not shown myself unwilling, to supplement this, and, in fact, Mr. King grumbled because I had given him too much, though now he complains that I have not told you enough. He says it wasn't his business. He says that if Mr. Bradlaugh meant that the verses in Mark ix. are literally true, then that is all stuff and no sense. Well, if that is his comment on the Bible, I will read the words to you which he did not—(Mark ix. 42, 48)—“And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea. And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire: Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” Mr. King says that it does not literally mean fire and burning. Well, let us test it. Take Matthew xiii., 41, 42—“The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall

gather out of His kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. ” Matthew xiii. 49, 50—“So shall it be at the end of the world: the angels shad come forth, and sever the wicked from among the just, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. ” Matthew xxv. 41—“Then shad He say also unto them on the left hand: Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels. ” Now, our friend, if I venture to tell you that that means everlasting fire, says it is stuff and nonsense; that is Mr. King’s commentary on the Scripture. Ha was willing to admit that it meant eternal punishment—conscious punishment, but where was his authority for twisting the text in that fashion? Is it what he called an “official, ” or is it an “un-official” saying. If it does not mean everlasting fire, if there is no such thing as a burning lake prepared by the devil and his angels, if there is to be no weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth, then all I can say is that the bulk of the teachings of the Church have been utterly wrong. (Hear, hear.) He says that there are men of mark in the Church who do not believe this. Yes, but there are infidels in the Church, and if Mr. Bradlaugh may not quote them, why should Mr. King? We have men of mark as good as your men of mark, but our men do not quibble about it, but go into the matter boldly and honestly, and don’t complain of injustice because they have more forced out of them than they like. And such are the men one respects. I urge that the authorized version does teach eternal torments by fire that shall never be quenched, —and mind you our friend has not taken you to any other version, —and in his last speech he did not think it right or proper to pretend that there was some other version that he believed in, for all he did was to quote from Victor Hugo, who is a poet, a novelist, and a romancist, and Mr. King says you must try the words of Jesus by the same canon of criticism that you would judge the writings of Victor Hugo, George Augustus Sala, Balzac, or any other author. I am content with that; I don’t want to try them by any other standard, but just as you would believe Balzac, just as you would Victor Hugo’s “Travellers of the Sea. ” I am quite content. But Mr. King has not told us how much of the Old Testament he agrees with, nor accounted for the “particular document, ” nor said like a man that he had made a mistake in referring to it; and I do object that he should have introduced this subject in the early stage of the debate, and left it to me to deal with in my last speech, reminding you that these things are not to be gone on with afterwards. He says that I have been guilty of a trick in telling you that he has nine nights of debate in which to cover his questions. Why, he himself fixed and allotted out the questions and how they were to be discussed. I havn’t meddled with it, and if he had not time sufficient, if he did not think he could answer in the time, then he should not have signed the conditions for two nights’ debate at all, but should have taken the time he thought sufficient to enable him to answer them properly. I believe that I never in the whole course of my debating met with anything more contemptible as a pretence for avoiding argument on the other side than that addressed to us now. Let us, however, see what is our position by the light thrown upon the question of atonement. He says one great want is met in the death of Christ—it secures salvation from the one universal result of Adam’s sin. But I thought it was just now contended that that one universal result was a condemnation on those who were not saved by Jesus. If there was one result then Jesus supplies the

want, but if not then he does not supply the want, for one universal result does not accrue. There our friend has answered himself. Although I read to him an Article from the Prayer Book of the Church of England, he has not had the manliness to admit that he was in the wrong in saying that the doctrine is not taught by any church. He cannot say that this is one of the points crowded in, because I'll make him a present of all the others, and ask him to deal with this, and say whether he does or does not represent the orthodox Christiana in this debate. As the two fights' debate on "What is Christianity?" are drawing to a close, let us look at the position we are in. In ad my speeches I have gone close to the Bible. The complaint is that I have gone too close, and that there was not time to answer. Our friend went to the *National Reformer*, and everywhere except to the subject in hand; and then he has the audacity to say that I ought to have told you more, when I gave him too much. Then he said that I had no right to press him, but that I ought to have given the information myself. If this is not the veriest jugglery of debate, I don't know what is. If he is heterodox and does not believe, how far can he defend religion? What would be said of me if I made pretence of defending that in which I had no faith and for which I had no respect? I ask you to deal with the question as I have put it. I have taken the whole question and put it before you. I have answered every position our friend has taken against me, and the only complaint is that I have introduced more things than he could answer. My time is up. I must close by telling you, that if you are to judge Christianity by the explanations our friend has given, you are more likely to be damned than saved. (Applause.)

Mr. KING: —Almost the last appeal was as to whether Mr. Bradlaugh had rightly construed an Article of the Church of England. I repeat he has not—I repeat that the Articles which he has read to us do not set forth what he affirmed. They do not declare that every person who does not believe in the Gospel of Jesus Christ will endure eternal damnation. They do intimate that ad the human family are under the wrath of God, and that there can only be deliverance through Christ, and that is what I have been telling you. I am, thus far, perfectly in harmony with those Articles. They do not teach that without faith in Christ, all the race of man must perish. The Church of England does not teach infant damnation, which it must teach if Mr. Bradlaugh's interpretation of the Articles is correct. The Church of England does not teach that every one of Adam's family dying before they are able to know Christ shall go to eternal perdition. It is not the doctrine either of the Articles or of the preachers. Then Mr. Bradlaugh says that I have intimated, that if he said that the language of the Saviour means literal or everlasting fire it is ad stuff and nonsense. I said nothing of the sort. But he makes a great many erroneous statements of this kind. What I said, I have here in writing, and you will have it in the report. I said, "if he ted us that these words mean that bodies will be burning for ever in flame and not be consumed, that worms will be for ever eating them up and never finish them, that then he talks nonsense." (Applause). That is what I said, and the statement is very different to the utterly incorrect paraphrase of it by Mr. Bradlaugh. What I have demanded in the case, is simply this—that he interpret the language which the Saviour uses according to other occurrences of the same or similar phrases in other parts of the Bible where the attending circumstances demonstrate the sense, and I.

referred to Isaiah xxxiv. 10. There we read of a certain doomed country. It is said that "the land thereof shall become burning pitch. It shall not be quenched night nor day: the smoke thereof shall go up for ever." Now, when you refer to that country you will not find the fire always burning, and the smoke thus going up, and you will readily recognise a similar meaning in similar instances. I have not said that the fire spoken of by the Saviour is not literal fire. Nor do I believe that the sentence of the judgment day will be carried without literal fire. But I objected to bodies ever burning without being consumed and to souls tormented by literal fire. Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by fire, and that fire is termed eternal fire, but did the writer of the Epistle mean those to whom he wrote to understand that that fire would be for ever burning? The eternity, if rightly interpreted, has reference to the effects produced; eternal as would be the smoke of the burning of Paris as described by Victor Hugo. Now, as I have put the matter, it does not deny the eternity of the punishment of the wicked; it does not deny that the suffering will be eternal; it denies simply the eternal burning. That part of the sentence which is carried out by fire will be "a consuming of those who are subjected to it, root and branch; they shall be burnt up as stubble;" and, then, whatever follows will be in accordance with the unerring justice of God, who will render to every one according to his deeds. There is one matter to which Mr. Bradlaugh has referred again and again, or I should not have noticed it—I mean this business of "starving out," which seems to afflict him very much. Now, really, I have no desire to see Mr. Bradlaugh starve, and I have only placed him (in this "starving" business) in the same boat with myself (Cries of "No" and "Yes"). I am speaking now, to many persons before whom I made the statement referred to, when lecturing in this Had. I told the people that there would be a collection after the lecture, and I said to the Secularists "don't you give anything, because it will go to support the propagation of what you disapprove and, therefore, ought not to support." I added, on the other hand let the Christians support their own advocates. I said to the believers, "don't you give anything by way of payment to Secular lecturers; as Christians support their preachers let Secularists support theirs. If they are so numerous, (active and passive) surely," I said, "they are able to support the half dozen persons who, in this country are looking to them for support." Mr. Bradlaugh ought to feel obliged to me on that account. (Hear, and laughter). What I said then in effect, and what I repeat now, is this—if the Secularists will not support their own men then let them be starved out of the field as lecturers, so far as the pence of Christians are concerned. I had previously cautioned Christians against paying anything to unbelievers and, on the other hand, I said it was as much the duty and policy of Atheists to allow Christian advocates to be starved out rather than contribute to keep them at work in advocating what they consider error. That is the whole secret of the starving out business, and I hope you will act upon it on all occasions. (Hear, hear). Then with regard to Christ, and the three days and three nights in the bowels of the earth. Mr. Bradlaugh said that He was put into the grave on Friday night, and as he turned to the Book I was waiting to hear him read something about Friday, but of course he did not. I heard him read something about the Sabbath, and I heard him infer that the day before that Sabbath was Friday. He said it must be so because the Sabbath was Saturday. Wed that, of course, is very conclusive—that is if the facts are so—if Saturday was the Sabbath the day before must be Friday there can be no doubt. But I

deny that that Sabbath must have been a Saturday, and that is where the whole question hangs. Why do I say so? Because in connection with the Passover (and it was at that period Christ was crucified), there were other Sabbaths than the Seventh-day Sabbath. (Applause). Turn back to the law of the Passover as originally given and you will find not merely one, but more than one Sabbath, and it is quite possible that the Saviour may have been in the grave not only two Sabbaths, but even three, that is, that three days in succession may have been Sabbaths. You now perceive where we are:—Every Seventh-day was a Sabbath under the Jewish law, but every Sabbath was not a Seventh-day. There was a special Sabbath, which was a high day, a Sabbath day, and that day had its day of preparation, and, therefore, Mr. Bradlaugh will have to prove that the particular Sabbath mentioned was a Seventh-day Sabbath, and not a high day, or special Sabbath appertaining to the Passover week. (Applause).

Mr. BRADLAUGH:—Permit me to rise to order. The text I quoted said, "At the end of the Sabbath as it began to dawn towards the first day of the week."

Mr. KING:—I thank my opponent for his remark, because it enables me to add a word. If the Saviour were in the grave two Sabbaths, the Passover Sabbath and the Seventh-day Sabbath, then the reference of Mr. Bradlaugh is strictly applicable to the case. But Mr. Bradlaugh mistakes the thing altogether. Those who came to the grave came not at the close of the first Sabbath, but, as intimated, in connection with that Sabbath which precedes the first day of the week. Mr. Bradlaugh mistakes me if he understand that I only argue for one Sabbath. I admit the Seventh day, but say that He was in the grave at least two Sabbaths, and, therefore, Mr. Bradlaugh's explanation was out of order and his interruption certainly disorderly, inasmuch as it does not affect the case. (Hear, laughter, and applause). Now, I suppose each party will conclude, that the debate has been satisfactory. I scarcely remember any expressions of dissent from the audience, and the approbation has been on both sides moderately expressed. I think I have given an outline of Christianity, which covers the entire ground, or at least on ad the great points of the Christian faith. With regard to the Atonement, my opponent might have entered upon that early, for I gave it place in my first speech. As to future punishment he had also in that speech a distinct intimation with which he might have closed and grappled and gone into the matter quite early in the debate, but instead of doing so he piles question on question, so that he has always been able to point to something, which I could not from want of time call your attention to. All that I can now say is, let us always make it our main object to seek for truth. I only desire that; and if I could be convinced that Christianity is not the truth, I would abandon it. I would then not take the course which Mr. Bradlaugh takes, but I would relinquish Christianity if I could not believe it and publicly declare that I had done so. I do not think it for the good of mankind for any person to defend Christianity if it be not true. I want you to lay hold of the truth and follow that truth wherever it may lead. For truth ne'er dies—once let the seed be sown, no blight can kill it. Neither wind nor rain, nor lightnings, nor all the wrath of elements can e'er uproot it from the hungry sod. (Cheers). Let us be men of truth. If truth lead us to

Atheism let us go there: if it lead us to Christianity let us go there but; let us search diligently, “prove all things, and hold fast that which is good. ” (Applause). The great evil is seeking to defend what we feel to be shaky, which under all circumstances all persons should avoid. (Applause).

END OF FIRST SUBJECT.

IS CHRISTIANITY OF DIVINE ORIGIN?

REPORT OF A PUBLIC DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

DAVID KING,

*Of Birmingham, Evangelist, and Editor of the
BRITISH HARBINGER, and*

CHARLES BRADLAUGH,

*Of London, President of the National Secular Society, and
Editor of the NATIONAL REFORMER,*

HELD IN THE

CO-OPERATIVE HALL, BURY.

THURSDAY EVENING, SEPTEMBER 29th, 1870.

—: 0 :—

UMPIRE—J. DUCKWORTH, ESQ.

CHAIRMEN—For Mr. King, Rev. J. WEBB, M A.; for Mr. Bradlaugh
Mr. PEEL.

MR. KING:—Christianity, if of Divine origin, cannot be destitute of supernatural attestation. You are entitled to demand miracles in support of its claims. That demand we are prepared to meet. At the first it was attested by miracles, and miracles will attest it to the end of the dispensation. I do not say that our *present* miraculous attestation is of the same kind as that which accompanied the early proclamation of the gospel, but we have that which is sufficient for the requirements of the case.

The miracles of Christianity may be divided into two classes:—the one class for the generation living when they were wrought, and the other for periods then future and distant.

Man is possessed of *physical* and *intellectual* power. Beyond a given line he cannot go. By an exertion of physical power he can move certain bodies, but he cannot move a mountain. By an exercise of intellectual power he may calculate some of the effects of present continental movements. But no man can tell who shall rule England three hundred years hence, nor predict the then character of its government nor give a list of its ministry. To move the mountain would require supernatural physical power; and to map out the future in the way described can only be accomplished by supernatural intellectual power. Applying these remarks to the subject in hand the case stands thus—Man cannot do the works attributed to Christ—the walking upon the sea, giving sight to the born blind, healing the sick, raising the dead. Nor is there power in nature to bring one from the dead, as Christ is said to have been brought after blood and water from His side had given evidence of actual

death. So, on the other hand, it is impossible by an exercise of power appertaining to our race, or inherent in nature, to foretell the rise, character, decline and fall of nations, and other events not less remarkable, as has been done by those who claim to have spoken by the Holy Spirit. If we prove this to be the case it will then be established that God has spoken to man and that, therefore, Christianity is of Divine origin.

We might offer various proof of the numerous, public, beneficial displays of supernatural power put forth by Christ and His apostles, did time permit. I must, however, on this head, be content with insisting that the early extensive progress of Christianity cannot be accounted for except by miracles. It must be remembered that the first advocates of Christianity were few, poor, uneducated for the most part, and un-influential. They could use no force themselves, nor had they help from Jew or Roman. They were subjected to fierce opposition and persecution.

Of the vast early progress of Christianity there can be no doubt. The Emperor Trajan died A. D. 117. Pliny, about A. D. 107, wrote to the Emperor for instruction as to what he should do with the numerous Christians who everywhere avowed their faith in Christ. He intimated that great numbers were examined, some by torture, and he further said—*“Suspending, therefore, all judicial proceedings, I have recourse to you for advice: for it has appeared to me a matter highly deserving consideration, especially upon account of the great number of persons who are in danger of suffering. For many of all ages and every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused, and will be accused. Nor has the contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also and the open country. Nevertheless it seems to me that it may be restrained and corrected. It is certain that the temples, which were almost forsaken, begin to be more frequented, and the sacred solemnities, after a long intermission are revived.”*

Now let it be observed that this was the state of the case A. D. 107—that is within about 70 years of the death of Christ. Further, that this state of things had then existed for some time, as the “solemnities of the heathen temples” had been subjected to a “long intermission,” though they were then somewhat reviving by means of severe persecution. Turning to the infidel historian, Gibbon, we have not only this vast early spread of Christianity admitted, but the fact is accounted for, in part, by reference to the miracles. He says—*“A pure and humble religion gently insinuated itself into the minds of men, grew up in silence and obscurity, derived new vigour from opposition, and finally erected the triumphant banner of the cross upon the ruins of the capitol.”* Again he says—*“It will, perhaps, appear that it was most effectually favoured and assisted by five following causes.”* Among the five he names—*“The miraculous power which was ascribed to the primitive Churches”—“The pure and austere morals of the Christians”—“The union and discipline of the Christian Republic.”*

Thus, then, the Heathen and the Infidel attest the progress of Christianity and the latter calls in the aid of miracles to account for the fact. Nor can it be otherwise accounted for. It has been well said that its first propagators had for adversaries—*“the national pride of the Jews; the implacable hatred of the Sanhedrim; the brutal despotism of the Roman Emperors; the raileries and attacks of the philosophers; the libertinism and caste-spirit of the pagan priests; the savage and cruel ignorance of the masses; the faggots and bloody games of the circus; they had an enemy in every miser, every debauched man; every drunkard; every thief; every murderer; every proud man; every*

slanderer; every liar. Not one of the vices, in fact, which abuse our poor humanity, which did not constitute itself their adversary. To combat so many enemies, and surmount so many obstacles, they had only their ignorance; their poverty; their obscurity; their weakness; their fewness; the cross and miracles." Miracles of *healing* and of other displays of supernatural physical power wrought by Christ and His apostles, were intended as demonstrations, to the people then living, of their claim to be received as ambassadors from God. On the other hand, PROPHECY (which is not less supernatural) supplies miraculous attestation, not to the people to whom the prophecies are uttered, but to those of the time of their fulfilment and, *subsequently*, to all who know that they were recorded before their accomplishment and sufficiently definite and complex to render certain that they could not result from human forecast.

PROPHECY, then, is a standing miracle in evidence of Christianity. It is enough in itself, though there is enough without it, to render certain that God has spoken to man and that Christianity is Divine. Prophecy offers a vast field, in which we might roam for more than our nine nights, but there are only two evenings devoted to the present inquiry, and, as I shall have to pay attention to matters introduced by the other side, I can devote but little more than an hour to this important branch of evidence, and, therefore, only some three or four distinct prophecies can come under notice.

So far as the Old Testament is concerned, I shall, perhaps, fall back chiefly upon the book of Daniel. The first question is—Did the Old Testament, or this particular book of the Old Testament, exist before the time when it is alleged the predictions were fulfilled? I answer, "Yes," and give one fact in proof, viz., that of the translation of the Old Testament into Greek, say some 250 years before the introduction of Christianity. This *Greek* translation (known as the Septuagint) then, renders us certain that the Old Testament existed long before the days of the apostles of Christ. This cannot be gainsaid, and I need no more as the foundation of my argument.

Now turn to the book of Daniel. Observe! I do not care *when* the book was written; nor whether you admit Daniel as its author. I only *insist*, that it was known *two* or *three* hundred years before the introduction of Christianity. I do not for one moment admit that it was not in existence long before that, but I do not at this time so assert because my argument requires no more than I have now affirmed.

Now, in Daniel ii. we have a dream-vision with its interpretation. The vision was of a large image, with head of gold, breasts of silver, middle parts of brass, legs of iron, and feet of iron and clay. The interpretation sets forth that the head represented the King, or Kingdom, of Babylon, which existed when Daniel gave the interpretation. The silver represented a second Kingdom, which was to subdue the first and take its vast dominion. The brass part stood for a third Kingdom, which in its turn was to arise and subdue the second, and the legs of iron were the symbol of the fourth and last Empire, which was to absorb the previous dominions. It will, of course, be admitted that counting Babylon as the first there have been just four successive kingdoms such as the vision foretells. Turn to chap. vii. and you have the same prophetic outline over again, only in place of four metals you have four beasts (ravenous beasts and birds being in Scripture symbols of kingdoms). The beasts of this vision were—1. Like a Lion, with Eagle's wings—2. Like a Bear, with three ribs in his mouth—3. Like a Leopard, with four, wings and four heads—4. A Beast, dreadful,

terrible, and strong, with great iron teeth and ten horns—out of whose head also there arose another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots. Turning to verse 15 we find Daniel saying—“I was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me. I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this, do he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things. These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever. Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet; and of the ten horns that were in, his head, 6nd of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows. I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom. Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the most High, and shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end.”—Dan. vii. 15-26.

Now, beginning with Babylon (which existed when the vision is said to have been seen and which is therein represented by the first beast, as in the former vision it was by the head of the image) there have been just four vast successive Empires—i. e. Babylon, the Medo-Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman. We are now prepared to note the prophetic intimations of this vision concerning the Roman Empire, whose symbol was the fourth beast.

1. *It was to be diverse from the three previous empires.*

That each empire differed in some points from the others might be alleged, but the difference thus so *strongly* expressed must be peculiarly distinctive, and accordingly there were two particulars in which the Roman empire was at opposites with each and all of the three previous world-powers.

1. *They were absolute monarchies, Rome was a republic*—2. Each of the three was succeeded by another of its own kind—one great dominion taking the place of the other. Rome was *not* succeeded by any such empire. No *fifth* power, like unto those of which Rome was the fourth, has been allowed to exist, and even now if the nations of Europe go to war it is almost certain to be over some attempt, real or imaginary, to disturb the “balance of power.” The nations will not allow any one of their number to take steps to facilitate its becoming what Rome and the previous three empires were.

2. *Its territory was to be divided into Ten Kingdoms.*

It is distinctly said that the ten horns are (or stand for) ten Kings (or Kingdoms). This is not a fanciful correspondence of mine. There stood the prediction, centuries before the breaking up of the Roman Empire.

And you know that Rome was not subdued and replaced by one power, as were the previous Empires, but it was divided into several Kingdoms as indicated by the horns.

3. *After the Ten Kingdoms another Kingdom, represented by the Little Horn, was to arise.*

This, however, must not be put down merely as one item in the specification, for there are several points of remarkable prediction involved.

(A.) *This Eleventh Kingdom was to be diverse from each and all of the Ten Kingdoms among which it arose.*

After the ten Kingdoms the Latin kingdom arose—i. e., the Kingdom of the Popes, which is unlike all the others, inasmuch as the Ecclesiastical and Civil swords were held by the same hand; and its Priest-King, as the pretended vicar of Christ, obtained authority over all the Kingdoms. In that, astounding particular the Little Horn Kingdom is *diverse* from all the others.

(b.) *More stout than his fellows.*

He was to speak great things. And the Pope-Kings have declared themselves God, and exalted themselves above all that have been called Gods. This stoutness, or the power of their kingdom, has been felt by all Europe. Even England has bowed down at its feet. And what nation has not in some way and time prostrated itself before the Little Horn, or Papal Kingdom.

(c.) *To pluck up three of the Ten Horns—Kingdoms.*

Yes, just three of those kingdoms were to be broken, and to yield their territory to the Popes, and thus constitute them kings—Lords of peoples and territory. In the eighth century there were ten kingdoms, and of three of these the Pope possessed himself—the *Exarchate of Ravenna*, the *Kingdom of the Lombards*, and the *State of Rome*. And, till this year, he who pretends to have in his girdle the keys of St. Peter, has worn "*The Triple Crown*." The mapping out of these extraordinary facts thus clearly (centuries before their occurrence) has to be accounted for by those who deny that we are dealing with the words of inspired men.

(d.) *Shall wear out the Saints of the Most High.*

The term *Saint* is the recognised New Testament name for the Church of Christ. How completely and fearfully this prediction has been realized martyrs in thousands testify. The horrors of the Inquisition and the numerous persecutions instigated or directly carried out by the Papal Institution fill up the outline of this section of the prophecy.

(E.) *He shall "think to change times and laws."*

But does not every government think to change the times and laws of the state to which it appertains? Certainly. And, therefore, this prediction cannot be understood in that usual sense; for that could not be given as a marked peculiarity of this kingdom which is a common feature in all kingdoms. It must, therefore, have special reference to the times and laws (or commemorations, statutes, and institutions) of *other* kingdoms, which in *some unusual degree* and in *some special way*, it would subvert and abolish. Now, what are the facts? Why the Pope-Kings have controlled, in an extraordinary manner, the kingdoms of Europe generally. Not only so, but they have set at defiance the enactments of Christ and His apostles; and, while claiming to be the vicar of Christ, not only *changed*, but *reversed*, the laws of His kingdom and church; not only thus changing times and laws, but using the secular power of the nations to inflict capital punishment upon those who refused to submit.

(f). *His dominion to be taken away to be consumed and destroyed till the end.*

It was not to terminate by some great and sudden overthrow, but a *consuming* or *gradual destruction* of his *kingly* or *civil* power was to progress until its complete end. Or, as intimated in another part of Scripture—"The ten horns, or kingdoms, which gave their power to the beast, shall turn again and consume him with fire."—Rev. xvii. And so indeed it has been. No kingdom has done more for the papal kingdom than has France. Yet it was the work of the First Napoleon to humble the Pope and to sever *many*, and weaken *all*, the ecclesiastical and civil ties that bound the whole of western Europe to the throne of Rome. This, indeed, seems to have been his mission, and so long as he confined himself to it success crowned his efforts. In 1796 he took the command of the army in Italy. The Pope was compelled to cede part of his territory and to pay large ransom. In 1798 the commander of the French army entered Rome, abolished the papal government, proclaimed a republic, sent Pope Pius VI. to France, where he died in captivity. More recently a better man than either the first or the last Napoleon (Garibaldi) led on his few brave but untrained followers and, as if by miracle, defeated disciplined troops innumerable and handed over a considerable portion of the papal territory to Victor Emmanuel. The events of the last few weeks you know. The sceptre is broken—the dungeons are annihilated—from the temporal power of the papacy the nations are freed, and that, too, by the very process described in our prophecy.

(g). *The prophecy further intimates that the duration of the papal persecuting power would continue not less than 1260 years.*

Daniel describes this period as "a time, times, and the dividing of time," by which the Jews understood *three years and a half*, or forty-two months. This is seen in the fact that the 1260 days of Rev. xii. 6 are in verse 14 distinctly termed "a time, times, and a half." But in prophecy a *day* often denotes a year (as in Ezekiel iv. 4-6; Numbers xiv. 34). The persecuting power, then, was guaranteed for at least 1260 years. This renders the prophecy vastly more explicit, because all that we have shown to be fulfilled might have been accomplished in half that period.

But when did this term of 1260 years begin and end? There are two periods, from either of which the beginning might date, and give a termination in complete accordance with the prediction. What we want to find is those events which put the little horn (or Bishop of Rome) in the position of avowed headship over *all* professing Christians.

Bower (in his *History of the Popes*) thus writes concerning Justinian:—"By an edict which he issued (to UNITE ALL MEN IN ONE FAITH, whether Jews, Gentiles, OR CHRISTIANS) such as did not in the term of three months embrace and profess the Catholic faith were declared infamous, and as such excluded from all employment, both civil and military, rendered incapable of leaving anything by will, and their estates were confiscated. These were the convincing arguments of the Catholic faith; but many, however, withstood them, and against such the imperial decree was executed with the utmost rigour. Great numbers were driven from their habitation, with their wives and children, stripped. Others betook themselves to flight, carrying with them what they could conceal, but they were plundered of the little they had, and many of them inhumanly massacred." In connection with these events Justinian addressed a letter to John II., Bishop of Rome, saying—"We have hastened to *bring into*

subjection and to unite to the see of your Holiness all the priests of the whole Eastern church—*your Holiness* THE HEAD OF ALL THE HOT. Y CHURCH. ” To this the Pope replied—“You preserve the reverence of the *Roman See, and are subjecting all things to it, and bringing them into union with it; to whose founder, Peter, the charge was given from our Lord’s lips, Feed my sheep, which See, the rules of the fathers, and the statutes of the princes, and the much-to-be-honoured expressions of your piety, attest truly to be the head of all the churches—your* EDICT *is conformable to apostolic doctrines; I CONFIRM IT WITH MY AUTHORITY.* ” Here we have the Emperor *giving*, and the Pope *accepting*, that “lordship” over the saints which was condemned by Christ. This took place in the Hebrew civil year, which commenced September, 532. Now, what happened 1260 years after that time? In September, 1792, the French National Assembly proclaimed the Republic, a result of which was the destruction, for the time being, of the papal power. But the prophecy shows that the foretold break-up was not to be *final*, but the commencement of a *consuming* which was to go on to the end—the words are, “*take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it to the end.* ” That consuming has been going on, delivering *this* nation and *that*—rescuing *this* part of the papal territory and then *the other*, until now nothing remains. The other date of commencement is 606, when the Pope first completely assumed universal headship. If we start from there, the 1260 years land us in 1866. Then, and since then, events have followed in quick succession which bring to a close the temporal power of the Pope, and deliver the residue of the peoples from his grasp. Before 1796, then, the papal persecuting power could not pass away, or Daniel would be a false prophet. Nor could it then wholly terminate, as a *subsequent* consuming was foretold.

Thus I have demonstrated the fulfilment of a long and extraordinary series of predictions, coming down to this day, and foretold 2, 000 years ago. And surely these fulfilled predictions, which can be greatly multiplied, prove that God has spoken to man by the prophets, and that, consequently, Christianity is of Divine origin. (Applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —Perhaps when Mr. King replies again he will tell us the precise part of the Papal territory which Garibaldi handed over to Victor Emmanuel. I was there at the time, and I don’t remember it. I dare say our friend would not have ventured on saying it without thinking he could support it with proofs, unless he said it without knowing what he was talking about; but I don’t remember any part of the territory held by the Pope which was handed over by Garibaldi to Victor Emmanuel. I must complain of the utter recklessness of Mr. King talking about four kingdoms, and ten kingdoms, and beasts and horns, as though it were all a matter of certainty, and as though they were sufficiently put before you as to be capable of distinct proof. Nothing can be more reckless than this sort of wild talking. Supposing, however, the prophecy to be a correct one, will that prove the Divine origin of the Book in which it appears? Because, if so, I can refer to much more striking prophecies in our own day. I know of persons—one in my own paper a week or two ago prophesying the breaking out of the war, now existing between Germany and France, much more distinctly than anything we have heard prophesied in the Bible; and Sir George Cornwall Lewis for one, has given much more distinct intimations of the Imperial attack, of the provinces to be

attacked, and of the reasons which led to the attack, than any that are given in the prophecy of the Septuagint; and I say it is utterly reckless to take loose statements of this kind, and bolster up an argument with them. As a specimen of these statements, we may mention the one about the Papal territory, but as another specimen, let us hear how the authority of the Book of Daniel was spoken of. Mr. King says that he does not care to trouble *as* to when the Book was written, nor whether you admit that Daniel was the author, because at any rate it was written 250 years before Christ, and he spoke of that as a dead certainty, and as if there was no doubt about it at all. I hold in my hand the book of Dr. Irons on "The Bible and its Interpreters," and in it he says: "What is this Greek version, or Septuagint, as it is called? Who made it? From what originals was it made? And when? And why? And what is its present state?" And his answer is, strictly speaking, no one knows who made the Septuagint, no one knows from what copies of the originals any part of that version were made. It appears to be a growth of at least two generations; and, as might be expected, the style is not the same throughout. Dr. Whittaker argued that what we have presented to us as the Septuagint is a production belonging to this side of the Christian era. Cardinal Bellarmine held differently. Now I don't pretend to set myself up between these two divines, but I urge that if the Septuagint is to be quoted here, I have a right to insist upon evidence by which its date shall be fixed. I am prepared with all that is written about it, and I will go into it, and demonstrate the fact? if our friend dares to adduce any proof to show that he has not introduced his statement for the sake of deceiving you. I don't care to discuss to-night the fulfilment, or the nonfulfilment, in the wretched fashion in which he has put it, of these alleged prophecies of the Book of Daniel, because when you come to look at it, nothing could be more monstrous than to urge in loose and indefinite phraseology about kingdoms and horns and beasts mixed up in this most extraordinary fashion. Why, even our friend, who wants to make out the prophecy precisely, by his own account makes it six years out, and then adds to it. Well, if it is not precise of what value is it as proof at all? I reject the Book on this ground, that it has antedated the whole of the four kingdoms of which it speaks. I urge that we must have more definite proof than Mr. King's loose words, —by ancient authors, not modern writers who manufacture history to fit in with their particular views. But leaving matters of prophecy for a moment, and putting this to you as if the prophecy were thoroughly correct—supposing it to apply in every particular, what evidence is it of the truth of the history of Jesus? How does it prove that Jesus was born without a father! How does it prove that His mother's husband had two fathers? How does it prove the genealogy through Joseph to David, who was no relation whatever? How does it prove that John knew him and did not know him at one and the same time. How does it prove that He was three days and three nights in the grave, and that He was interred on the Friday, and did not rise again on the Saturday? And by the bye, since I came into the room I have had handed to me by Mr. King the text as to the supposed second Sabbath, which he alleges as making up the time of the days, and nights. He gives me Lev. xxiii. 1 to 8th verses, and Lev. -xxiii. 24 to 28th verses. He has not dared to give you a text out of the Gospel, to show the possibility of the Sabbath coming in—not a word in this text from Leviticus to show the possibility of two Sabbaths intervening between the texts which I have read, and I think that is simply monstrous as a matter of argument.

Leaving prophecy for a moment, the same thing applies to miracles. Mr. King urges that if the Bible is of Divine origin, it cannot be destitute of Divine attestation, and he quotes the miracles to show such attestation. Now, Mr. Rathbone Greg, in "The Creed of Christendom," urges "1st—That miracles wrought by any individual are not, nor can be, a proof of the truth of the doctrines which he preaches; and, 2nd—That miracles are not the real basis of Christianity, and cannot be a safe foundation on which to rest its claims, inasmuch as miracles can never be proved by *documentary* evidence, least of all by such documentary evidence as we possess." Now what is the documentary evidence on which Mr. King will have to base his miracles, which he has to support his book by? Why, he will have to quote the book for the miracles, and then quote the miracles for the book. He makes a double endorsement come from the same pages. But what book does he quote? The Gospels. Well, if so I ask, when were they written? Where? Who by? How will he trace back the Gospels to those who are supposed to be the original writers of them? On this subject I'll let Dr. Irons, as a clergyman of the Church of England, speak again, for nothing can be more definite on this matter. He says in effect:—"that the further we trace back for the ancient standards of Christianity in the Greek text, the greater is the obscurity and uncertainty—in fact we become perfectly lost. in the search." Now, I ask here—Are we to have unknown unauthenticated writers quoted in support of miracles, which in their turn are to be quoted in support of the Divine authority of the books themselves? But let us press this still further. Miracles, says Mr. King, are of two kinds—the one as evidence for the generation then living, and the other for those who were to live thereafter. The miracles for those who were then living evidently failed, for the Jews, the people among whom these things are said to have been performed, always persistently rejected Jesus, and never have believed in Him. But, says Mr. King, the progress of Christianity, so suddenly, in itself was a miracle. Let him show, numbers for numbers, that Christianity spread faster than Mormonism or Mohammedism has done in the same period of time. If he cannot, then if the progress of Christianity is a miracle the progress of Mormonism and Mohammedism is equally a miracle. But he says that Christianity was first advocated by poor men, humble men, ignorant men. That is Mr. King's statement I know; but has he got it from the book? Let him quote from the book, and let him show from the book sufficient authority for his statement. Don't let him assume all the facts, and then treat his assumption as facts. In his speech we have had the loosest and wildest sort of attack imaginable. We had read to us from Pliny—not quite accurately—some statement about the Christians, but surely Mr. King is not so unacquainted, so ignorant of what Pliny tells us, as not to know that what Pliny says of them, with the exception of the singing of a hymn to Christ,—that what that ancient writer said of them would apply equally well to the whole of that sect he was speaking of, and to the Essens, or Essenes, or Essaens, and that those things described by them answer in every respect—in all the asceticism, in all the morality—to what you may find is supposed to be taught by Jesus. No man would be mad enough to deny the existence of the sect. I don't care to discuss whether a man called Jesus or Christ was at the head of it. But what I do care to discuss is, whether His mission was originated by God; whether the Book contains a divinely-revealed account of His life and teachings. I don't care to discuss whether there was a people called Christians, because their existence is a fact;

but I don't admit the divinity of the account of the Christians given in that book, just as I don't dispute the existence of the body called Mohammedans, and the book called the Koran, though I dispute the divinity; or the existence of the Mormons, though I do not admit the Divine origin of the book of the Mormons handed out by Joe Smith. It is utterly useless to point to Pliny, because I have a copy of his letter, and I don't find a word in it in corroboration of the history of Jesus as recorded in the Gospels; and I put it to you that it is manifestly wrong to tie a number of loose things in this discussion together, as though they were any sort of argument at all. Permit me, as nothing whatever has been done (as I submit) to discuss the question from my point of view, to ask—Is this Christianity of Divine origin? First, we are in the grave difficulty, that even now, after two nights spent in this debate, if you understand what Mr. King knows, what Mr. King means, by Christianity, you are in a happier position than myself; because first, I was, it seemed, to be precluded from going to the Old Testament; then I was not; then there were certain parts of it repealed; and now Mr. King goes wholesale to the Old Testament for his prophecies. Let me go to the Old Testament, too. I take it that our friend puts it that Daniel's prophecy is of Divine origin, and he brings one book of the Old Testament to bolster up some portions of the New. Then take them side by side, and I will ask whether such a thing as this, taken in connection with any other, can be read as Christianity. We read in Lev. xxv. 44, "Both thy bondmen and thy bondmaids, which thou shalt have, shall be of the heathen that are round about you; of them shall ye buy bondmen and bondmaids. Moreover of the children of the strangers that do sojourn among you, of them shall ye buy, and of their families that are with you, which they begat in your land: and they shall be your possession. And ye shall take them as an inheritance for your children after you, to inherit them for a possession; they shall be your bondmen for ever: but over your brethren the children of Israel, ye shall not rule one over another with rigour." Now I ask whether any book which contains an injunction permitting people to buy, and breed, and sell slaves can be a book that comes from God. It will not do for my friend to shut out the Old Testament now. He has gone to it for prophecy, and I go to it to demonstrate that what comes from bad and rascally men cannot be from an all wise and beneficent God. But I will take the course followed by our friend and turn to the New Testament. Let us see what is recorded in the Epistle of Jude: "Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." Now, does my opponent hold that it is part and parcel of Christianity to believe that the devil and the archangel Michael did have a dispute about the body of Moses, and that that story is of Divine origin? Does he think that God revealed it, and that it is part of God's message of salvation to man? Evidently Jesus believed in devils, for we find distinctly spoken of the casting out of devils by Jesus. Now, these are a portion of the miracles relied upon. Is it not true that for years and years people went on believing in demoniacal possession, and that hundreds of people have been burnt for witchcraft and wizardry? But modern science has set aside all that delusion, and the insanity which arose from it. Well, then, I ask whether such monstrous stories as these are to be taken to be of Divine origin. How will the prophecy of Daniel show that Jesus cast out devils, and that the devils went into a lot of pigs, who ran into the sea? What earthly connection is there between the evidence and the facts? Take

another illustration. Turn to Hebrews, chapter xii. 16, 17: "Lest there be any fornicator, or profane person, as Esau, who for one morsel of meat sold his birthright. For ye know how that afterward, when he would have inherited the blessing, he was rejected: for he found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears." Romans ix. 13: "As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." Turn to the story of Esau in the Old Testament. As our friend turned, so I turn to Genesis to see what is said of this story, and what do I find? What-ever the fault of Esau in selling his birthright to his knavish brother, that this same brother got the blessing. Jacob, as stated in Genesis xxxvii. went disguised to represent himself as Esau. "And Isaac his father said unto him, Who art thou? And he said, I am thy sou, thy first born Esau." Jacob gives a lying account of the matter. Can we believe the account in the New Testament from God when we read the extraordinary account that Jacob, the liar, who tricked his brother out of his father's blessing, inherited heaven for this virtue and for no other than that of cheating and lying. And what becomes of the benefits of your Christianity when Jacob, rascal as he was, was loved of God and in heaven? I ask how is this a fulfilment? Things so absurd are scarcely worthy to be noticed. Again, in Romans ix. you find: "For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth." Now turn to Exodus and see the account that is given of that in the book. You find that God determined to rescue His chosen people, who were at the time in Egypt. You find that He sends Moses with a message to Pharaoh to let His people go that they might serve Him. You find that Moses asks him, and that he did not, and the text, in express, distinct, and clear terms, says that the Lord had hardened Pharaoh's heart so that he would not let the people go that they might serve Him, and yet He punishes the people for it. Then we find that the Lord works miracles. I won't discuss the absurdity of these miracles, the plagues that were inflicted on the people, ending with the destruction of a number of human beings who could have no share in Pharaoh's crime; but I ask you whether you believe that God dealt with the people in this way in consequence of Pharaoh hardening his heart when God had previously said to Moses, "I will harden his heart, that he shall not let the people go." But go further. In Gal. iv. 22—3 you will find this: "It is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh, but he of the freewoman was by promise." Now, I ask you do you believe Jesus and His disciples could hold that same horrible doctrine of Leviticus about there being a difference in the position of life because some were born bond and some free? What is the use of quoting Daniel in support of an argument that Christianity is of Divine origin when we are told that God makes a distinction between the bondwoman and the free? We come next to Timothy, where Jesus is said to be of the seed of David. How on earth can it be shown that the prophecies of Daniel prove that He was descended from David? The only way is by tracing the genealogy through some one who was no relation. It cannot even be traced to His mother, Mary; because, so far as the gospel tells us, she was the cousin to somebody who was of the tribe of Levi. How can the prophecy affect this, and what is the use of our friend bringing forward statements in this loose fashion which are utterly unconnected?

In the 2 Tim., iii. 8, we have an example of conduct put as conduct to be imitated. We read—"Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also resist the truth." Now, we know nothing about Jannes and Jambre. How do we know how they withstood Moses? What is the object of telling us anything about it? If the book is of Divine origin, why did God send such a foolish message? because if we turn to Genesis and Exodus we find nothing about it. What is the use of telling me about the Divine origin of Christianity being proved by Daniel's prophecy and its fulfilment, when I can point you to reckless and incoherent matter such as you have here? But carry it further, and I will take my opponent up to the very door and he shall not escape. In Matthew vi., 9, Christ was giving directions to His apostles, and He commences: "After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name." Now, I ask Mr. King whether the doctrine that God lives in heaven was of Divine origin? Clearly it was a doctrine which the apostles held, because in Acts vii. you find these words: "But he, being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God. And said, behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." There are many passages in the Old Testament which speak of God coming down from heaven, but I ask whether Christ resided in heaven, and how the statement of invisibility accords with the text? Take the contents of the book itself, and say if you can that it is of Divine origin? Are the stories contained in it any more reliable than the fables of Baron Munchausen or than the Arabian Nights' fiction? It is of no use people concocting fables as vain as themselves, and then pretending to build something upon them. I have striven to adhere to the Bible in what I have had to say; and I ask whether, even after two nights' debate, we have the subject really grappled with at all? How will you know, from what has taken place, what Christianity is, and whether or not it is of Divine origin? If our friend had in any way shown us that the history of Jesus was connected with the prophecy—if it had been shown that Daniel in any way spoke of Jesus, then it might be understood. If he had spoken correctly in one instance, there would be some ground for saying that he had spoken correctly in the other; but the prophecies of Daniel are not shown to have the slightest bearing on the question of proof as to whether or not Christianity is of divine origin. Why, you might as well say that the prophecies of Ruth—the prophecies in the Book of Job and Proverbs, attributed to Solomon, were proved to be of Divine origin by the history of Jonah. You must connect them in some way with Christianity, which you yourself define to be the doctrine recorded in the New Testament, and the teachings of Jesus and His apostles. That you have not done; you have not taken one step to do it. More than that, you at first recklessly repudiated the Old Testament. It was the basis of the argument, and when I asked what authority you had, you were obliged to return to it. Now, don't let us play fast and loose with the matter. Let us understand each other; let us understand, as nearly as we can, the standard of authority on which we base our arguments in these discussions. Is Christianity of Divine origin? Does its spread show it to be of Divine origin? If so, I say that the Bhuddists and the Mohammedans are more numerous than the Christians. Does the spread in old times show that it was of Divine origin? If our friend says so, let us have some proof of it, because if I had known that he intended to take up this line of argument, I should have been prepared to show

that the spread of Christianity in the early ages was effected, not by miracle, but by fraud, by perjury, and by every sort of cruelty, such as are charged against the Church of Rome now. I have occupied my half hour, and I sit down hoping that our friend, in his next speech, will abandon this reckless and woe-begotten rhodomontade about beasts and horns, and apply himself to something which really appertains to the matter in hand. (Cheers.)

Mr. KING: —You are told that I have not given you a passage from the New Testament showing the existence at the time of Christ's crucifixion of a Sabbath other than the Seventh-day Sabbath. But I have given proof, and will give you further proof from the Old Testament—Lev. xxiii. 24, "Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, In the Seventh month, in the first day of the month, shall ye have a Sabbath, a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation." There then you have a Sabbath which falls on the first day of the Seventh month, and I suppose every return of the first day of that particular month, did not happen on a Saturday! You have the Sabbath of that particular month, on whatever day of the week the first of the month may fall on. It was to be "a memorial of blowing of trumpets, an holy convocation." Then you have on the tenth day of this Seventh month (which sometimes falls on a Saturday, but six times as often on other days), a Sabbath in addition to the Sabbath of the first day of the month. If you turn at your leisure to the first part of the xxiii. chapter of Leviticus, you will find Special Sabbaths which are not Seventh-day Sabbaths, but connected with the Passover, and falling on the fifteenth day of the first month, and also on the seventh day of that convocation, whatever day of the week that might be. Now, the Saviour was crucified at the Passover season, and, therefore, there were of necessity other Sabbaths than the Seventh-day Sabbath at that time. Now, what Mr. Bradlaugh has to show in order to make good his case, is, that one of these Special Sabbaths could not have followed the day of Christ's crucifixion. His business is to prove that, or he fails to demonstrate that Christ was interred on Friday night. I have shown that the next day could have been a festival Sabbath and not a Seventh-day Sabbath and, therefore, his argument falls to the ground, unless he shows the impossibility of one of these Special Sabbaths recurring. A word in reference to my abandonment of the Old Testament and my return to it. The Old Testament has never been abandoned by me; not one fraction of it have I ever abandoned. The whole question was whether Christianity could be found in the Old Testament? and I said "No." The question was, whether the laws of the Jewish nation are the laws of the Christian Church? I answered, No! for the laws and ordinances of the Church of Christ are in the New Testament only, and those of the Jewish nation are wholly in the Old Testament. Christ quotes from the Old Testament in innumerable instances. All the New Testament writers, or nearly so, quote from the Old Testament, and portions of the Old are embodied in file New. Mr. Bradlaugh is quite entitled to appeal to the Old Testament, inasmuch as Christ and His apostles claimed that the Books comprising the Old Testament were there as a result of the Divine inspiration, and, therefore, I have appealed to it. No Christian can abandon the Old Testament. But then he must be sadly wanting in discrimination who cannot perceive, that if the history of the Jewish nation and the laws and ordinances of that nation are in one part of the Bible and the history

of the planting of the Church of Christ and a record of the faith and order of that Church are in another part of that same Bible, and that the two records are so far distinct, that the law of the one is not the law of the other—he must be, indeed, undiscerning, who does not observe that we must go to the Old Testament for the one and to the New Testament for the other, and he knows nothing of the science of interpretation who jumbles them up together. (Applause). I did not, then, abandon the Old Testament; but I have endeavoured to show my opponent how to use it. (Renewed applause). Next a word is demanded as to the antiquity of the Book of Daniel. It was, according to Josephus (Ant. B. xi. c. 8), shown to Alexander the Great, in Jerusalem, on his way to Persia 332 B. C. The Book of Daniel is in all the copies of the Septuagint. Aristeas, Josephus, Philo, and others, testify that the Septuagint was made during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Others refer it to the date of Ptolemy Lagus. These traditions are reconciled by understanding it to have been produced during the two years when Ptolemy Philadelphus shared the throne with his father, which brings us to about 285 and 286 before the Christian Era. At that time (it is well known) a multitude of Jews had settled in Egypt, particularly at Alexandria. They had their Sanhedrim, of seventy or seventy-two members, and it is not unlikely that their authorization or sanction of the translation originated its title—

THE SEVENTY. Aristobulus in the 2nd Century before Christ (in a fragment preserved by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and also by *Eusebius*), affirms the translation into Greek in the time of Philadelphus. Thus—“It is manifest that Plato has followed our law, and studied diligently all its particulars. For before Demetrius Phalereus a translation had been made, by others, of the history of the Hebrews going forth out of Egypt, and of all that happened to them, and of the conquest of the land, and of the exposition of the law. Hence it is manifest that the aforesaid philosopher borrowed many things; for he was very learned, as was Pythagoras, who also transferred many of our doctrines into his system. But the entire translation of our whole law was made in the time of the King named Philadelphus, a man of great zeal under the direction of Demetrius Phalereus.” Then, too, the prologue of the wisdom of Jesus, the son of Sirach (ascribed to the time of Ptolemy Physcon about 133 B. C.) makes mention of “the law itself, the prophets, and the rest of the books” having been translated from the Hebrew into another tongue. The apostles also largely quote from the Septuagint, and the early Fathers speak of it and refer to the time I have intimated. Thus we are thrown back to that period. Now please to observe that I have been careful to narrow the compass of this matter in order to have something tangible—something really worth grappling with. You will observe that I rest my case, with regard to Daniel’s prediction, upon those events which have been fulfilled since the time when the existence of the book is demonstrated by its translation into Greek. Nor do I rest upon events transpiring soon after the Septuagint was produced, but I come right down the Christian Era to the present time, and show continuous fulfilment, even to the present year, and, therefore, the evidence is undeniable. It matters not, to a year or so, when the Septuagint was made, nor who were the translators, I prove the existence of the Book of Daniel, more than sufficient time before the fulfilment of the prediction to render it impossible for those prophecies to have been given otherwise than by Divine revelation. Now, in what way have these various fulfilments been met by my opponent? “Oh, you have been told of beasts and horns” is the answer given to my minute

pointing out of the fulfilment of the various explicit predictions presented in connection with these beast symbols. Had I been simply deducing from them the interpretation—had I been simply giving you my own opinion of the interpretation, the remarks you have heard to-night from Sir. Bradlaugh might have been presented. But the chapters from the Book of Daniel contain both the symbols and to a large extent their interpretation, and history supplies us with the fulfilment. (Hear, hear). Now, there are various irrelevant matters arising out of the remarks of Mr. Bradlaugh. Some of these we shall classify, and bring them before you either on this evening or the next. But let us have a word in reference to the spread of Christianity. My opponent objects to my argument, that you cannot account for the early and extensive spread of Christianity without admitting the miracles. I referred to Gibbon, who alleges that the miraculous power ascribed to the first Christians was among the causes of that vast progress. He did not, I presume, believe in the miracles, yet he could not account for the vast early spread of Christianity without thus ascribing it to that cause. But if the people of the apostolic time embraced Christianity on the belief in miracles, then, taking into view the criterion by which they are sustained, they must have been wrought. Then there has been an endeavour, and not at all a creditable one, to throw some doubt upon the testimony of Pliny. That ancient writer spoke of the Christians, but my opponent intimates that Pliny might have alluded to some other class of persons. But I must insist that Pliny knew what he was writing about, and intended exactly what he said, and has left no authority to my opponent to correct what he has written. Pliny states that the Christians overran the cities and the smaller towns and the open country round about, and not only so, but that the worship of the temples had come almost, if not entirely, to a close. It had been suspended, but through rigour and force and persecution it was reviving again, and all this was within 70 years after the death of Christ. This testimony cannot be shaken; we must allow Pliny to mean Christ when he said Christ, and Christians when he said Christians. We must allow him to have been conversant with the facts he wrote about, and which as a public magistrate he had to do with. Then our friend says that the spread of Christianity was not greater than that of Mohammedanism and Mormonism. That is easily said; but what would be much better is proof, rather than the mere declaration, because you have not only to take into consideration the spread of Mohammedanism and Mormonism, but you have to take in the whole of the accompanying circumstances. There is one very famous way of spreading Mohammedanism—and that is, to present the Koran and the sword and to say, "Now, you must receive our faith or you die." You have here, then, a very important element in the spread of Mohammedanism, but the apostles of Christ did not go forth with the sword. If my opponent will produce evidence that in the days before Pliny men were forced into the church by the Civil Government and by the sword, he will have done something in the case, and will have brought the matter to the level, in one particular, of Mohammedanism. But he will have to do that before his plea can be admissible, and before his alleged analogy can be accepted. He must, therefore, look somewhere else to make out his case. But Mohammedanism not only prevailed by the sword, but it did so by adapting itself, in its promised rewards, to the passions of the people. Christianity did not do so, but exactly the reverse. It came with large demands upon its adherents for self-denial and cross-hearing. The whole case then falls to the ground. There is really no comparison. Then there is Mormonism, and with that my opponent

fails as completely as with the other, Why so? Because, in the first place, Mormonism did not come preaching an entirely new faith. It came to people professedly Christian and proposed to them great leading doctrines of Christianity. True, some of those doctrines were subverted by Mormon teaching but, nevertheless, they were there, held forward in the foreground, and did their work in gaining entrance for the doctrines peculiar to the Mormon system. Thus Mormon preachers proclaimed one God, and one Son of God (Jesus Christ), and one Holy Spirit, and one Baptism—they taught salvation by faith. Mormonism has its vast falsehoods, directly opposed to Christian doctrine, but it is as deceptive and cautious as it is false, and hence it came holding out to view almost exclusively those points of its doctrine which are Christian, or that deviate but little therefrom. It has made most of its converts by having Christianity emblazoned on its banner (Applause), and by thus adapting itself to the conditions of the people; and it gained many converts merely on account of the facilities supplied for emigration. In these particulars, the conditions presented were the opposite of those which accompanied the early preaching of Christianity, and Mr. Bradlaugh's comparison utterly fails. (Applause).

Mr. BRADLAUGH—The first point alluded to was that of the second Sabbath. I did not require Mr. King to give me proof of the other Sabbaths. I required him to give me proof of the second Sabbath intervening in the gospel, which he has not done; and the Sabbath which he refers to, and quotes Leviticus to prove, cannot by any possibility be the one referred to in the Gospels. There was to be a Sabbath "in the seventh month, in the first day of the month but if you look to Ex. xii. 18, you will find the Passover fixed for a different time altogether. "In the first month, on the fourteenth day of the month, at even, ye shall eat unleavened bread until the one-and-twentieth day of the month at even. " But then he says that to make out my case I have to show you that one of the Levitical Sabbaths could not have intervened. I say no; it lies on him to show it. But, if it does rest upon me, I will show that it did not intervene. Mark xv. 42: "And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath, Joseph went and craved the body of Christ. " *The Sabbath*—you see the definite article is used. Next we have in chapter xvi. these words: "And when the Sabbath was passed" the two Marys went and found that Jesus had risen; and I say that the plain meaning of that language is, that the Sabbath which was past meant the Sabbath immediately preceding the first day of the week, and must have been the Seventh-day Sabbath. The definite article must refer to the Sabbath just before mentioned as preceding, and precludes the possibility of any other intervening. Then we are told that Mr. King did not want to insist upon any particular time as the date of the Septuagint, and he quotes Josephus, B. C. 32; but surely what that historian wrote about the commencement of the Christian Era can hardly be evidence of something that happened 300 years before, unless he quotes some one who had written before him, and I would rather have the original testimony in that case. But what is the use of quoting antique dates. You see he quoted from the Septuagint. Is that truer? If you say that he quoted some of the passages in the apostles and some in the Septuagint? Yes, but only to show that what was denied in some cases was absolutely defended in others; and yet Mr. King spoke as if the Septuagint was in evidence, and in their hands at the time. Then he

objects with regard to the instance of prophecy I cited. I gave you the precise instances of its fulfilment. Did he? Well, did not he take an illustration from our own times to show that Garibaldi handed over some portion of Papal territory to Victor Emmanuel—a statement which he has not substantiated. It is enough for me to take one brick out at a time, and if I show that one is wrong I floor all. Do you say that Gibbon speaks of them as alleged miracles? Why, that is a most amusing style of argument. He says—Well, if a people are shown to have believed in the miracles, the miracles must have happened. Do you mean that? People believe in Hindoo miracles performed by the Dervishes. Must they have happened? People believe in the miracles of Mahomet. Must they have happened? Why, we have not a religion in existence without miracles devoutly believed in by its followers. If miracles alleged are to be taken as admitted because somebody believed them, then you have overwhelming evidence of the truth of every religion in the world. And I did not say that the Mohammedans or the Mormons were more numerous. (Hisses.) Hold your tongues—(Shame.) What I did say was—will Mr. King show that the Christians were more numerous among the people then living for some time after the introduction of Christianity. (Applause.) Mr. King coolly reverses every position. He invents a statement and then he wants to prove the opposite. He has got to prove his statement about the miraculous spread of Christianity, and the only evidence he gives us is from Pliny's letter; and anything more reckless, more unfair, more absolutely devoid of truth, could not be than Mr. King's repetition of what he professed I said. I did not pretend to say that Pliny did not refer to the Christians, but I said that a sect called the Essens, or Essenes, or Essaens, with all the main features of the doctrines attributed to Christianity by Pliny, existed long before, and were spoken of in the Talmud, and by other writers. But Mr. King says that Mr. Bradlaugh asserted that Pliny meant some other than Christians. I did not say other than Christians; but I say that Pliny's speaking of Christ was no more evidence of the truth or the Divinity of the religion recorded in the New Testament and the Gospels than the existence of the Mormons was evidence of the authenticity of the Book of Mormon, or the existence of Mohammedanism was evidence of the Divine origin of the Koran. I complain of these things; and I say that if this is the style in which the debate is to be conducted I shall get an utter contempt for the advocate who can so forget every argument one adduces to him. But Mr. King says that Christianity came across the passions of the people, and that Mohammedanism accommodates itself to them. I thought the Koran spoke against the lowest forms of all sorts of vice. I may have missed the passages our friend refers to, but perhaps he will quote them. If he wants to compare the two books even now I will show him moral injunctions as striking in the Koran as in any other book. I challenge him on that point, and it is for him who alleges the fact to make it out. Then his argument about Mormonism is a striking one. He says it differs from Christianity in this respect. It did not seek to overturn the old faith. It admitted there was one living and true God. So I thought that Jesus and His apostles admitted that there was one God and Father; and the alteration made was quite as important, but not more important, than Mahomet makes from Christianity. There was an alteration in both, but to pretend that one was not built on the other is a pretence utterly at variance with the facts. I think I have now pretty nearly gone through the points urged during the address which has been delivered to us; and

I will now ask you, supposing you take it for the moment that the clearest fulfilment of the alleged prophecy by Daniel has been made out, is that evidence to show the Divine origin of the scheme of Christianity—of Adam's sin and the world's redemption by Jesus? How are the two in any way connected one with the other? How can one be made to bear testimony of the other? And I ask more than that, how are we to deal with this question? Jesus comes to save the world from Adam's sin. Does he come to save them whether they believe in Him or not? If He only came to save those who believe in Him, how can you urge that that religion is of Divine origin which even up to a recent time has left hundreds of millions whom it has never reached at all? If He came to save all, whether they believe in Him or not, is that religion of Divine origin which puts forward a penalty of damnation which hundreds of millions escape because the penalty was not put on them? I urge that the statements as to miracles have been passed over in a reckless way without any attempt to justify them, and I would not degrade myself by taking part in a debate on one side or the other in which the opponent shows not the slightest respect or attention to what is said by the other. If the spread of Christianity in early times is to be believed as demonstrating the actual occurrence of a miracle, surely the existence of 500, 000, 000 of Buddhists, and at least 150, 000, 000 of Mohammedans, justifies the belief in a miraculous work in each of these religions far more than in the case of Christianity. But without even contending this, take it that there is some weight of evidence on the other side, and you have in Mr. King's argument clear proof of the Divine origin of Buddhism and Mohammedanism; and when Mr. King talks of the difference in the way in which Christianity and Mohammedanism progressed in the world, it will be time enough for me to deal with that question when he shows that there were a larger number of *bona fide* Christians existing at the time. And I allege, without fear of contradiction that the moment you find as large bodies of men moving the world as you do large bodies of Christians moving after the introduction of Christianity, you find the sword and the dagger and persecution and fire, as weapons in the hands of those who tried to spread that religion. I affirm that without fear of contradiction, and I leave it to you (Applause).

Mr. KING: —There has been an attempt to insist that the Sabbath referred to must be the Seventh-day Sabbath because of the use of the definite article, as: "Now when the even was come, because it was the day of preparation, that is, the day before the Sabbath." Now, there was a special preparation day preceding the festival Sabbaths, but I know not of any special time or day of preparation preceding the Seventh-day Sabbath. I know they observed every Seventh-day as a Sabbath, but I do not know that they were ever called upon to, or ever did, set apart every Friday as a day of preparation for the ordinary Sabbath. When you come down to the next chapter—and, mark you, there is an interval of three days—then you read: "And when the Sabbath was past j" and, says my opponent, with a curious kind of logic, the Sabbaths were on one day, and consequently the definite article further on must refer to the Seventh-day Sabbath. Nothing of the kind. It was *the* Sabbath preceded by a fixed day of preparation. In the other case, and with regard to the ordinary Seventh-day Sabbath, there is no day of preparation. As to the burden of proof—that lies with him, not with me, and on this ground—

if I affirm that certain things were done in a certain room and at a certain time, by Mr. Bradlaugh, he calls upon me to show that it was not possible for anyone else to do it; and unless I can prove that it was not or could not have been done by any other person, he is free from the charge. And as there were other Sabbaths falling at that time, he must prove that this was not one of those special festival Sabbaths before I can allow that it refers necessarily to the Seventh-day Sabbath. The mere possibility of its being one of these special Sabbaths overturns his assertion that it must have been a Seventh-day Sabbath. Then he very carefully turns to the two verses which I read from Leviticus, and shows that the Sabbaths there referred to did not fall in the right month. Quite correct. The Sabbaths there referred to were not in the Passover month. But then the fact is before you that similar special Sabbaths were connected with the institution of the Passover, as I indicated by the other verses; and, therefore, that being in evidence, and those Sabbaths being preceded by a day of preparation and the one in question being also so preceded, you have even more than is necessary to meet the case, and our opponent is no longer in a position to utter again what he has so often uttered, as to the time in which the Saviour was in the grave. (Hear, hear.) Then he asks, how can the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy prove the truth of Christianity? I look for practical results, and I am quite satisfied when these results are ascertained. I have never yet met a man who believes the Bible to be a book of prophecies which have been fulfilled, or are now fulfilling, who doubts that Christianity is of Divine origin. I don't believe such a man lives, or has lived. No man can be found in this country who so believes and yet rejects Christianity. And under these circumstances, taken with the multitudinous fulfilment of prophecy, I shall be willing to give up the whole case if a man can be produced who admits that the prophecies have been fulfilled, or are fulfilling, and who yet says that he does not accept Christianity as true. The men who assent to the evidence of prophecy in every case accept the religion of Jesus; and under the circumstances, with that fact before me, knowing that it cannot be shaken, I am quite content to leave the matter where it stands. I know what the result will be if I convince Secularists that the Old and New Testament prophecies are fulfilled or are in process of fulfilment. They would not withhold their assent from the Christian religion, whatever Mr. Bradlaugh may urge to the contrary. We are specially asked with regard to the Papal territory, and to save time I remark that the phrase "Papal territory" may be contemplated in two aspects. In one sense this kingdom, has never been Papal territory; Garibaldi has never been here and handed it over to anyone, but in a very important sense this kingdom has been Papal territory. The Pope has ruled here through a nominal king. The Pope has had England's king prostrate at his feet, and has interfered with the civil action of the people and the operation of the law. He has changed the laws of this country, and to that extent enslaved its people. In that sense the kingdoms around the Roman territory proper may be contemplated very reasonably and properly as Papal territory. Their governments were in a large measure in subjection to Papal influence and they were rescued one after another, so that at this date there is no longer any Papal power in existence which can enforce the Papal decrees. The Pope may still effect much by moral suasion, but he has no longer power to afflict nations as this country was afflicted, when, as I have said, its monarch was prostrate before the Papal throne. Next I am appealed to concerning the death of Christ—whether He died to save the whole world from the

consequences which come upon all men through Adam's sin? I answer—Yes, He came to save the whole of our race from that one result which came upon all by the transgression of Adam. But that one result common to all is not (as Mr. Bradlaugh puts it) eternal burning, but death—that death which overtakes us all, saved and unsaved, and which would have been followed by no resurrection had not Christ died. And the result of Christ's atoning work in this particular is declared to be that of bringing again from the dead the descendants of Adam. So that thus a justification unto life comes upon all, as did a condemnation to death. But that justification which thus comes upon all through the work and death of Christ is not unto eternal life, but only unto resurrection life, and consequently only amounts to deliverance from that death which by virtue of our connection with Adam comes upon all irrespective of our sins. The race thus raised to life through Christ is raised to judgment—each one to give an account of himself, and to be judged for his own deeds alone, and not for those of Adam. Mr. Bradlaugh is in the habit of urging that men are to be damned eternally for Adam's sin. There is not a line in Scripture that so teaches. I call upon him to show from the Bible that man is to be eternally damned for the sin of Adam. And if he cannot prove it let him not say it. (Applause.) Adam's sin brings all men unto the grave, but (as I said last evening) a justification unto life—resurrection—comes on all men through Christ, as intimated by Paul in 1 Cor. xv.: "For, as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." Here you have universal deliverance from the grave. It is clearly intimated that all who die in Adam will be made alive in Christ—but not all to eternal life—for it is clearly said that in the resurrection some will arise to everlasting life and some to everlasting shame and contempt. Thus you have the matter as it stands before you in the doctrine of Christ and His apostles. We have again been referred to Mormonism. My opponent says that I misrepresent. If I do I am sorry for it, but we shall then only be equal, for he continually misrepresents me. But he puts it, that I said that Mormonism did not seek to oppose the old faith. What I set forth was, that Mormonism did not come avowing opposition to Christianity, but that it put prominently forward leading articles of the Christian faith. That it largely neutralized those doctrines by certain additions, which tend to demoralize, is readily admitted. But, nevertheless, wherever it was presented among professedly Christian people it came telling of the Gospel, pointing to Christian institutions, thus laying hold of people in an entirely different manner to what Christianity did in its early days, when it denied the gods of the people it addressed, repudiated their ordinances, refused all compromise, and demanded that Christ be accepted as the one and only Mediator. Now, if my opponent can show that Mormonism came and progressed under circumstances at all similar, then in that particular he will have established his point, but until he does that he has not established anything, but only wasted time by pressing the subject further upon us. I shall have to call your attention somewhat further to prophecy. In doing this I shall come to the New Testament. We must presently come back to the Old Testament, and I presume there can be no question raised as to the existence of the New Testament sufficiently early for my present purpose. I shall accept any time my opponent may please to fix. Of course he cannot put it beyond a given date, and the latest he can suppose will fully answer my purpose, as the fulfilment of New Testament prophecy comes down to our own day. I come then to the predicted apostasy in the church—the predicted rise of a vast unchristian ecclesia*

tical despotism, under the Christian name, but subversive of its principles. Christ's own teaching in general, and his parables in particular, foretell this. But the chairman calls time. I must, therefore, leave it for the present. (Hear, hear, and applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —Mr. King says the definite article is applied to a Sabbath three days afterwards. I read the texts and showed what happened immediately after the definite article was applied, and the three days' intervention is only dragged in to save Mr. King from the position in which he has placed himself. He says the mere possibility of there being two Sabbaths is enough—that the argument is answered by the mere possibility of my being wrong. But then it is a mere possibility, and let us see what it is. He says that I carefully turned to Leviticus. Where should I turn but to where he told me? I turned to one—he gives me another. I decline to wander about through the book for his amusement. Curiously, the matter remains just as it did in the beginning. My allegation was, that so far from the allegation of Jesus being three days and nights in the grave being true, it was shown that he was buried late on the evening preceding the Sabbath, and that he was out of the grave before the night of the Sabbath was over; and if he can make three nights and three days out of that you have- it before you. You have Jesus out of the grave before the Sabbath is completely over, and the man who says the two *the's* apply to two different Sabbaths asks you not to judge the book as you would any other book, but to manufacture an interpretation to relieve him from a false position. Then I asked him what Papal territory Garibaldi handed over to Victor Emmanuel. He talked a lot of nonsense about England either having been or not having been Papal territory. What he meant I do not know, but I have got in my mind the precise territory handed over, and he has never yet told me what Papal territory he referred to. Let him find any territory to which his remark applies. I know the land, and the bulk of the laws of the kingdom as it stands at present, and I say they do not come under such a definition as he has given. I can't guess what territory he refers to until he tells me, because the explanation he has given does not apply to any territory; and if in a modern instance our friend breaks down so evidently, is it worth while to wade through the others? One brick out of the structure is enough for my purpose. Then he says—"Mr. Bradlaugh asks me, supposing Daniel's prophecy is admitted, how I connect that with any Bort of conclusion that the history of Jesus is of Divine origin, " and Mr. King replies, "I never met a man who believed the prophecies and not Christianity. " But the men Mr. King never met are not the men to quote here to night. We are here to discuss on a fair, logical basis, and I ask if the bulk of the men of Naples believe that the Pope was Divinely placed at the head of affairs, is that evidence of the Divinity of the Papacy? Surely if we are to discuss this matter at all, we must reason it out for you as a jury to come to a conclusion on the argument. Mr. King says, did I ask him if Jesus came to save from Adam's sin. No, I asked whether Jesus came to save all mankind from Adam's sin whether they believed in him or not.

Mr. KING: —Yes.

Mr. BRADLAUGH—Yes, he came to save them whether they believed in Him or not. Well, then, can that religion be of Divine origin

which has so much blundered that at the present moment the Church of England teaches the precisely opposite doctrine? Can that religion be of Divine origin in which so large a number of persons have been utterly misled by it? Jesus has come to save men whether they believe or not. Men are only then to be judged by their works. They are relieved from the consequences of Adam's sin. Then where is the need of teaching men to believe an impossible story and hindering them in that progress of life which they might otherwise achieve? What is the use of your chapels and churches if men are relieved from the consequences of Adam's sin? It is better to go with us who are unbelievers, living well here whatever may be your fate hereafter. Because, according to Mr. King's doctrine now it is not necessary to believe, though you may still do your work in life honestly, fairly, and truly. But if Mr. King is light you are wrong, and you have to consider whether the doctrine is of Divine origin which Bays that all who do not believe shall be damned. Mr. King chooses to say that damnation is not eternal.

Mr. KING: —I did not.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —The Bible says the burning shall never cease; the Bible says the fire shall never¹ be quenched; the Bible says that the worm dieth not; and I say that unless the words are a mockery, unless you twist all signs of English out of it, the Bible does teach that the unbeliever shall suffer the penalty of eternal damnation, and that there is a lake of brimstone and fire where he shall consciously suffer the pains of burning for eternity. If the Bible don't, say that I don't understand the meaning of the English language, and the man who pretends that it does not twists the English language to bolster up a weak case, and does not judge the author as he would any other author or book. Let us say a word about Mohammedanism, and mark how recklessly my opponent passes over everything that it does not suit his purpose to notice. Let me again ask him to quote the passages in the Koran which accommodate themselves to men's passions more than Christianity. He says that I misrepresent him; I don't know that I do; the report will speak for itself. As to Mormonism putting forth the leading doctrines of Christianity, so did Christianity put forth the leading doctrines of the Jewish system. It put God as the God of Moses, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and the variations were of a character not more diverse than the variations which the Mormons made from Christianity. Both of them stood, therefore, in the same relation, but it is convenient for Mr. King to forget that the whole question did not turn upon that relation, but upon his allegation that the numbers of the Christians were proof of divinity of origin. I say, take age for age in the history of the world and show me that the Christians were more numerous than the Mohammedans in the same period, and that argument has been quietly and completely overlooked, and I don't see how this sort of thing is to be persevered in. Then Mr. King says he is going to the New Testament, and he will allow me to put any date to it I please. Why, my opinion of the Bible is, that of the writer of not one of its pamphlets is there the slightest reliable evidence. It was written we don't know where, or by whom, and in the first times when you find it, it is mixed up with forgery and fraud, so that Lardner speaks of the use of forged evidence. As to the gospels themselves, I allege without fear of contradiction that the only evidence of the existence of the gospel refers to a gospel not alike in character to the gospel we have. I

ask you, then, why you put these books to me for me to discuss when you have no data for them at all. I won't have the book put in that way, but you must fix your own date for it. If you want the date fixed you shall fix it with all the consequences. If Christianity is of Divine origin, how is it that during two or three centuries of the Christian Church, certainly with little omission, you find forgery and fraud resorted to on every side? Why, if they believed it to be of Divine origin, and if it was of Divine origin, at least it must have been protected against these kinds of corruption in its earlier years. I ask that this may be met, and I ask that when Mr. King replies he will give his reasons why punishment should be inflicted upon all men for the crime of another, and say what Papal territory it was that was handed to Victor Emmanuel by Garibaldi—(Laughter and cheers)—and don't let him keep me driving away as I did for his views about eternal torments, until I found out what he was at. If he has made a mistake, I have knocked one brick out of the fabric, and the whole theory falls. We have now got a step farther. We have got to the step of having it taken as a part of Christianity that Jesus died for all men, whether they believed or not. I ask again, is that religion of Divine origin, which teaches that it is part of God's special plan that He should have for hundreds of years punished the whole human race, and that then He should let one man die to give an excuse for not punishing them any more? With regard to the doctrine of eternal or other torments, I ask, does it not look like the religion of a fiend, rather than that of a good and wise God? Is it a religion of Divine origin that condemns men for a crime they have nothing to do with, and then releases them afterwards by an atonement they need not be acquainted with? (Applause).

Mr. KING:—It might perhaps meet Mr. Bradlaugh's difficulty with regard to the Papal territory, if I ask what territory it was of that which was handed over through the agency of Garibaldi which was not under the influence of the Papacy and, therefore, Papal, as I have described? But, if it were proved that, in this particular, Mr. King had made a mistake—that he had made a statement with regard to that territory that could not be sustained—then, according to Mr. Bradlaugh, there is one brick out of the fabric, and the whole thing falls. Indeed! Nothing of the kind! It would, then, simply come to this—that a certain territory was thought capable of a certain designation, which turns out inapplicable. What a tremendous business to have called for so much attention! But mark, we have given you the prediction, showing that the persecuting power was to continue in that little horn kingdom for at least 1460 years; that that persecuting power was to be destroyed in a certain way; that there was to be a gradual consuming; and you see it has continued to the present time, so that whether the reference with regard to Papal territory is correct or not, is, so far as the argument is concerned, of no importance whatever. You have the fact, that that persecuting power did extend over a period of 1260 years; that it was brought into a state of captivity by the first Napoleon, but was allowed to resuscitate to a considerable extent, and has been wasting away till now, when it is no longer in a position to persecute the people of God. You know that that is established, and my opponent, it seems, does not intend to grapple with these facts. He has ignored every point in the fulfilment of prophecy. Let him endeavour to show that these things have not been accomplished. Let him endeavour to show that the prediction did not exist before the events by which it was fulfilled! He cannot, because taking whatever date you please with regard

to the Septuagint, and bringing it down through the time of the apostles, even then, the great bulk of the fulfilment of the prophecy comes down nearly to our own door. The comparison between Mormonism and Christianity, is brought up again, and you are told that I ignore the leading features in the case, namely, the comparative number in a given time. Well, I answer by what I have read from Pliny, that the numbers of Christians were then so great that the temples of the larger cities and smaller towns had been almost, if not entirely, deserted. Have the temples, the places of worship in London, or New York, or other great cities, or those of smaller towns in England, been deserted in consequence of the progress of Mormonism? Have you shut up any of the chapels in Bury, or have they been deserted in consequence of multitudes turning to Mormonism? If he can show this kind of thing in the history of Mormonism, he will meet the requirements of the case, but not till then. But even had the progress of Mormonism been equal to that of Christianity, what then? The mere matter of progress will not answer the case. You will have to demonstrate that the attendant circumstances were equal, and you find, and I have proved to you, that they are vastly different. Now, returning to the New Testament, I have to observe, that Christ's own words indicated that there would be gathered under the Christian name very much that has no affinity with His church and doctrine. The grain of mustard seed became a great tree, and the birds of the air took shelter in its branches. Even Secularists in the *N. R.*, quoted the other night, understood the parable to relate to those in the Apostate Church who prey upon and plunder the people. But the Epistles to the Thessalonians and to Timothy, mark this out, not merely in a general way, but by specifying remarkable particulars, quite beyond the range of human foresight. Only a few verses can we stay to notice. But those few foretell exactly what now prevails. So that when Secularists point to priestly wrongs and robbery and to other Anti-Christianism, existent under a profession of Christianity, they but show that the apostolic prophecies are completely fulfilled, and that instead of these conditions making against the truth of Christianity, Christianity could not be true had they not been realized. But let us read, "Let no man deceive you by any means: for *that day shall not come*, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he who now letteth *will let*, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of His coming."—2 Thess. ii. 3-8. Turning to 1 Tim. iv. 1, we read; "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, *and commanding* to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." Then in 2 Tim. iii. "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boast era, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, highminded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers

of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such turn away. " Here then we have foretold a dire apostacy from Christianity, specifying the most *unlikely* results. The apostacy was not to consist in an avowed falling back to Judaism or Heathenism, but to be in the setting up, under the Christian name, a vast unchristian institution, which would reverse great principles of Christianity, and establish a despotism that would exalt itself above all that were called God—whether kings and rulers (who were so called), or the deified souls of heathens. You will perceive that the description of selfishness and lust, in the letter to Timothy, is not applied to the *world*, but to the professing and apostate church, which we have already contemplated in its work of changing times and laws and persecuting saints. And surely the fulfilment is complete. "Forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats" has its accomplishment in the forced celibacy of the clergy, contrary to Scripture, which says the bishop "must be the husband of one wife. " That this apostate Christianity is characterized by a "form of godliness without the power, " precisely as predicted, infidels avow. Then as to the "Doctrine of Devils. " It is foretold that in the apostate church, the doctrine of devils would prevail. But was there any root in the doctrine of Christ out of which it could fairly grow? Certainly not. But the very opposite, —so much so that it could not prevail without reversing great principles of the Christian faith. Still this doctrine has been grafted in, and the fact is the more remarkable when you remember that the very existence of the prediction, in the hands of those who gave it admission, rendered its introduction more difficult and wonderful. But what is this doctrine? According to the theology of the Gentiles there were middle powers between the sovereign gods and men. Plato says "Every demon is a middle being between God, and Mortal Man. " He also says, "God is not approached by Man, but all the commerce and intercourse between the gods and men is by the mediation of demons. " He also intimates that the demons convey the supplications of man to the gods. Now, any approach to this doctrine strikes at the very root of Christianity, which rests upon the assumption that Christ is the only Mediator between God and man. Yet Paul foretold that this utterly repugnant doctrine of heathenism would prevail in the so-called Church. And so it was, for Constantine (and others after him) sought to retain the power of the Christian name while they were dressing up their shams and imposing upon the people heathen superstitions. Accordingly Eusebius quotes and approves the doctrine of Plato, and compares the Saints and Martyrs with the demons of the Gentiles, and counts them worthy of the same honour. Theodoret speaks of applying to them as to Divine Men, and beseeching them to become intercessors for us to God. Thus was the worship of demons revived in the Church of the apostacy. As the worship is the same, so it was performed with the same ceremonies. The burning of incense; sprinkling of holy water; lighting lamps and candles in broad daylight before the altars; votive offerings and rich presents as attestation of miraculous cures and deliverance from danger; canonization or deification of deceased worthies; assigning provinces, or prefectures, to departed heroes and saints; worshipping and adoring the dead in their sepulchres, shrines and relics; consecrating and bowing down to images; attributing miraculous powers and virtues to idols; carrying images and relics in procession; flagellations at solemn seasons, under the notion of penance; making a sanctuary of temples and churches; religious orders and fraternities of priests; imposing of celibacy and vows of chastity on both sexes—all these, and many more rites and ceremonies, are equally parts of

Pagan and of Papal superstition. Nay, the very same temples, altars, and images, which once were consecrated to Jupiter and other demons, are now re-consecrated to the Virgin Mary and other Saints. In short almost the whole of Paganism is converted and applied to Popery; the one is manifestly formed upon the same plan and principles as the other, so there is not only conformity, but almost uniformity in the worship of *Ancient and Modern, of Heathen and Papal Rome.*” Had we time to supplement these texts with others from the Book of Revelation, other not less remarkable features of this apostasy would appear as distinctly foretold. But we have adduced enough to show that to the Spirit, which dictated the Epistles of the New Testament, the future was as fully open as the past. (Applause.)

MR. BRADLAUGH: —It was not my difficulty as to the Papal territory. He made it himself. He instanced the handing over of Papal territory by Garibaldi to Victor Emmanuel, and he has not been manly enough to tell you in his last speech whether he abandons it. If he made a mistake why does not he admit it, and if he knows what he stated to be truth why does not he explain it? He says that Mr. Bradlaugh was not justified in assuming that he has gained this point, and why does not he attack the others? One falsehood at a time. Is it insisted upon as truth? When that trick is admitted as fairly demolished, then I will go to another. And I say that either Mr. King knew that his statement was true or he did not; and bear in mind it was made in a written statement; it was not an unguarded thing uttered in debate, but a carefully written statement, forming part of the proof of this prophecy. * Then when he is challenged three times as to his argument about the Mohammedans—another reckless statement—he leaves it utterly unnoticed, although reading a lot of rotten stuff to fill up the time, and although there were other matters which he had to meet. Then he gives us another of his illustrations. He says, show me the temples in England that have been affected by Mormonism, as the temples were affected in the time of Pliny, by Christianity, and then I will admit that there is something in it. That is what I am going to do.

MR. KING: —Thank you.

MR. BRADLAUGH: —You needn't thank me; you will have nothing to thank me for before I have done. In quoting from Pliny I fear that he had not the advantage of consulting Pliny directly. He introduced after the word “temples” the words “of larger cities and smaller towns” as having been deserted. These words do not occur in the English nor in the Latin text, nor in relation to the desertion of the temples in this passage. And as to the desertion of churches in this country, why it is actually printed in the newspapers of to-day that in many parts of Wales the churches are deserted and falling to pieces. In the *Liverpool Mercury* of this morning two or three instances are mentioned in which there are only five, six, or seven people attending the services, and in which the parishioners are afraid of the churches tumbling over their heads. I don't care about that as an illustration, but I know that all through England—I don't know from what cause—the clergy are asking why the working classes do not go to churches and chapels, so that here in England even the temples are deserted.

* See Appendix No. 2.

Mr. KING:—Have the people become Mormons?

Mr. BRADLAUGH:—Mr. King wants a lesson in decency, which I will give him if he interrupts me again. He knows through what books it is traced to exist—traced to exist coupled with the very heresies of which he is speaking. Celibacy is said by Mr. King to be opposed to Christianity, but in 1 Cor., vii. 32, we find it written: "He that is unmarried careth for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please the Lord. But he that is married careth for the things that are of the world, how he may please his wife." "So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well, but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better." I do not care to point out that the author contradicts himself—it is enough for me that he contradicts Mr. King, Mr. King has given us no explanation that can be satisfactory as to the Papal territory, and I may readily be excused for referring to that matter, considering that Garibaldi wrote to thank me specially for the assistance I gave him in it. I ask if, in dealing with this matter he has taken up a dignified position, why did not he say that he had made a slip of the tongue? Why did he leave it till the third night? Again I ask him for the non-existent "particular document", and challenge him to produce it. Why does he not produce it, or say that he cannot? I make slips sometimes, and apologize for them the moment they are shown to me. Any man may make a slip, but no man who is honest tries to evade it after he is tackled with it. Take, for example, the quotation from the Koran. That was a slip made in a set speech; but has it been acknowledged? Why evade it? And in the question of Papal territory he made a speech which might, under other circumstances, have misled you: and I ask you whether Christianity can be of Divine origin when its last result is an advocate who cannot adhere to the truth in support of it? I leave that and go to an illustration which seems to me conclusive against Christianity, and you will notice that Mr. King's time has not enabled him to deal with one of the scriptural illustrations I have given. His time allows him to go on reading papers, but it is too short to answer infidel arguments. In Acts vii. 40, we find: "Make us gods to go before us, for as for this Moses, which brought us out of the land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him." On turning to Exodus what do we find? We find that while God and Moses were on the mount Aaron made a golden calf at the request of the Israelites and that they worshipped it. I will read the language which God addressed to the people on that occasion as clear proof that this book is not of Divine origin. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Go, get thee down; for thy people, which thou broughtest out of the land of Egypt, have corrupted themselves. They have turned aside quickly out of the way which I commanded them; they have made them a molten calf and have worshipped it, and have sacrificed thereunto, and said: These be thy gods, O Israel, which have brought thee up out of the land of Egypt. And the Lord said unto Moses: I have seen this people, and, behold! it is a stiff-necked people. Now, therefore, let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them, and that I may consume them; and I will make of thee a great nation. And Moses besought the Lord his God, and said: Lord, why doth thy wrath wax hot against thy people, which thou hast brought forth out of the land of Egypt with great power, and with a mighty hand? Wherefore should the Egyptians speak, and say: For mischief did He bring them out, to slay them in the mountains, and to consume them from the face of the earth. Turn from thy fierce wrath, and repent of this evil against thy people. And then the Lord

repented of the evil which He thought to do unto His people." Now, I say it is utterly impossible that that book can be of Divine origin which represents the Jews as surprising God in the mountains by their desertion of the worship down below; it is impossible that that book can be of Divine origin which represents the immutable Deity getting into a passion because His people so deserted, and saying to Moses: "Let me alone, that my wrath may wax hot against them." I say that that book cannot be of Divine origin which represents Moses, not as appealing to law and justice, but saying to Him: "Think what Egypt will say about you," which represents the unchangeable God as repenting of the evil he thought to do. Now, I have submitted a case as to the origin of Christianity from the book itself. I will not trouble to deal with matters as my opponent has done only, I submit, for the purpose of wasting time in this debate and keeping in a certain countenance the ultra-Protestants who otherwise would be disgusted at his manifest heresy. We have got it alleged now that Jesus did come to save all mankind from the consequences of Adam's sin, although Mr. King has preferred to read a written paper in answer to the question. What is the good of Christianity at all if we are all saved, and can go about doing good because it is good and making the best of this life whether there is another or not? He did not trouble to answer that, but he read to us so that the reporter might take his words down without regard to whether they had any force in this debate or not. If this is all, it is a wretched thing that this debate ever took place at all. I am free to confess that the chairman was right when he asked us to refrain from anything like warmth in this discussion, but did he know what has gone about round this town as to the paper tiger who dare not meet this man? (Laughter and cheers.) David is coming out to kill this Goliath. What a pretty David! (Laughter.) Where's his sling? What was his sling? The Papal territory theory, which, when he tried to throw it, doubled up and fell on his own head. This is Mr. King's own case—not mine; and I put it to you whether, under the circumstances, some warmth may not be excusable in this debate. Mr. King chose to wind up the debate last night with some remarks about the question of starvation, and he put it as a wise and good doctrine to starve secular advocates because they only speak for money, and that they could starve them out. Now, I have come here to-night refusing to take one halfpenny from my Committee, and I ask Mr. King whether it is not true that he has written to his Committee asking them to make a collection for him, and telling them that he was ready to receive it. It would be no argument in a debate like this, but it is an argument when we are told that for nine nights a man living by his pen is brought here to be starved. Fortunately I can earn enough in the daytime, for my tongue and pen have not yet so lost their wit but that I can keep in sufficient cue to meet a dozen such Davids when they come out with their slings. David went out and killed a lion and a bear, and took them both by the beard, and smote them and slew them; but this David will find that the paws of the one and the grip of the other will be more than he can grapple with. (Applause.)

Mr. KING—It is not true that I wrote to my Committee to make a collection.

Mr. BRADLAUGH—I ask Mr. Martin to produce the letter in which it **was** so stated!

Mr. MARTIN rose to deny having received such letter, but was deemed not in order by the Umpire.

FRIDAY EVENING, SEPTEMBER 30, 1870.

CHAIRMEN—For Mr. KING, the Rev. W. ROSEMAN; for Mr. BRADLAUGH, Mr. THOMAS SLATER.

The Umpire:—Exception has been taken to my conduct as Umpire. Now, I must confess to those who engaged me, that I have yet to ascertain where my offending lay. (Hear, hear). [After commenting upon the matter upon which some persons had complained, Mr. Duckworth continued] Now, when I was asked by the joint Committee to accept of this unenviable position, I did it out of pure respect for the gentlemen who called on me, but if either Committee have seen fit to regret the course adopted in selecting me I am prepared to retire—(Hear, hear)—or if either Mr. Bradlaugh or Mr. King has the slightest idea that I have dealt unfairly with them; because I will not be second to any man in my endeavour to act fairly. Gentlemen, the subject for to-night is the same as last night. “Is Christianity of Divine Origin?”

Mr. Bradlaugh:—Having for the last of these four nights to open the debate on the question “Is Christianity of Divine Origin?” I don’t think I should do well to waste any of the half hour at my disposal by any other reference to what has fallen from the Umpire than this—I saw that gentleman for the first time in this debate. For my own part I am perfectly satisfied with the way in which he has fulfilled his unpleasant office, and I can only say that I should sincerely regret if any conduct of mine should even savour of want of respect to him. The question whether Christianity is of Divine origin appears to me to be solvable by references to the New and Old Testaments, which it will be my duty to submit to you in the course of this speech, and my first objection is that it cannot be of Divine origin, because it evidently was not originally intended for the whole world. In Matt. x. 5-6, you find restriction on the preaching of it, the disciples being directed in these words: “Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not;” and in chapter xv. 24, you find Jesus himself saying: “I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel;” in chapter xix. 28, He carries that doctrine further because He says “Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” In Luke xix. 9, you find this also brought out in the same way, where He speaks of salvation coming to a house. He says “This day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham.” I submit to you that the first scheme of Christianity, propounded by Jesus (if the Gospel contains a correct record), was a national scheme of salvation—a scheme limited to the Jews alone and not intended for all the world, and that the doctrine “Go and preach the Gospel to every creature” was, at least, an after-thought and, so far as we can judge from the Bible, an after-thought con-

sequent upon the rejection of the original doctrine by the Jews. In fact the original doctrine alluded to the Jews, apparently with very slight exceptions, during the whole of His life time, and it was only after His death that He had wider and more liberal notions. The second objection is this. Mr. King laid down the doctrine that all were equally saved from the consequences of Adam's sin, and this whether they believed in Jesus or not, but if you refer to Mark xvi. 16, John ii. 18, John v. 24, John vi. 29, 40, 47, John xi. 26, John xx. 21, &c., you will see expressed limitation of salvation to those who believed in Jesus' name; and I ask how that doctrine can be of Divine origin which preaches salvation alone through the name of Jesus when God, if all wise, must have known as a fact, that even 1800 years after the doctrine is supposed to have been first preached there would be hundreds of millions in the world whom that doctrine had not reached, and millions and millions who have died in the interim without having heard of it at all. (Hear, hear). I submit that it would show a want of conception, as to the wants of mankind, to issue a message of that kind. Take again Matthew xxi. 18 to 20, Mark xi. 20 to 24. I mean in the case of the fig tree. Jesus on a certain day was hungry, and He came to a fig tree in a season when it did not bear figs, and cursed it, and caused it to be withered, because figs were not there. Is it a Divine record which says that Jesus, the Divinely originated Redeemer of the world went to the tree in the expectation of finding figs there, and then in a passion at being deceived withered it up because there was no fruit on it? I say if you wanted an illustration that it was not of Divine origin, you have it in such a case as that. But go still further. Take the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 19, 31. This parable is interesting, because, as you may remember, Mr. King repudiated it, because I suppose he thought humanity a better religion, and I pay him a compliment for it. There is however the burning for ever, and I don't quite compliment him, because he says that people will be consciously tormented for ever, though he clearly denies the Biblical doctrine of people burning in flames for ever and ever. But you will find in the parable of Lazarus, that the one is not mentioned as having any virtues except that he was a beggar, and the other as not having any vices except that he was a rich man, and who in fact seems to have been tolerably benevolent, because Lazarus lay at his gate full of sores to be fed with the crumbs which fell from his table, which is more than some rich men would allow at the present day. Yet we are told that the one went to heaven, and the other to hell. The beggar was "carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom;" and Abraham was the man, you will remember, who turned his wife out into the desert. Lazarus is in Abraham's bosom, and the rich man is in hell, and now I must read you a word or two, "In hell he lift up his eyes, being in torment, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame." Mr. King of course says that this unquenchable fire does not mean everlasting torment, and probably he would tell you that when the man said he was "tormented in this flame," he did not mean it. He says, judge this as you would any other book, but whenever it is convenient, he says, you must not judge it as you would any other book. But the text represents the rich man in hell, and does it please Lazarus in heaven to see and hear him in torment? Can that religion be of Divine origin which pictures even the possibility of a man being happy in heaven for ever, while he can see and hear unfortunate beings writhing in the agony of torment in hell. (A voice "Yes.") Then th«

man who says such a thing is no man, and I'll prove it in a moment. (Applause.) I have a wife and children whom I love; I have daughters who have learnt to love me. Can you picture my daughters who love me happy in heaven for ever, while their father, whose slightest pain they sympathise with, is writhing in agony and crying out in bitter despair in their sight? A man who can be happy, seeing another writhing in agony, is a fiend in human shape that I don't want to speak of. I urge, then, that a doctrine so inhuman cannot be of Divine origin. I take next the parable of the unjust steward, as related in Luke xvi. 1. This is amusing stuff. "There was a certain rich man which had a steward and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods." And the rich man determines to dismiss and call him to account. The steward, calling his lord's debtors to him, said to the first "How much owest thou unto my lord? And he said, An hundred measures of oil. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and sit down quickly, and write fifty. Then said he to another, And how much owest thou? And he said, An hundred measures of wheat. And he said unto him, Take thy bill, and write four-score. And the lord commended the unjust steward, because he had done wisely; for the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light. And I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations." I want to know what sort of doctrine Mr. King will deduce from that—whether it is not a recommendation to a man, when he has got a quiet chance of cheating, to do so to make his position safe. If it means anything else I shall be glad to hear what it means, but I submit that this is one of the teachings which show that this religion is not of Divine origin. Next we refer you to Matt. xxii. It is a picture of the kingdom of heaven under the guise of a marriage feast. The king having a son married invites a number of guests. Whether they knew the kind of reception they were to get or not I don't know, but certain it is they declined the invitation in all sorts of excuses. Some of them made light of the invitation, until at last he got wroth, and in the words of the text "Then saith he to his servants, the wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy. Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage. So those servants went out into the highways, and gathered together all as many as they found, both bad and good; and the wedding was furnished with guests." There did not seem to have been any option left to the guests, in fact from a corresponding print of the same parable, they compelled them to go. All were gathered in, and then we are told that the king came and found one man without a wedding garment, "and the man was speechless." What could he say? That the servants had collected them on the highways? "Then saith the king to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth. For many are called, but few are chosen." Now, I ask, can a religion be of Divine origin when it says that many are called to heaven and few are chosen there; whose God peoples the world with human beings, having the intent to damn the most of them? Follow it out further still, and I will take you to a Book which my opponent has taken you to once or twice, Rev. iv., professing to give a picture of God himself. I have refrained from attacking these things hitherto, but, challenged, let me call your attention to the picture drawn of God in heaven, and permit me to ask if it is **within** the region of **possibility** that God could have originated **this picture** of Him-

self. "I looked, and, behold! a door was opened in heaven, and the first voice which I heard was as if a trumpet was talking with me, which said: Come up hither, and I will show thee things which must be hereafter. And immediately I was in the spirit; and, behold! a throne was set in heaven, and one sat on the throne. And he that sat was to look upon like a jasper and a sardine stone; and there was a rainbow round about the throne, in sight like unto an emerald." Now, I may be told that that is only a vision—that it does not represent any picture at all; but turn to Ex. xxix. 9-10 and you get that which is very analogous: "Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel. And they saw the God of Israel; and there was under his feet, as it were, a paved work of a sapphire stone, and, as it were, the body of heaven in his clearness." Now, I ask whether the book which represents an invisible deity as visible to sight—which represents God, who is not put as having body parts or passions—with feet, under which was a paved work of sapphire stone. But, further, we are told: "Round about the throne were four-and-twenty seats, and upon the seats four-and-twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment, and they had on their heads crowns of gold." Now, I ask if you read that in "The Arabian Nights," "Jack and the Bean Stalk," "Tales of Genii," or anywhere but in this book about which you are so credulous, the mere fact of finding such things in it would not be sufficient to stamp it as not being of Divine origin? Next we are told that "in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne, were four beasts full of eyes before and behind. And the first beast was like a lion, and the second beast like a calf, and the third beast had a face as a man, and the fourth beast was like a flying eagle. And the four beasts had each of them six wings about him; and they were full of eyes within; and they rest not day or night, saying, 'Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come.' And then those beasts give glory and honour and thanks to Him that sat on the throne, who liveth for ever and ever." Now, I ask you whether you can imagine such a picture as that to be a picture originated by the God and Creator of the universe? That being the picture of God in heaven, now take a picture of God on earth! I refer you to Gen. xviii., and I ask you to put the two pictures together and tell me if you can imagine them to be those of God? God is represented as appearing to Abraham on the plains of Mamre. I pass over the confusion as to whether God's feet were washed and He a partaker of the food, and I take you to the 21st and 22nd verses, where God says: "Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous: I will go down now, and see whether they have done altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not I will know." Now, I ask you whether you believe the Divine origin of the story of God going from place to place to find out the truth of some story that had reached Him? I ask if He is to be pictured as saying: "If it is not true, I'll go and find out what is." I ask you if it is conceivable that God could be pictured under such circumstances? But go further Still, and let us see how God and the devil are painted in this book, and if, you can make out from that its Divine origin? Turn to Job i. 6: "Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also amongst them. And the Lord said unto Satan: "Whence comest thou? Then Satan answered the Lord, and said, From going to and fro in the earth, and from walking up and down in it." I ask you if you can imagine children coming before the Lord, and the devil coming among them? I ask, what you think of the picture of the All-wise asking Satan whence he came. Satan had been about in the

world, and yet God had not seen him. Can a hook containing such a story be a revelation from God to man? Take now one of the teachings of the gospels. I will not read it, but I ask my opponent to say whether such a doctrine can in any wise be thought of Divine origin. Mat. xix. 12. Now, I have one text to which I would particularly direct my opponent's attention. Mark xvi. 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe. In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues. They shall take up serpents; and if they chink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover." I ask my opponent, if he be a true believer, why he has not fulfilled these texts? I ask, if it be impossible of fulfilment how it can be supposed that this book is of Divine origin? I ask my opponent, true believer as he is, I presume, for if not he has no right to come here to defend the faith without the text can be fulfilled by him. I will go a little further now, and take one other instance which would be conclusive in itself against this book being of Divine origin. In Hebrews xi., you will find, among other people mentioned as worthy of notice for their faith, Jephthah. Who was Jephthah? He was a man who went out to fight against the children of Ammon and vowed a vow to the Lord, that if He would deliver the Ammonites into his hands that "Whatsoever cometh forth of the doors of my house to meet us, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt offering." The first who came out to meet Jephthah was his daughter, and when he saw her he rent his clothes, and said, "Alas, my daughter! thou hast brought me very low, and thou art one of them that trouble me, for I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and I cannot go back and he did what he had vowed. Can that book be of Divine origin which says that in the case of Jephthah God had not repudiated the barbarous practice of human sacrifice? My opponent may tell me that the Bible sanctioned it. He may refer you to Lev. xxvii. 29: "None devoted, which shall be devoted of men, shall be redeemed; but shall surely be put to death." But I urge that that cannot be of Divine origin which expressly sanctions human sacrifice as a burnt offering. But now a brief moment and I will give the finishing touch to this argument. In the Old Testament God repeatedly spoke to Abraham. We read in Ex. vi. 3: "And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob by the name of God Almighty, but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them." If that means anything it means that God was not known to Abraham by the name of Jehovah. But in Gen. xxii. 1-1, you find Abraham calling a place Jehovah-jireh, "for in this place have I seen the Lord." Now, I ask you, how could Abraham call this place Jehovah-jireh if he did not know God by the name of Jehovah? And I believe my opponent, who professes to be a great scholar—and although he is not good enough to display it here, is a scholar by repute—will be able to tell you that the name, as the history progressed, occurs no less than 130 times in the book of Genesis. Then, I ask, had God forgotten that they know the name, or did he tell a lie? If you say that he forgot, that cannot be, for God cannot forget; if it was a lie, and not truth, that book cannot be of Divine origin which so represents it. Finally, as to sacrifices, you read in Gen. viii. that Noah built an altar unto the Lord and took of every clean beast and fowl and offered burnt offerings on the altar, and whilst the world was covered with rotting corpses, with the dying and the dead, "The Lord smelled a sweet savour; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again

curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth; neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done." I ask if a God of love and generosity could be represented in such a brutal picture? These are the grounds on which I impeach the Divinity of the Bible, and these are the grounds on which I challenge Christianity. (Applause.)

Mr. KING: —We shall now resume our argument. On the evidence of Pliny we established the vast early spread of Christianity, which cannot be accounted for without admitting the miracles. We cited Gibbon as placing that admission among the causes of so wonderful a progress. My opponent sought to break the force of this by insinuating that Pliny mistook some other people for the Christians, and then he retreated from his position so soon as I put a finger upon it. He also undertook to find instances of religious progress equal to that of the early Christians, and under circumstances which render them parallel. Mormonism came first, the progress of which, he implied, was thus equal. Then he refused to say it was so, and yet undertook to prove, that Mormonism had caused the churches and chapels of Great Britain to be deserted as the Pagan temples had been; and in proof cited the fact that the people of Wales had almost wholly forsaken the State-church temples and taken to worship in Nonconformist chapels, few of which belong to the Mormons. Then by way of proving that Mormonism had produced the change he insinuated that perhaps Secularism is the cause. In taking himself off to Mohammedanism he fared no better. He affirmed its like early progress and denied that its permissions ministered to the sensual appetite, calling upon me to read in my *next* speech passages from the Koran, just as though he supposed I had, in my carpet bag, that wonderful library of his, which betakes such special care to advertize in lectures and debates. But in reference to this point let me give you a few words from Bishop Porteus.

"Mohammed was a man of considerable rank in his own country; he **was** the grandson of one of the most powerful and honourable men in **Mecca**; and though not born to a great fortune, he soon acquired one by marriage. These circumstances would of themselves, without any supernatural assistance, greatly contribute to the success of his religion. A person considerable by his wealth, of high descent, and nearly allied to the chiefs of his country, taking upon himself the character of a religious teacher, in an age of ignorance and barbarism, could not fail of attracting attention and followers.

"Christ did not possess these advantages of rank and wealth, and powerful connections. He was born of parents in a very mean condition of life. His relations and friends were all in the same humble situation; he was bred up in poverty, and continued in it all his life, having frequently no place where he could lay his head. A man so circumstanced was not likely, by his own personal influence to force a new religion, much less a false one, upon the world.

"Mohammed indulged himself in the grossest pleasures. He perpetually transgressed even those licentious rules, which he had prescribed to himself. He made use of the power which he had acquired to gratify his passions without control, and laid claim to a special permission from heaven to riot in the most unlimited sensuality.

"Jesus on the contrary, preserved through life the most unblemished

purity and sanctity of manners. He did no sin, but was perfectly holy and undefiled. Not the least stain was ever thrown on his moral character by his bitterest enemies.

“Mohammed, during the first twelve years of his mission, made use only of argument and persuasion, and in consequence of that, gained very few converts. In three years he made only fourteen proselytes; and in seven, only eighty-three men and eighteen women.

“In the same space of time, our Saviour and His apostles converted thousands and tens of thousands, and spread the Christian religion over a great part of Asia.

“Mohammed told the Jews, the Christians, and the Arabs, that he taught no other religion than that which was originally taught to their forefathers, by Abraham, Ishmael, Moses, and Jesus. This would naturally prejudice them in favour of his religion.

“Christ preached a religion which directly opposed the most favourite opinions and prejudices of the Jews, and subverted, from the foundation, the whole system of Pagan superstition.

“Mohammed paid court to the peculiar weaknesses and propensities of his disciples. In that warm climate where all the passions are ardent and violent, he allowed them a liberal indulgence in sensual gratifications; no less than four wives to each of his followers, with liberty of divorcing them thrice.

“In the same climate, and among men of the same strong passions, Jesus most peremptorily restrained all his followers from adultery, fornication, every kind of impurity. He confined them to one wife, and forbade divorce, except for adultery only. But what was still more, he required them to govern their eyes and their thoughts, and to check the very first rising of criminal desire in the soul.

“With the same view above mentioned of bribing men to embrace his religion, Mohammed promised to reward his followers with the delights of a most voluptuous paradise, where the objects of their affections were to be almost innumerable, and all of them gifted with transcendent beauty and eternal youth.

“Christ entirely precluded his disciples from all hopes of sensual indulgences hereafter, assuring them that in heaven they should neither marry nor be given in marriage, and promising them nothing but pure, celestial joys, such as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man conceived.

“Besides the powerful attractions of sensual delights, Mohammed had another still more efficacious mode of producing conviction, and gaining proselytes; and that was force, violence, and arms. He propagated his religion by the sword; and, until he made use of that instrument of conversion, the number of his proselytes was a mere nothing. He was at once a prophet, a warrior, a general, and a conqueror. It was at the head of his armies that he preached the Koran. His religion and his conquests went on together; and the former never advanced one step without the latter. He commanded in person in eight general engagements, and undertook, by himself, and his lieutenants, fifty military enterprises. Death or conversion was the only choice offered to idolaters, and tribute or conversion to Jews and Christians.”

So much from Bishop Porteous. Now, in what does a system like that answer to Christianity? It is perfectly absurd to set the progress of the one against the other.

Now let us hear a few words from Paley.

“The ordinary experiences of human affairs leaves us little to wonder at in any of these effects, and they were likewise each assisted by peculiar facilities. From all sides the roving Arabs crowded round the standard of religion and plunder, of freedom, and victory, of arms and rapine. Besides the highly-painted joys of a carnal Paradise, Mohammed rewarded his followers in this world with a liberal division of the spoils, and with the persona of the female captives.

* * * * *

That Mohammed's conquests should carry his religion along with them, will excite little surprise when we know the conditions which he proposed to the vanquished: death or conversion was the only choice offered to idolaters. ‘Strike off their heads! strike off all the ends of their fingers I kill the idolaters, wheresoever ye shall find them.’ To the Jews and Christians was left the somewhat milder alternative of subjection and tribute if they persist in their own religion, or of an equal participation in the rights and liberties, the honours and privileges of the faithful if they embraced the religion of their conquerors. ‘Ye Christian dogs, you know your option; the Koran, the tribute, or the sword.’”

Further pointed statements to the same effect, I have here from the “Faiths of the World,” which show the complete absurdity of my opponent setting up the plea he has. Thus then his entire effort falls to the ground. Neither Joseph Smith nor Mohammed help him. Evidently he was trying to throw dust into your eyes, for with his many books he must have known the facts I have cited.

Falling here, he got savage with Daniel's beasts and horns. He raved and abused both the poor beasts and myself, which reminded me of the instruction given to a certain unprincipled legal pleader—*i. e.*, “We have no case—abuse the witnesses and browbeat the counsel on the other side.” The whole argument was not *worth his* notice, but afterward he seemed to think that he might raise a dust upon one or two points, thus showing himself willing to go into it had he been able. But he was not able, and, therefore, he represented me as setting forth that the persecuting power was necessarily to end with the 1260th year, and that it had continued four years longer, whereas I showed, not that it must *end* then, but that it must continue *till* then. A man's lease guarantees him possession of his premises for its full term, but it does not follow that in all cases he must be turned out at the moment of its expiration. The saints were given into his hands for that time, and for the full of that time they were under his power.

The New Testament prophecies were not so replete with horns, but still he was not comfortable in their presence. He turned round and growled at certain ultra protestants instead of answering the argument. He however did tell us that certain heresies were in existence before the time the Epistle was known to exist. But that would not serve the case, because it is not a question of certain early heresies, but one of latter fulfilment in a vast and formidable anti-christian *organization*, taking the place and name of the church and being in almost everything the opposite of that church.

At the onset he grew violent over a demand to be told what Papal territory Garibaldi handed over to Victor Emmanuel. Though given to understand that we did not say Papal territory in one of the senses in which the city of Rome was Papal territory, *i. e.*, having the Pope for its actual King, but in that sense in which England was a Papal country when the Pope controlled it through its civil rulers, and as were those

states or kingdoms transferred to Victor Emmanuel, in which the Pope consigned men to dungeons, by means of the secular power, for crimes against his laws, such as reading the Bible. Those *sections*, if nob so in the primary use of the phrase *Papal territory*, were nevertheless completely so, so far as affects the tiling under notice, that of Papal persecution of the saints. But it suited Mr. Bradlaugh to go over this ground again and again, because he desired to get away from the argument and to change the debate, as far as possible, into a personal squabble.

Then to keep at the utmost distance from the horns, he went back to a point duly settled the night before and talked again about damnation for Adam's sin and the relation of Christ's death thereto. I have only to repeat on that head—

1. That Christ's death saves *all* Adam's race from the grave, and thus removes the only penalty which came upon man through Adam's sin.

2. That the race, thus raised, will be judged according to their own acts, not at all for Adam's. Some will go away into everlasting life and others be subject to that eternal punishment which is awarded to the impenitent and unsaved.

3. That, according to Rom. ii., those who have not the law, or will of God, revealed to them, but who, by well doing, seek immortality (according to the light they have), shall attain to *eternal* life.

4. What then is the good of sending them the Gospel?

(a) Because it is right that men should come to know truth, and specially the truth relating to their Creator and destiny.

(b) Because that Gospel produces greater present happiness in those who believe and obey it than can be otherwise realized.

(c) Because though the faithful of the class referred to are saved from everlasting punishment, there is no intimation that they will ever attain to the *highest* state of bliss and glory, which is reserved for those who form the church and whose higher moral and spiritual natures (resulting from communion with God and Christ) fit them for that blessedness.

Thus then Mr. Bradlaugh's wretched burlesque of Christianity, so far as all human beings (save those who believe) being doomed to eternal burning is concerned, falls to the ground.

Then he represents me as arguing, that wherever persons believe miracles to have been performed they must have been wrought according to that belief. But my argument is not thus universal. I speak of miracles believed to have been wrought as early after the time of their occurrence as is the case with those of the apostles and Christ, and sustained by the same criteria that apply to them, which is a widely different thing.

He *said*, in reference to prophecy, that certain moderns had foretold events as remarkable as those cited by me. But he only *said* so, and that goes for nothing, and only requires in answer that it is not so.

We need a further remark upon the standing trick of giving an opponent a *peck* measure and then seeking to compel him to put into it a *bushel* of Secularist rubbish, designated *Scripture discrepancies*—the design being to throw upon him more than double the amount his allotted time allows him to notice, even in the most brief manner; and for the further purpose of keeping out his affirmative matter. In a printed debate I had in hand to day, page after page is thus filled. Just taking one page, —in *forty* lines there are *seventeen* distinct charges of discrepancy. In Mr. Bradlaugh's "What did Jesus teach?" in twenty-one lines I count

about sixteen such instances. In one speech in this debate I count nearly twenty instances of alleged contradiction or absurdity, and then vehement declamation follows because they are not answered. One of the number (the three days and nights), being particularly urged upon me, I dealt with. But, of course, when you take up one there is a reply and a rejoinder. In this one instance I have had to spend upon it certainly not less than ten minutes, and there can be no doubt that, upon an average, that length of time would be required. It thus follows that the *twenty* items thus thrown into one speech, could not have been taken up had I devoted every moment of the time allotted me during the two nights we debate the question on which that one speech was made. It then follows, that had I entirely passed *everything* else said by my opponent, and not offered one word of argument in favour of the proposition I affirm, that the whole of them could not have been attended to. I leave, then, all I have left, because they could not be noticed in the time. There is no other difficulty in the matter, and for this reason, that almost the whole of them are answered (in a way I hold satisfactory), in printed debates I have with me here. But I could not have got them done in the time had I merely adopted what is there printed and read it to you. I, then, hereby protest against the mere farce of demanding that I shall put the contents of a *bushel* into a *peck* measure, and then frantically screaming out demands to have the whole duly handled, complaining, whichever point is taken, that some other has been passed over. I am glad to have this opportunity of exposing so contemptible a trick, which is only resorted to to cover conscious weakness and obstruct real investigation. Now, I think it needful, before resuming the line of evidence I was presenting, as I could not finish it in time, just to notice one or two of the points presented to-night. I will first refer to Mark xvi., on which you have had several statements, and on which I think a very fair challenge has been thrown out. If we are the persons there referred to, I submit we ought to work miracles; if we cannot, we ought to admit that we are not the persons there referred to and give it up. (Hear, hear.) I accept that putting of it. Now, let us see who are the persons referred to, I read in Matt. xvi.: "Now, when Jesus was risen, early the first day of the week he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils. And she went and told them what had been done with him as they mourned and wept. And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not." After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country. And they went and told it unto the residue; neither believed they them. Afterwards he appeared unto the eleven (here you have the **ELEVEN APOSTLES**) as they sat at meat, and upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen Him after He was risen. And he said unto them (to the apostles): Go **YE** unto all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," &c. Believeth who? Themselves, the apostles, who were the persons commanded to go forth and preach the gospel to every creature. Then is added—"And these signs shall follow them that believe." Believe who? Certainly those who were then commissioned—the apostles? "In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues. They shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick and they shall recover. So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right

hand of God. " After the day of Pentecost the apostles, thus commissioned, "went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following. " Now, there was a peculiarity connected with the apostles (as you will find by reading The Acts) which points them out as standing, in a certain particular, in a position distinctly different from all other preachers. They were empowered to impart, by the laying on of their hands, the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit. Hence, then, when men believed their preaching, a result could, and did, follow which did not appertain to other preachers of that day. That result was, that those who believed their personal preaching were, by the laying on of their hands, empowered to work those miracles which constitute the signs promised to those who believe through the personal ministry of the apostles. There is no instance on record in the book of other persons than the apostles ministering the Holy Spirit by laying on of hands, and the apostle Paul teaches that wherever the Holy Spirit is thus received there is a miraculous manifestation—in the power of healing, prophecy, or other supernatural gift. Reading the Acts of Apostles through you find that this special power appertained to the apostles, and that the promised signs did follow in the converts made by them. Take the case of the church in Jerusalem, which by persecution was, with the exception of the apostles, entirely scattered. The church thus dispersed went everywhere preaching the gospel. The preaching of this scattered multitude was successful—many believed and were baptized. Did the signs follow in the persons of those converts? Certainly not! Among the dispersed preachers there was not an apostle and, therefore, no one who could impart the sign-power. Was there a failure then, as to the promise? Not in the least. The promise was given only to the apostles, and in view of their sole possession of the function of administering the power; and it applies only to the persons who believed the gospel from their lips, and who, consequently, were to receive the Holy Spirit by the putting on of their hands. There is the case of Philip in complete illustration. Philip was not an apostle, but he was lull of the Holy Spirit, and wrought mighty miracles. He went down to Samaria and preached Christ unto them (see Acts viii.), and the people hearing, believed and were baptized. But did the signs follow in them? Certainly not; for Philip, not being an apostle, could not impart the power, although he possessed and used it in working miracles. But in the same chapter you learn that when the apostles, who were in Jerusalem, heard that the people of Samaria had believed, they sent down to them two of their number—two apostles—who, when they were come, prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Ghost, for as yet he had fallen upon none of them. Then, upon the laying on of the hands of those apostles, the sign-power came upon the converts made by Philip. Thus the signs did follow in those believers who received power from the apostles. My opponent then has blundered by applying to the converts of all preachers, what was said only in reference to converts in contact with the apostles. The thing, then, does not apply to us, and, therefore, Mr. King, though a believer, is not called upon to exhibit the signs in question. Those to whom they were promised had them, and the chapter informs us of the fact by stating what these apostles did, and what results ensued. The last verse reads, "And THEY went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by signs following. " But it may be asked—If the sign-promise is thus restricted to the apostles, what about the preaching and the salvation; are not they also

restricted? Yes, equally restricted so far as that commission is concerned, and could we not find elsewhere authority for others to preach and we should not be able to prove the right of any save the apostles to engage in that work, nor should we find authority to continue it after their death. But the apostles were, under Christ, the legislature for His church, and they taught and sanctioned the preaching of the gospel by all Christians; and, therefore, on their authority, which is also the authority of Christ, preaching is perpetuated. But as they have no successors (to the apostolic office) the impartation of the sign-power ceased when they departed this life. (Applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —I never said last night that Pliny, in speaking of the Christians, had been mistaken. I never retracted my statement. The assertion that I did so is, to put it in the mildest possible way, an utterly incorrect mode of repeating what took place. On the contrary, I said I did not deny that Pliny said there were Christians, but what I did deny was that Pliny's assertion was any proof of the Divine origin of the history of Christ, as related in the four Gospels. And when he was charged with having inserted in Pliny's letter the words "larger cities and smaller towns" after temples, without authority, he might have admitted that it was a mistake and apologised for it. Then he says I alleged again that the churches were deserted and the Welshmen gone from the churches to dissenting chapels. I never said a word about dissenting chapels. I said that the papers of that day stated that the congregations of the churches were very limited in numbers, and that some of the churches were falling in pieces in consequence of neglect. What I did say was that the clergy of the United Kingdom were asking why the working classes were deserting the churches and chapels? If our friend has no memory, at any rate he should not have challenged me on this point. Then he objects to my reference to the Koran, but I did not make it until he had made a point of it that Mahomet accommodated his religion to the passions. I said I did not believe there were certain passages to be found in it; at any rate, after twenty-four hours interval, he might have brought the Koran with him to-night. But what has he done? He has only quoted Bishop Porteus, Paley, and "Faiths of the World." Would you take Voltaire as a fair representative of Christ? If not, why should I take Bishop Porteus as a fair representative of Mahomet? What I want is the fact in this matter. Mr. King says that Mohammedanism accommodates itself to the passions; I allege on the contrary that the Koran recommends sobriety, and reproves looseness of life. But, says Mr. King, when Mahomet was in his early stage, while he used persuasion, he made only few converts; it was at the head of his army that he made them. Mahomet, it is said, was a general, a warrior, a conqueror; but where did he get his army wherewith to convert others? Did that grow? The army came from somewhere with which he converted others. Then he says the Koran permitted its believers to have four wives. I forget, and should not like to charge my memory with the exact number of wives allowed in the Koran, but I know there is a strict limitation against a man having wives whom he cannot keep in common comfort. But does he mean that having four wives is an immoral thing? Because if he does I think he can read in the Bible of a man having several hundred wives, and a few hundred concubines (Lauh-ter). I think you will find David, favoured of God, was not limited to four wives, and that he borrowed a few of other people's when he was

short. (Laughter). I am not standing here to defend the Koran, but to urge that what Mr. King says about its accommodating itself to men's passions in order to win them, is not a fair statement of its scope. Then he says that Mahomet gave the persons of his female captives to his servants. Does he mean that that is bad? I shall be inclined to agree with him if he does; but what have we in the Bible? Deut. xxi. 10, "When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive, And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife: Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house." Then it provides that she shall bewail her father and mother for a month, after which, we are told, "It shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandize of her, because thou hast humbled her." I challenge our friend to show anything in the Koran which says that after a man has sated his lust in a wife he shall turn her out into the wide world without any protection at all. (Hear, hear). Well, I don't know that I need trouble you much further, but I think I may say that Paley would hardly be a sort of evidence that I should like to take for the Koran. I have read him with considerable attention and I allege, and I am able to sustain it, that he did not hesitate to do as Eusebius did, modify and suppress facts which did not suit his purpose; and I am afraid our friend has not been very strict in his limitation of Christian advocacy.

With regard to Garibaldi and the Papal territory I did not make a point of it. I asked him to substantiate the point he made, and he has not done it—he has not named the territory which Garibaldi handed over to Victor Emmanuel. If he means Sicily or Naples it is not true that there is any alteration of the Papal laws from what obtained under Bomba, and I say that the man who pretends there is lies. Now, that's a tolerably distinct way of putting it. (Laughter). I have driven our friend into a corner. I have studied the laws, and I know the Code of Victor Emmanuel, and it is not true that they are in any way changed or altered. The only thing that happened was the expulsion of the Jesuits from Naples; and so far as religion and religious dominion goes the whole of Naples and the whole of Sicily are as much Papal territory as they were under Bomba himself. I say that from personal knowledge of the country and of its laws, and I say that the person who ventures to assert that it is not so is bound to show me the decrees by which any of these laws have been repealed. Then he says that he did explain (and mind you he has left himself no loop-hole to escape), that he meant that the same change had gone on as that which had taken place in England, when it ceased to be—what? Can he charge such an act as that of Henry—in taking away the Pope's power, and declaring his independence of him! Can he point to any such decree in Italy [at the present moment? Why it is utterly monstrous, and no man with any decency or any honour, having taken time to consider, would come here with such an utterly lame excuse as we have heard to-night. Now I will ask (and by the way I am told not to be in a fluster)—I will ask you whether a man who devotes his life to platform advocacy, may not be pardoned if he shows some indignation, when he finds a man who professed before he met him to be far greater, —who actually indulged in talk about catching his hare before killing it—complaining of Infidel tricks, and whining like a beaten cur because there are so many objections thrown upon him, instead of trying to answer them. Why, I was held up through all

Lancashire as a coward who dare not meet this man, and yet here he is eking out his want of argument by that which only wastes time. If he did not know what he had to meet before he came, all his boasting was untrue, and if he did know, then he boasted untruly that he was prepared to meet me with all he knew of me.

But further, Mr. King says men are to be judged according to their own acts, and not according to Adam's sin, because the coming of Jesus redeemed them from the consequences of that sin. Now really I cannot imagine any man who has heard or read the Articles of the Church of England still asserting that that belief is a belief that no considerable body in this country teaches. Article xviii. expressly says that "They are to be accused that presume to say that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which lie professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law, and the light of nature. For holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ whereby men must be saved." And the declaration of the Church is positively that if they do not believe, they shall not be saved. Mr. King ventured to say that no clergyman ever taught this doctrine. Why Dr. Bailey, in the famous discussion I had with him at Liverpool, said that not only was it taught that all unbaptized children would be damned, but that if I had never been born at all I should be damned. (Laughter.) It is really a doctrine of the Church of England, which teaches in Article ix. that "Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and, therefore, in every person born into this world it deserveth God's wrath and damnation." Therefore, to pretend that no considerable body of clergy teach it is most monstrous. I don't know whether proof that Mahomet used the sword shows where he got his armies, but if it does, listen to the argument of Judge Stallo, used in the case of "Minor v. the Board of Education." It was a question of importance, and the Judge made this part of his speech:—"From the very moment the Church obtained civil power under Constantine, the general principle of coercion was admitted and acted on, both as regards Jews, heretics, and pagans. The first had become especially obnoxious, on account of a strong Judaizing movement, which had produced one or two heresies and many apostasies; and they were also accused of assailing (with stones and other manifestations of rage) those who abandoned their faith. Constantine provided against those evils by a law in which he condemned to the flames any Jew who threw a stone at a Christian convert, and at the same time rendered it penal for any Christian to become a Jew. Against the Arian and Donatist heretics his measures were more energetic. Their churches were destroyed, assemblies were forbidden, the bishops banished, their writings burnt, and all those who concealed those writings threatened with death. Some of those Donatists were actually condemned to death, but the sentence was remitted, and any blood that was at this time shed seems to have been due to the excessive disturbances of the Circumcellions, a sect of Donatists, whose principles and acts appear to have been perfectly incompatible with the tranquility of the case." I don't quote that as evidence against Christianity at present, because it is not the fair place at present to quote it, but I quote it as an argument against that relating to Mohammedanism. Mr. King says he might have read the printed debates, and thus put in an answer to all that I here

advanced. Why did he not do it, then, instead of reading page after page of twaddle, not having any earthly connection with the subject in hand? (Applause.)

Mr. KING: —The question is again put as to my not answering a multitude of questions which my opponent clothes in briefest terms, crowding in a larger number of questions than anyone can possibly answer, if nothing else were attempted in the time allotted for the entire subject. It is not a question of difference of language, though he does talk somewhat faster than I do. But, taking only ten minutes to examine each of his allegations, I repeat what I have proved to-night, that the whole could not be covered in the time allotted to debate the subject into which they are introduced. Therefore, when he puts it that way he knows that he is practising a trick and seeking to impose upon us. (Cheers.) He talks of my readings; but they present my affirmative argument, and his move is to crowd that out and compel me to reduce it to the lowest possible quantity. He aims at shutting it out by keeping up a running fire of questions in order to put his opponent on his defence in reference to more points than he can possibly handle. This is the work of a trickster, and not that of a man honourably seeking truth. (Cheers.)

With respect to Mohammedanism, I said that it was of no use to refer to the early progress of that system without considering whether an increase equal to that of Christianity had been brought about in similar circumstances to those under which Christianity at the first progressed. Now, the fact is admitted in favour of Mohammedanism, that you have the sword, and this was not the case with regard to the progress of Christianity early in the Christian Era, but the Christians were the persecuted, and the vast progress to which we have referred was not the progress of a persecuting but that of a persecuted people. In later times so-called Christians persecuted; but that does not belong to the time to which our argument refers. Nor was the persecution of that later time the work of Christians, but it appertained to that apostacy which arose out of Christianity, for which Christ and His apostles are in no way responsible. That progress referred to by Pliny was not helped forward by persecution put forth by Christians, but in defiance of the sword held in the hands of their enemies. I alleged that the doctrine presented in the Koran met the carnal desires of the people. My opponent talks about not producing the passage in the Koran; but he has admitted sufficient. They went forth, he says, allowing four wives; there might be a diversity of three or four; and that at any rate, in an Eastern country, would be acceptable to the passions of men. But everything of the sort was forbidden by the teaching of Christ. My opponent said, that marriages were discouraged under certain circumstances. Certainly, but in no instance did he show that the Christians gave the slightest liberty for more than one wife at a time. Therefore, had the progress of one been equal to the other, which it was not, the case would fall to the ground, because the two systems are not at all equal, and the result consequently not parallel. With regard to Mormonism, he has wasted a good deal of time. But I did not imply that the Mormons had got the chapels, I insisted that they had not done so. The fact is that the Welsh Nonconformists have become more numerous by far than the State Church in that country, and their chapels, comparatively, are filled. Even in the last session of Parliament we find members so alive to this state of things as to advocate in the House the dis-establishment of the Church in Wales,

deeming Wales more ripe for dis-establishment than England, because the bulk of the Welsh people are in favour of Nonconformity. When, then, Hr. Bradlaugh asserted that the progress of Mormonism had equalled that of apostolic Christianity I asked whether it had emptied the churches and chapels. He replied to the effect that it has emptied the churches in Wales. But did he dare to say that the people had become Mormons, and that that is the reason the churches are empty? He did not. Why, then, did he trifle with us by putting forward such nonsense? If the men who deserted the State Church are not gone to Mormonism, he knows, as well as anyone, that it does not affect the question. Therefore, having failed to find any parallel case, my argument as to the miraculous spread of Christianity in early times remains unopposed, and that is the only one of my arguments he has attempted to grapple with.

Then we are brought back again to his favourite book—the Prayer Book. (Laughter.) He seems to be desperately in love with it, and he tells us that the Articles set forth that all are to be accursed who presume to say that any man shall be saved otherwise than by the death of Christ. I have not said anything contrary to that doctrine, and I do not say anything contrary to it now. What I said was, that resurrection to life on the part of our race is a result of the death of Christ and, therefore, what I said is perfectly in harmony with the Article referred to. I have put before you that the heathen would never be raised from the grave but for the death of Christ, but that being thus raised they will be judged according to the light they had, or might have had, and disposed of according to their conduct in relation thereto, and yet that at the same time the blessing that thus comes to them comes not irrespective of, but consequent upon, the work of Christ. My opponent talked about the death of Christ being too late, inasmuch as millions had died before He was born. But then the New Testament also meets that. When you look to the Epistle to the Hebrews, with regard to sacrifices under the law as compared with the sacrifice of Christ, you have it distinctly set before you that the sacrifices under the law did not take away sin. They simply put it back until the time had come when the one sacrifice, sufficient to take away the sin of the world, should be offered. Therefore, in contemplating the sacrifice of Christ, we are to regard it as not only prospective, but retrospective—that as the arrangement under the typical dispensation was only preparatory and temporary in its results, suspending as it were the punishment due to sin till the ever and completely availing sacrifice should be offered, when those sins, of which, under the law, there was renewed remembrance every year, would be taken altogether and for ever away. Now this doctrine is not contrary to the doctrines of the State Church, though I should not care if it were, so long as I can teach it from the New Testament. (Applause.) My opponent has urged that Christianity cannot be of Divine origin because its founder did not intend that His scheme should embrace other than the Jews. If Mr. Bradlaugh so understands the New Testament he greatly misunderstands it. His mistake consists in supposing, that because certain texts refer only to Jews, and because Jews were first addressed, and the truth in the first instance proclaimed to them, that therefore enlargement to a world-wide mission was not contemplated. But you must take the whole matter into view when you speak of Christ; and whether you admit the Bible to be a book coming in any way by the aid of inspiration or not you must interpret its parts in the light of the whole. If you give me Disraeli's last work, and ask me to describe its leading character I must take the whole circumstances into consideration. If I merely view

the man in the light of certain passages, without proper regard to others, I shall get but one side of his character and a wrong conception of his work and design, and thus completely miss the author's intention. And this principle applies equally whether the book be of Divine origin or otherwise. Hence I remind you that when we come to interpret the sayings of Christ and His apostles we must look at them in the light of the scheme as a whole. Well, you have God selecting, for certain purposes, a people—a nation—making them the custodians of His revelations and bringing down through that people, in a given line, the person who is to be the head and king of a new dispensation—the Christ. Then you have, in keeping with all this, what might be very reasonably expected—namely, that the first announcements of a new economy and the first offers of its blessings should be to that people. And this was the case. But, mark you, my opponent evidently felt that his ground is not so solid as he represents it to be. After affirming that the idea, on the part of Christ, of setting up a world-wide kingdom was merely an after-thought, the result of his fading to enlist the Jews, he gave you to understand that Christ's teaching, with but few exceptions, confined the kingdom to them. But what can the man be thinking of when he reasons, or rather talks, in this way? Does he not perceive that a single exception destroys his argument root and branch? If Christ only once, before His death, intimated that His rule would extend beyond the Jews, then that expansion was not devised after His death. He did give early intimation of the subsequent universal character of His work. He declared that He had other sheep, not of that fold and that them also He must bring. His parables exhibited the wide extension of his kingdom. Early He foretold His own death, and He declared that if He were lifted up (that is, crucified) He would draw all men—not Jews merely, but all men—men of all nations and peoples—unto him, thus basing His world-wide kingdom on His own death. (Applause.) But what are we to think of the man who, with these facts before him, knowing of their existence as well as I do, and alluding to such like exceptions, tells us that Christ contemplated nothing more than a mere Jewish movement, and that, therefore, the scheme cannot be of Divine origin! (Applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —His contention is that we must interpret this Book as we would the last romance, or any other. Jesus said "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of Israel. " Why are you not to interpret other texts in accordance with that? Why twist all these texts into harmony with some others that Mr. King refers to? He has never ventured to show the harmony. He says the text "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned, " did not mean everybody; it only meant the people to whom the apostles were commissioned to preach. Very well, then, if it didn't apply to us what's the use of preaching the Gospel to us at all? Mr. King says that the Prayer Book is my favourite book. It is not. You rather find that the Bible is my favourite Book—I have given you a great deal more of it in this debate than he has (Laughter), and I only take the Articles because they are those of the Church established by Act of Parliament. They are not my favourites; I am trying to get rid of them; and to talk of infidel tricks because I refer to them, is an impertinence from the man who has challenged me to this debate. If you take out a pop-gun to meet an Armstrong gun which gives twenty shots per minute, and have to run, can you

complain and cry "What a shame!" (Interruption). I did not ask you to bring your pop-gun; you challenged me. (Cheers and hisses). Mr. King says I alleged that Christ prohibited marriage. I never did. I read to you from 1 Cor. vii. 38, "So then he that giveth her in marriage doeth well; but he that giveth her not in marriage doeth better." That is all I read to you, and without comment, and I did not say one word about Christ having anything to do with it. Mr. King says with regard to Mormonism that I utterly failed. He put it that the rapid progress of Christianity is a miracle and a proof that religion is of Divine origin; and said, show me the numbers in the same time and then there will be something in the argument. Then he read a passage out of Pliny to show the increase in numbers. Then I alleged that Mormons had left Britain, and that in Wales churches were deserted, and that is all I said about it. But then Mr. King says that he does not say that all the alleged miracles believed by people are to be accepted, but only such as are believed at the time, and have the same criteria as we have in the miracles of Christianity. Why who believed them? The people among whom they were worked always denied them. You cannot show any record to the contrary. I ask then whether all this miracle story does not fall down in the same way. Then he says I have admitted the case with regard to Mohammedanism. I have not. He has not ventured to give a passage from the Koran at all. All he says is, that Mohammed made converts by his army. That is inconsistent, for he must have had an army in some fashion collected, account for it as he may; and I do protest that it is utterly undignified to treat the matter in this way. If I had forced on this discussion for nine nights, he might have complained that I was piling too numerous objections, but he has announced himself as a David going forth, with sling and stone to slay Goliath, but his stone is not big enough, nor his sling strong enough, and altogether it is the wretchedest attempt imaginable. Now, what has he submitted as proof that Christianity is of Divine origin? I submit only a plea for admission of Mr. King's right to read his speeches. He says those written speeches are his affirmations. Of what? Of matters foreign to the subject in hand—a lot of twaddle about everything in general and nothing in particular. There have been great complaints, occupying minutes after minutes, about objections which there was not time to answer, and yet time has been wasted by a wretched assertion of facts without arguments, or of arguments without facts, to prove them. Where is that particular document which I told him did not exist, and which he has not had the manhood to say he made a slip in pretending to quote from? * How am I to deal with one who conducts an argument like this? Who, having been challenged a third time as to the words he put into Pliny's letter, did not admit that he had made a blunder. Why did he not do this fairly and honestly? Is this an advocate of truth who quibbles with it against infidel advocates? At least if he is the advocate of truth he should be true, and noble, and grand. But am I to take it as a proof of the Divine origin of Christianity, that after 1800 years of its existence God has only been able to commission an advocate like this, who has challenged me up and down the land, who talks about the difficulty of catching me before you kill me. (Hisses and cheers). If it were an ordinary man, if any fair minister of the town had met me in consequence of challenges in this town, and had to plead his unacquaintance with the general principles of debate, I should not have complained, but here is a man who says that he has the printed debates of Mr. Bradlaugh before him, and could have read the answers to his questions from them, and I

* See Appendix No. 1.

gay he could not, because they are not there, and he knows they are not. (Interruption). This is the veriest trifling. Is this the messenger of love and truth—of God's salvation to human kind—who trifles with this doctrine, who tricks with that, and who cannot let you know honestly and fairly what he really thinks about it, and does not know that it is a matter of heterodoxy we have to discuss. What does he tell you as to the parable of Lazarus? Did he venture to deal with that? No. He complains that he had not time, and takes up the time in complaining in which he ought to have dealt with it. I can give him at least 200 other points to consider, but he has not grappled with these. Oil, yes, he says it is possible there might have been three days and three nights between Christ's burial and the time he rose from the grave, and if there is a mere possibility of it why I must be right, and he is wrong, and this is the stylo in which we are to discuss whether or not Christianity is of Divine origin. There is a mere possibility in its favour. A mere possibility! And this from one who talked about infidel tricks, and who announced that he would put a stop to this kind of thing in debate! This is the man who introduced Greek into his first speech, and when challenged with it, steered clear off, although his great learning has been paraded about the country. I have no learning; I am a self taught advocate; any little power I have has been won by bard strife and struggling; but if once I could bring myself to believe that it was not dishonourable to suppress a fact in dealing with an argument, to invent a statement in order to hide the consequences of defeat, I would abandon the conflict altogether. (Cheers). At least if there be no penalty of shame in the advocate, if every Christian chooses to step back instead of answering face to face, at least let us be truthful and brave to the cause we have in hand, and when we learn to be otherwise we will go to Mr. King and enrol ourselves on his side. (Cheers, hisses and interruption). One moment more, and I have done. I know that for tonight this debate is approaching its close, and I don't disguise to you that I have ventured upon it reluctantly. I am never reluctant to meet a brave good man whom I have learnt to respect, but I knew that my opponent was neither brave nor true before I met him, and knew the work to be done; and if there is five more nights of this painful duty to be done I tell you frankly that I shall feel it my duty to nail down as many lies as I can, so that at the least the clergy who sit behind Mr. King shall be ashamed of the advocate to whom they have entrusted their cause. (Cheers and disapprobation).

Mr. KING: —I rather expect there will be some nailing down of lies, and you will see on which side it takes place. I understand there is a determination, if possible, to break up this discussion at the end of the four nights, and to set aside the other five. Mr. Bradlaugh knows why he introduces mere personal matters, which have nothing to do with the question. I should like to know why he forced on us, three or four times, the statement about my starving him out. What had this to do with the question, Is Christianity of Divine origin? And I should like to know why he, last night, in demanding of Mr. Martin a letter which aid not exist, put before you a most daring lie. (Cheers.) I should like to know that. Then you have the old complaint that I have not talked upon all the topics he has crowded in. Now his complaint relates to the parable of Lazarus and the rich man. If I had referred to that of course he would have complained that I did not occupy the time with some other of his numerous stock; because, as I have said, it takes ten times as long to reply to as to state

these objections. This is but a repetition of the trick. But you understand it now. (Cheers and Laughter.) Then he says, that I complain that he presents more objections than I could answer in the time. But why does he not answer the statement I made on that point? I put it thus: Give a person who is as perfectly competent to answer them as he is to put them; let that person talk as rapidly as any man can talk, and he could not answer them, on an average, in less time than ten minutes each, and, therefore, the objections alone would take up more than the whole time allotted me in the two nights, so that I could not by any possibility enter into a statement of my own arguments. Now, that is the real position of the case. Nothing is more easy than to make statements which cannot be taken up in the time. But I began at the beginning. I took up his statement as to the limitation of the Saviour's mission, the miracles, and the marriage question, and he at once complains that I have not referred to the others. He supposes, and of course that settles the case, that Christ came not but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and that He did not go but to them. But He took care to send others into the wide world. He was sent to them, and more than that—take the history of the planting of the Church, and it will be evident that not for years after the final commission of the apostles did they understand that the Gentiles were to have the gospel preached unto them—not only until Christ's death, but for a considerable time after, those apostles, who had the world-wide commission confided to them, confined their labours only to the Jews. And when in time the Gentiles were to be introduced into the Church, and Peter by revelation was directed to the house of Cornelius, the Church was not prepared for the change, and it had to be made manifest that God receives not only the Jew but the Gentile, and that in the matter of faith He is, unquestionably, no respecter of persons. Mr. Bradlaugh says that I made a mistake in attributing to Pliny words that I have been unwilling to acknowledge as wrong. The way he put it you could but suppose that I had put in words Pliny had not written. (Hear, hear, from Mr. Bradlaugh) But the words "larger cities and smaller towns" are Pliny's, and the reference to temples is Pliny's also, and, therefore, though by leaving out an unnecessary portion of the quotation (to save time) the words are thrown a little closer together the sense is not in the slightest degree changed. Pliny does, unquestionably, intimate that the temples were deserted; that the Christians had spread not only into the great cities but into the towns and open places.

I have one short matter to refer to in continuation of the argument as to the prophecies of Daniel. In chapter viii. we read that Daniel in a vision saw a *Ram*, with two tall horns. In interpreting the vision the angel said, "*The ram having two horns denotes the kings of Media and Persia.*" He saw also a he-goat come up from the west, having a notable horn between his eyes. The interpretation is given thus—"The rough goat is the king of Greece and the great horn is the first king." Then Daniel saw the goat break the horns of the ram, and the ram was powerless and stamped upon by the goat and the goat waxed great and strong. After this the great horn of the goat was broken and there came up in its place four notable horns towards the four winds (or quarters) of heaven. Thus far then we have the overthrow of the Medo-Persian empire, and the subsequent wide supremacy of Greece, under Alexander the Great. Concerning the four horns the angel said—"Now that horn being broken whereas four stood up in place of it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nations but not in his power." And so it was. Alexander and all his family were cut off, and the governors of provinces usurped the title of

kings. These were afterwards reduced to four, so that the four *notable horns* represented *Greece, Thrace, Syria* and *Egypt*. So far, then, the prophetic vision is completely fulfilled.

Next Daniel saw a *little horn* come out of one of the four and it waxed exceeding great. Now as there is a little horn in the preceding chapter some may suppose that the two are identical. But not so, for the one came up among the ten horns of the beast-symbol, whereas the other comes up out of one of the four horns of the goat, which was the symbol of Greece. The seat of the dominion of the eleventh horn has always been in Western Europe, over which Alexander's empire never extended. The two horns, then, are totally different—one has long been the curse of Western Europe and the other of Western Asia—one is the *Papal* power and the other the *Mohammedan*. In order that this may be clear we notice several items in the prophetic description:—

1. As to locality—Mohammedanism had its rise in Arabia. According to Rollin, on the division of the Greek empire among the four kings (or horns) Ptolemy had Egypt, Lybia, Arabia and Palestine.

The little horn or Mohammedan power then answers (as to the locality of its origin) the requirement of the prophecy.

2. It also meets the requirement as to time. It was not to arise till the latter period of the fourfold division.

3. It was to prosper largely and destroy wonderfully. Its feeble beginning, vast enlargement and tremendous destruction and subjugation of multitudes are the fulfilment.

4. It was to wax great towards the South, and the East, and the pleasant land (Jerusalem). The Map of the Saracenic Empire shows that its conquests were largely in that direction.

5. It was to be skilled in understanding dark sentences. The Arabians have always been noted for parable and enigma. The Koran abounds in the dark parabolical forms of the East.

6. It was to exalt itself against the Prince of Princes. This is a Scriptural designation of Christ. And His followers, in large districts, were persecuted by Mohammedanism.

7. It was to prosper much through craft. And Gibbon testifies that it was so. It was to destroy many by peace. The terms generally proposed to the vanquished were death, tribute, or peace on condition of embracing the faith. Thousands accepted the last alternative to their disgrace and ruin.

These are only a part of the remarkable items of this prophecy; and thus we find the predictions of the little horn, or Mohammedan power, accomplished after more than six centuries of the Christian Era had passed away. It was to be of *long* duration and it still exists, waiting the time when it shall expire without hands—it is now dwindling away as these words indicate—the eyes of Europe are upon the sick and dying man.

Here, then, we have a matter about which there need be no contention as to the date of the existence of the book containing the prophecy, for the prophecy brings us down to the establishment of a vast system of falsehood which commenced centuries after the Christian Era, which answers to the description, and still continues as foretold by the prophecy.

Then with regard to the three days and three nights, I urged upon Mr. Bradlaugh that all that it is necessary to show, so far as the argument is concerned, is, that the Sabbath referred to is not necessarily the Seventh-day Sabbath. If it may be another Sabbath, then, most unquestionably, his argument falls to the ground. I urged further (and he has taken no notice) that special Sabbaths are referred to, not only in the Gospels, but elsewhere. John also referred to a special Sabbath which required a special

preparation day. We read that this Sabbath was a high day—terms which do not apply to the ordinary Seventh-day Sabbath. So, then, as the matter now rests, he is not able logically to affirm that the Sabbath referred to must have been the Seventh-day Sabbath. He says I have introduced Greek. I simply introduced one Greek word, and I have not taken it back. My opponent has never said that the word was improperly applied; he has not said, and he dare not say, that I wrongly used the word. I used it rightly, and in place of an English word, and I told him why I did so. I said there were two Greek words translated by one English word, and I used the one which most distinctly expressed the fiery punishment called hell. He would now make you believe, if he could, that I introduced something I did not understand, and that because he noticed it I withdrew the whole matter. I affirm that I am perfectly correct in my use of *ge-en-na*. I defy him to say to the contrary, and I charge him with seeking to deceive you, at my expense, by his utterly false representation of the case. (Applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —As this is to be my concluding speech, bear with me while I go through it. Mr. King says I have challenged him with writing a letter which does not exist. Mr. King is a perfect master of language. I did not allege that it now exists. I allege that it did exist, and I am told that it was read at a meeting of the joint committee. That is all that I allege about it. Then Mr. King puts it to you, that if he had taken ten minutes to each objection he could not have answered them all. I repeat that you should not have challenged me to this discussion, boasting that you would drive me clean out of the field, when you knew that you would have to plead for mercy on the ground that you hadn't time. It is perfectly true that I did not want the four nights' discussion—that I don't want the five that are to come; but it is also perfectly true that I shall be in my place, and, I daresay, fulfil my duty as I always have done. It does not become me to boast as if I had met a great man, but against a small one boasting would be stupid impertinence. (Laughter.) Then Mr. King says that the portion of Pliny was of no importance. Why not have at once admitted it instead of giving me all this trouble. I only ask you to be truthful and candid. Mr. King referred to Daniel, and as I shall have no other speech I must deal with it now. Chapter viii. says nothing about an angel interpreting, and I ask our friend for the verse.

Mr. KING: —The 15th and 16th verses give you the name Gabriel.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —It is not true, and I'll read it to you. "And it came to pass, when I, even Daniel, had seen the vision, and sought for the meaning, then behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man. And I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision." There is no evidence that Gabriel was an angel any more than Daniel. It was a common name of men since Noah, and except for the purpose of showing authority for the interpretation there was no reason for putting it in *j* and even if it were so he has made a misrepresentation, because there is not the slightest proof, nor does the text show it even, that Gabriel talked at all. There is nothing whatever to connect Gabriel with the angel. Gabriel is a common Jewish name—so is Daniel. It is perfectly true that in other parts Michael and Gabriel are connected with the angels, but it is not

true that Gabriel is spoken of as an angel; it is mere looseness to try to give authority to the text—a looseness which has characterized this matter all through. What does Mr. King contend? He contends that there is proof of what? Proof of prophecy. It is utterly impossible to make out a case consistent with Mohammedanism. It is perfectly impossible, for the kingdom of Media and Persia was not existing when the book of Daniel was written. Mr. King says that Christ said He was only sent to the lost sheep of Israel, but he says He sent others. Did He? He said himself, "Go ye not to the Gentiles," &c., and it was only after He was dead that He said "Go to every nation, and preach to every creature." I object utterly to such unfair quibbling with the truth. Then Mr. King says, I have talked about his using a Greek word; was there anything wrong in using it? He says that in the Common Version there are two words translated in the same way, and surely you should not be misled because I took the Greek word. But what did I ask—where did he get the Greek word from? How dare he go to any other book. Did he go to the printed Greek text? And in his next speech he referred to some particular document, and I said there is no particular document, and he has not produced it. I don't know whether it is right or dignified to waste one further word to the other side, but I shall do my duty and address myself in the way which I have during the four nights been dealing with these questions. The first question is, "What is Christianity?" The second, "Is Christianity of Divine origin?" I went to the Bible to show you what Christianity is. I took text after text, passage after passage. I went through the whole history of Jesus from beginning to end to show whether or not it is of Divine origin. I very carefully quoted text after text from the Bible. It is not urged that I misquoted, or that one of my arguments was unfounded, and all that is alleged is that I was guilty of a trick in crowding in a number of matters that could not be answered in the time. That were a very good reason if he had not challenged me in this debate. Mr. King does not profess to be surprised. He even said that he had the printed debates, and had counted so many objections in a given lime, and therefore he ought to have been prepared to meet me here, and he ought not to have misled a number of Christian people to come to hear a number of infidel objections which he knew he would not be able to answer. If I engaged in this debate for any special reason it was, because if I entered into it Christians would come to hear me whom I could not get to come to hear me in any other way. I know that the principles of infidelity once heard cannot be forgotten, and I bring this propaganda before you with advantage, not simply estimated by my powers of speech, but by that weakness which is a defence to plead with you for my cause. I know your young men hear these objections to Bible morality and the history of Jesus who would never hear them under other circumstances, and if I am glad at all that such men as Mr. King should speak about it, it is because a brave man, as many Christian men are, with their bravery will hide the deficiencies of their text, while an opponent like Mr. King will add to the deficiencies of the text by defective advocacy. There is not one thing to cover the other, and people cannot help seeing it. If the people hear a man of courage and bravery—a man whose arduous life commands respect, then those who listen to his arguments are carried away by the largeness of the man, but when plausible arguments and paltry conduct are combined with something between a whine and a cry, no one can be impressed with the dignity connected with it. We seek truth, and we want men to meet us bravely, truly, and gal-

lantly. We don't want you to accept our unbelief unless you think you are choosing the right because it is right, the true because it is true, the brave because it is brave. I wish we had a better advocate here to-night. I have been an humble advocate for twenty years, but I wish we could command on our side more of that trained eloquence which Christian colleges give, the trained polish which Christian advocates possess; but with only the rough earnestness of truth, unskilled, taunted with the absence of virtue, reviled, and treated with contumely, we can hold our own, and when we meet libels face to face the proclaimers thereof whine out that we have crowded in more castigation than they can bear. I never feared a brave, true man, but I knew before I came that Mr. King was neither. (Applause and hisses.)

Mr. KING: —Gabriel, you are informed, as an angel, was only introduced to give authority to the interpretation. The introduction of Gabriel gave no special authority to the interpretation. It matters not if the interpretation presented were Daniel's own. It matters not whether it comes from an angel or from one who professedly, to say the least, is there before us as a messenger from God. With regard to the letter, Mr. Bradlaugh says it was in existence, and it was read to the joint committee. Such a letter never was in existence, and was never read to any committee. (Hear, hear). I affirm that there never was a letter in existence, containing that which he stated here last evening. (Hear). The whole of the letters are in existence now. They have been before my Chairman to-night, and he was here to-night to tell you what they contain; but the Umpire ruled that the matter could not be introduced. They contain nothing like the statement of Mr. Bradlaugh, and the letters stand there as evidence of his slander. (Applause). Then it was said that I have been boasting that I would drive Mr. Bradlaugh from the platform. I never made any boast of the kind. This assertion is merely one of the lies he intended to nail down. I believe no man living could drive Mr. Bradlaugh from the platform, because he would brave out any amount of infamy. More than that, I never said that he was afraid to meet me in this hall, and I have no doubt there are hundreds here who distinctly heard what I said. (*A voice:* You said he would't meet you). I said he was not willing to enter upon an arrangement for such a debate as would give time and opportunity for fully and fairly grappling with the matter we should have to take in hand. I said distinctly, that Mr. Bradlaugh, had no fear of meeting me, as a man, but that he did not want to deal with the question from my stand point and would not if he could avoid it. Again with regard to the matter of the challenge, I do not think it is a bad thing to challenge to discussion. Sometimes a great deal of good comes of it, and I should not hesitate to challenge a man with that object. But with regard to this matter I was not the challenger. His friends rose in this hall, and challenged me to meet him. (Cheers). I stated in answer, that though not desirous of meeting Mr. Bradlaugh, I was willing to meet him. There was considerable commotion, and as various efforts had been made to bring Mr. Bradlaugh into an arrangement I said to them (when they intimated that they would procure his attendance), that I remembered the recipe in Mrs. Glass's cookery book, "Catch your hare before you pot it." That I said on the ground that he had commenced negotiation and dropped it again and again, as his own paper will show, and, therefore, I supposed he might do the same in this instance. When, in the correspondence in the *Blackburn Times*, it was

stated that I pretended to be desirous of meeting Mr. Bradlaugh. I wrote to that paper and corrected the statement, thus advertizing that I was not desirous of so doing, but that I was merely willing. The proposals for discussion with Mr. Bradlaugh have come from the Secularist's side of the house, ⁴ and not from me. The first was persistently pushed upon me in Birmingham after my debate with Gordon, which debate was not of my seeking. Deputations from the Secularists came to my house and urged me again and again to meet Mr. Gordon. I had given no previous challenge to him. Finally I consented upon condition that he should have no part of the proceeds (not eve a travelling expenses), but that the money go to the Hospital. In that discussion Mr. Gordon was completely defeated, as Secularists admit, and it was under the influence of that defeat that a second deputation came to my residence calling upon me to meet a stronger and better advocate—Mr. Bradlaugh. I replied that I had no wish for further debate, no desire to meet Mr. Bradlaugh. But I could not get them to take "No" for an answer. At last I yielded to their importunity and said "Well I do not challenge Mr. Bradlaugh and will not suffer you to say that I propose to meet him. But if he, through you, challenge me I will not refuse, providing that the money terms are the same as with Mr. Gordon; that Mr. Bradlaugh and myself have no part of the proceeds." They subsequently reported an invitation from Mr. Bradlaugh on those terms, and our correspondence arose out of that. But he dropped himself out of it. At Darwen (out of my lecture there this discussion has arisen) I gave no challenge to Mr. Bradlaugh, but was again publicly challenged by the Secularists sending to the platform a written invitation to debate with Mr. Bradlaugh. Here, subsequently, I gave no challenge in my lectures to debate with him, and had not the most remote desire to meet him in Bury, as I greatly preferred, if we met at all, that the debate take place in Birmingham or Manchester. But here, in this Hall, the proposal to debate with him was publicly put to me by the Secularists. Now what think you of the infamy of the man who after all this, represents me as challenging him to debate in Bury—hunting him, dragging him here, and so on, when I am the hunted party, and he has come because his own friends would not let him escape. I am no professional infidel hunter, and would have gone my own way had they let me alone in the matter of challenging. Still I am glad we have met, and the inconvenient effects of this debate Mr. Bradlaugh will find following him beyond his expectations. Then he tells you that I whine over the results. I have not whined. Mr. Bradlaugh has been saying things as false and as hard as he could utter, but I have neither cared nor seemed to care on that account. He is madly savage because he cannot move me from my own calm and deliberate course. I do not whine. I have uttered no complaint at his brutal personalities. If they please him they do not hurt me. But he knows what it is to whine. He remembers the chastisement administered to him by Brewin Grant, when he whined like a whipped hound. Why, in that debate, he talked against using personalities, lectured Mr. Grant upon the need of gravity, seriousness, and becoming language. He became so meek and demure that one might have taken him for a methodist preacher of the olden time. (Laughter). I neither whine at, nor complain of the treatment he has given me (personally). Indeed I rather like it, because I am to publish this debate, and it will then appear that I have given argument upon argument, and have been met only with trickery and the lowest abuse. He says that it is nothing to answer objections. I admit that it is quite easy to answer his questions. Nothing now is wanting but time, and that I cannot make. I give the full

half of my time to his speeches, and I will neither be enticed nor driven to shut out my own proper arguments on the other side, however much he may rave. I have taken up the most important of his alleged discrepancies, to the extent the time allows, and I have destroyed each one I have grappled with. You may take that as evidence of the fate the others would have met, had time allowed. It is then, not from defect on my part that I have not answered them, but, by computation of time, I showed that a speaker even more rapid than himself, doing nothing else during the time allotted him in the discussion, could not go over the whole of his points; and if any man will tell me that objections of that kind, such as the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, can be answered in less than ten minutes each, including time for rejoinder, I say that man is speaking unthinkingly. He says I should not have come here if I could not answer them. I say that no man could answer half of them in the time allotted, and whichever half he left behind, he would certainly be met with "Oh he could not touch them." (Applause). I should not come here, then, because I cannot do what no man can possibly do. But there is one thing I can do, and though I make no boast of driving him off the platform, I can take care that this trick shall be well understood, and that it shall not be long before the possibility of arranging a debate, without terms which shall exclude this miserable trick, shall no longer exist. (Hear, hear). But the fact is that money is at the bottom of the whole business, and Mr. Bradlaugh is dreadfully savage about the money aspect. (Hear, hear from Mr. Bradlaugh). But, as I said before, I put myself in the same boat with him, in regard to money. (Hear, hear). I said simply on that occasion, as I do now. Secularists, I advise you not to pay Christians to advocate Christianity, and to Christians do not pay Secularists to teach Secularism. I said, let Secularists pay their own lecturers and let Christians pay their own preachers; and, therefore, what I proposed is this, that neither he nor I should have anything out of the proceeds of these gatherings, save our travelling expenses, but let my friends compensate me and his friends compensate him, if they please so to do, or let both be left without compensation; but at all events let each party deal with its own money. He tells us of his being put in a starving position, but my own relation to the matter is precisely the same as his. It is that which I wish every man to be placed in who comes forth in the position which I occupy, and which he occupies, in reference to this matter. Then I think that I have considerable cause to complain that the arguments and the evidence I have submitted have not been grappled with, —have scarcely been touched. My opponent has gone over his objections, and has occupied much time in pushing in matters that I had not time to deal with, whereas he ought to have dealt with my arguments on the fulfilment of prophecy, and to have shown you that they were foundationless. He made no attempt to do this. He has simply dealt in negations of a worthless character, and that is generally the infidel way of dealing with an argument which cannot be answered. I have simply to say in conclusion that I am satisfied with the general bearing of the audience, and also with the attention we have received. The Umpire referred to some matters in connection with myself. I have just this remark to make on one single point. I consider that he should have stopped Mr. Bradlaugh on several occasions, when he introduced questions foreign to the debate (as the starving question). I don't know what right he had to bring that matter into a discussion upon the Divine Origin of Christianity. But I am quite satisfied that as the Umpire did not stop him, it was not because of intentional unfairness, and I repeat that we

are indebted to him for the service he has rendered, and I trust that when we meet again, we may have the favour of his presence. (Applause).

The UMPIRE: —I have just two things to place before you before closing the meeting. The first is with regard to the letter, and I will make a suggestion which I think will be honourable to both parties. I suggest that the Chairmen, Dr. Scott, Mr. Slater, and any other gentleman that they may choose, along with myself, shall, during the interval before the debate is resumed, examine the letters, and that I be deputed by that committee to tender to the audience their opinion on the same. (Hear, hear.) Having done that, I pass on to what Mr. King has said with regard to the position which I ought to have occupied when Mr. Bradlaugh named certain matters. Well, I will tell you the way in which I stood. I had on my left hand Mr. King's chairman. He never uttered a word; he never signaled that he was dissatisfied; he never made any motion whatever calculated to show to me that his opinion was unfavourable; and, therefore, while he did not move I did not think it was proper for me to do so. Well, now, gentlemen, let us after all sum up and say, that I really would rather we had personal matters kept out of the question—(Cheers)—and let us each, as far as possible, give both disputants the right time and fair play. Let them each address themselves to the subject in hand, and they will offer an example of fair play to all present and to all the inhabitants of Bury. (Applause.) I have only now to declare this meeting adjourned.

Mr. BRADLAUGH moved and Mr. KING seconded a vote of thanks to the Umpire and the Chairmen who had presided during the four nights' debate, which having been passed, the assembly dispersed to resume October, 1870.

END OF SECOND SUBJECT.

SECULARISM—WHAT CAN IT DO FOR MAN THAT
CHRISTIANITY CANNOT?

REPORT OF A
PUBLIC DISCUSSION

BETWEEN

DAVID KING,

*Of Birmingham, Evangelist, and Editor of the
BRITISH HARBINGER, and*

CHARLES BRADLAUGH,

*Of London, President of the National Secular Society, and
Editor of the NATIONAL REFORMER,*

HELD IN THE

CO-OPERATIVE HALL, BURY.

TUESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 25th, 1870.

—:O:—

UMPIRE—JOHN DUCKWORTH, ESQ.

CHAIRMEN—For Mr. KING, Rev. Dr. SCOTT; for Mr. BRADLAUGH, Mr.
THOMAS SLATER.

The UMPIRE:—Ladies and gentlemen, all of you who were present at the last meeting for debate, in September, will remember that at the close of the meeting a committee was formed with reference to the question of the existence of a letter (as alleged by Mr. Bradlaugh), in which Mr. King asked his committee to make a collection for him. I must tell you that a committee meeting was held on the 9th of October, 1870, when there were present: Rev. Dr. Scott, Rev. Mr. Roseman, Mr. Thos. Slater, Mr. William Coates, and Mr. John Duckworth. Mr. Martin was also present, as owner of the letter which gave rise to the above committee. The committee carefully put aside all matters not strictly bearing on the disputed point, but held itself closely to Mr. Bradlaugh's question and Mr. King's reply. Mr. Bradlaugh's question was this—"I ask Mr. King whether it is not true that he has written to his committee, asking them to make a collection for him, and telling them he was ready to receive it?" Mr. King replied—"It is not true that I wrote to my committee asking them to make a collection?" Mr. Bradlaugh then said "I ask Mr. Martin to produce the letter in which it was so stated?" At the request of the committee Mr. Martin handed over a letter, which letter was carefully read, and its contents as carefully discussed,—finally, it was unanimously agreed that it was *the letter* which had given rise to Mr. Bradlaugh's question. The committee agreed upon the following resolution:—Moved by the Rev. Dr. Scott, seconded by Mr. William Coates—"That this meeting having read Mr. Bradlaugh's statement and the letter from Mr. King on which it was founded, unanimously agree to request the Umpire

to read to the meeting on the 25th instant not only Mr. Bradlaugh's charge, but also Mr. King's letter of the 5th of April, referring to money; to express regret that the subject had been noticed, and to state that in the united judgment of the committee, Mr. Bradlaugh's statement is not sustained by Mr. King's letter. (Applause.) I would further say that the committee did not doubt but that Mr. Bradlaugh had been told that Mr. King had asked for a collection. *Now*, having thus placed the matter before the audience, I hope that both disputants will be perfectly satisfied with the verdict of the committee, and that the matter will now drop. I assure you that it has been the wish of the committee, who sat so unanimously and so comfortably, that both parties should have a fair and full hearing so far as they were concerned: and I am happy to say that the committee were perfectly agreed as to the course to be adopted. The subject for discussion to night is "What is Secularism; and what can it do for man that Christianity cannot?" and I call upon Mr. Slater to state the reasons why a change in the programme has been made.

Mr. SLATER: —Mr. Umpire, ladies, and gentlemen, I have simply to say that, on account of medical advice, Mr. Bradlaugh is induced to refrain from continuing the discussion for five nights successively; and in order to meet, as we thought, the wishes of the other side, we conceded that they should take what subject they liked for discussion. They have resolved that "Secularism" shall be the question for to-night and to-morrow, in place of the question "What are the legitimate effects of Christianity?" I have likewise to say, in order that there may be no misunderstanding, that Mr. Bradlaugh has put aside other engagements intervening between this night and next Thursday week, with the exception of one discourse on Sunday night. I have likewise to say that Mr. Bradlaugh will be prepared to complete the discussion at any time the other party may choose, leaving out those announcements already made in the *National Reformer*; so that it will be seen we have no desire to blink the question, but wish the whole subject, as announced, to be fully considered. We do not demand any expenses for Mr. Bradlaugh, on account of his journey from and to London on his third visit. The matter is now before you, and I hope you will accept that explanation; and I now beg to introduce Mr. Bradlaugh to your notice.

Rev. Dr. SCOTT: —As the matter has been put very fairly before you, and every moment of our time to-night is valuable for the debate, I shall not trouble you with any remarks.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —Mr. Umpire and friends, I cannot help expressing my personal regret that any want upon my side should be the cause of any change in your programme, but I so seldom make public duty subservient to my private convenience, that I trust those who have the smallest acquaintance with me will believe that I should not have insisted on this occasion had I not found it most material to the preservation of my throat. I wont waste one word further upon that, except to say that I have already been obliged to break two lecturing engagements during the last fortnight, and also to postpone eight or nine lectures which stood for delivery during the next fortnight, including two nights' debate at Holywell; and I say that not seeking to make an apology or excuse, but because I think when a man makes an engagement with the public he

ought to give at any rate some reason why that arrangement is departed from. The subject for this evening's debate is changed, and from its very nature there is not the slightest unfairness in this, because otherwise the postponement would have been the postponement of that which in any discussion I am bound to defend. The question, therefore, is "What is Secularism; what can it do for the world that Christianity cannot? " Now the only difficulty which arises on this question is the preliminary difficulty in defining Secularism, when one is compelled to accompany the definition with a declaration that it has not, and cannot, by its very nature, have any sort of definite and limited programme, which shall be the same ten years hence as it is to-day. The broad principle which I shall put to you will be the same. But the contention of Secularism is that each day's knowledge, each day's enquiry, each day's thought, may convince you of the truth of some matter of which you were heretofore ignorant, or of an error in some matter upon which you held there was no possibility of doubt. It would be unfair in me to disguise from you that by Secularism I mean and contend a position that is adverse to all the religious teachings of the world. It has been put in the Principles of the National Secular Society as clearly and distinctly as it is possible to put it, and I will read these to you, because they will form, to a great extent, the basis for the whole of my speech. "This Association declares that the promotion of human improvement and happiness is the highest duty. That the theological teachings of the world have been and are most powerfully obstructive of human improvement and happiness; human activity being guided and increased by a consciousness of the facts of existence, while it is misguided and impeded in the most mischievous manner when the intellect is warped or prostrated by childish and absurd superstitions. That in order to promote effectually the improvement and happiness of mankind, every individual of the human family ought to be well placed and well instructed, and all who are of a suitable age ought to be suitably employed for their own and the general good. That human improvement and happiness cannot be effectually promoted without civil and religious liberty, and that, therefore, it is the duty of every individual—a duty to be practically recognised by every member of this association—to actively attack all barriers to equal freedom of thought and utterance for all upon political and theological subjects. " Now, these are the principles of the National Secular Society, and they contain that morality which means nothing more and nothing less than that which effects the greatest good for the greatest number, and with the least injury to any, and which should be, of a surety, when found worked out by everybody who professes to be enrolled under its banner. And Secularism teaches this—that there is no man who can by any possibility give you the whole truth upon all subjects—that there are very few men who can give you the whole truth upon any particular subject, even when they have made it their especial study, and that to gather the truth upon any subject you must gather it from all men, from all ages, from all sects, from all churches, finding in all some good, and applying the best knowledge of the best men for the adaptation of that good to your own improvement and the improvement of your fellows. (Hear, hear.) Now, I shall not at present put to you any further than that, the mere theory of Secularism—rather waiting until I hear it attacked. But shall apply myself to that special portion of the question—"What has Secularism done, or what can it do for you that Christianity cannot? " Now, I think that the best evidence of what Secularism can do for the world will be to show you what it has done, because there can be no fairer test

of the ability of a system to accomplish its work than that which has resulted from it. And pardon my using the word "system," because it is a word forced upon me by the exigencies of language rather than by anything else. If you say party in lieu of system, or accept the word system as only an enunciation of the ideas of that party, I am content with the word; but if you mean by system that a hue shall be drawn round us as a circle outside of which you can find nothing, I object, because we belong to a party that professes its ability every day to enlarge that line, and to take every day more of the facts of the world to its use than yesterday. Now I will tell you one thing which Secularism can do that Christianity cannot, or has not,—that is educate the mass of the peoples, and so fit them day by day for the work they have to do. The evidence of that is unfortunately too clear. The evidence of it may be found in many parts of those countries where people are most religious—where no Infidelity obtains; for there they are the most ignorant, the most degraded, the most wretched, and in countries where the people are most professedly Christian they are also the most ignorant, the least educated. And if you go back for 300 or 400 years, to a time when there was no active and avowed Infidel propaganda in Europe, you find that the people did not know how to read or write, or in any way participate in the advantages of the civilization of the world. This will be the case which I will present to you, and I'll apply it first to England. The least Infidel population in England is the agricultural. There there is no division; there there are no subscribers to the *National Reformer* to be found; there there are no men, or at least so few as to be hardly perceptible, who are purchasers of Paine's works, or readers of Voltaire. Take the whole of the population of Wiltshire, or Dorset, or Somerset, or Essex, or Hertford, there would not be one in fifty that had heard of Strauss, or of Forbach, or of Kant. These would all be words or sounds without any sort of connecting idea. They do know the Church of England; they have seen the parson. They do know the Squire, and they open the gate to him. They know that they ought to hold themselves reverently toward their spiritual pastors, and behave respectfully to all their betters. They know that they must be baptized; when their wives bring them children they must be brought to church, and other interesting facts of that kind, and that is the sum and substance of their religion, yet everyone would be shocked at the supposition of there being atheists among them. If you ask them what they are, they say Christians. They will pray to any extent, believe anything the parson likes to preach, but as to knowledge they have not got it. Take, then, if you please, as an illustration, the state of the most religious countries in Europe—I mean places where people believe the most and pray the most. I have a little experience of Spain; I have a great deal of experience of Sicily and Naples: and I can say that in Sicily and Naples I have seen praying and profession of faith at the shortest notice, and under the slightest circumstances, and the mass of the people would be utterly horrified at the notion of having anything to do with a disbeliever. And yet what is their condition? A condition of the most wretched ignorance. What is the state of things in our own country? Take, if you please, Dorking, in Norfolk, and I am about to quote from the Rev. James Frazer's report to the House of Commons. He speaks there of the state of the people as a disgrace to any Christian community. He says that in one small chamber persons of one, two, and three generations were huddled together, and all the operations of the toilet, dressing, undressing births and deaths, were performed by each

within the hearing and sight of all, and children of both sexes of the ages of 13 and 14, occupy the same bedroom. He says that there "human nature is degraded below the level of the swine;" and this in a portion of the country where infidelity has never been able to penetrate at all, where the Church holds its own religion triumphantly and Secularism and Infidelity have been able to do nothing. But take, if you please, as a set off, the growth of education amongst the masses of the people in England. It is a very limited growth among the mass of the people, and limited to the last 150 years, and it has been effected chiefly during the last three or four generations. One body of men to whom probably we owe a great deal of education is the Unitarian body, at the time when they stood in relation to society very nearly in the same position as we stand in relation to it to-day. But the effectuation of education to-day was done by the Socialistic and Owenite party, who did more than any other body in the State to lay the foundation of an educational system which will grow in England. But what I wish to point out is this, that evidently all this could not be the result of Christianity, because, after Christianity had existed 1500 years (that is going 370 years back), you come to a state of things in England when there is not one out of a thousand of the working classes who know how to read and write. Well, all I can say is, that if Christianity could educate the people before, it is a pity it did not, and that it only began to try to do it when it found that infidelity was taking the work out of its hands. Then we will put the question of education aside for a moment. I don't mean to rest my case there; I have only thrown out this as a point for your consideration, and I have a few stronger facts to bring to bear than those I have already submitted to your notice. I will now take the question of slavery. Now, slavery is utterly inconsistent with Secularism. It is a purely religious institution. So far as Christianity is concerned it is part and parcel of it. It is enacted in the Old Testament and it was never repealed in the New. In the Old Testament God provides that men may buy slaves, sell slaves, breed slaves, and keep slaves for ever: and Jesus never revokes that provision in the New Testament. Now, when did men first begin to think of giving freedom to slaves? When men were disposed towards infidelity. And William Wilberforce, in February, 1796, when moving in the House of Commons for leave to introduce a bill to amend the laws relating to the West Indian slave trade, reminded the House that what they were pleased to call anarchic infidel France had given freedom to her slaves, while Christian and monarchic England had kept them in serfdom. Now, I put it to you that it is inconsistent with the true doctrine of Christianity to give freedom to the slave, and that it is only an infidel institution—which claims liberty of thought, which cannot be, or be effected, without liberty of body accompanying it—that can come forward and give freedom to men. The doctrine of religion is what God regulated, what God provided, and in fact, one of its distinct teachings is that men should be contented with the lot of life in which they are placed by Providence. Secularism says that it is a crime to be contented with your lot in life unless that lot brings you healthy food, healthy clothing, and shelter, and in addition leisure, in which you may and do cultivate yourselves and make yourselves better and more useful, in which you may benefit your wives and families, and devote yourselves to finding out those things that will tend to improve the condition of yourselves and your fellows. Here is the distinction between the two—Secularism and Christianity. Christianity says, if you are in any difficulty pray to God, and

He will remedy it. Secularism says, if there is a lump of mud in the way shovel it out, for if we don't Providence will never remove it; and the proof of it is that it never will because it never hag. (Cheers and disapprobation). Another point is, woman's enfranchisement. Secularism does that for woman that Christianity could not, or would not, because the Bible places woman in an inferior position. The Old Testament treated her as something merely to gratify man's passion; to breed children for him; and it never dealt with her as a human being, fairly and truly. Some of the passages in the Old Testament are so shocking that one wonders how an English mother could ever allow it to come into her daughters' hands. Now, Secularism has made the enfranchisement of women possible, and it is with heretic notions that the utilising of women's work and abilities has made progress in the world—woman in connection with medicine, woman in connection with occupations of life in which independence, and self-reliance, such as men have in their sphere, has figured only in proportion to the growth of heresy, and figured most in countries where heresy has most obtained. And you will find in the present day, in connection with this great institution, that the men who opposed the enfranchisement of woman—even to the extent of the Married Women's Property Bill in the House of Lords—are the people most associated with the religious systems of the country. I allege to you that Secularists seek to provide for woman a fitting place in society, where religion would have treated her as something very much less than man. On this point, though I cannot repeat the passages, I was shocked to find that the New Testament, which is a later development, is in this respect nearly as much wanting in its appreciation of humanity as the Pentateuch itself. Then in regard to the mere matter of civil liberty Secularism gives to man the right to contend for individual right, and to perform individual duty in a way which Christianity not only did not, and could not, but in a way to which Christianity is entirely opposed. If you have a bad King you must not meddle with him; you must be obedient and submit yourselves to the powers that be. If you have a bad one you are bound to submit to him—that is laid down as clearly as it can be. Now, Secularism teaches that bad governments are a reflex of a bad, a corrupt, an ignorant, a degraded people, and that in making yourselves strong and true, you trust to your right and ability to throw off a bad government, and Secularism does not simply teach you to throw off the government, but to throw off in yourselves that which renders a bad government possible, at the same time that you denounce the government which is the result of the bad system against which your efforts are directed. The Christian religion teaches you to pray for the King, the Queen, the Royal family, without reference to whether they be good, bad, or indifferent. If a drunken, licentious prince, or a rascally cabinet, it is just the same. Christianity makes no difference; in fact the book which is its mouth-piece, teaches you to obey them, and if anything is bad it will be remedied by and by; and I say that that is bad doctrine, and utterly destructive of all progress. Now, what is the evidence as it stands that this is so? Why all the civil and religious liberty of the world has grown, so far as the masses of the people are concerned, during the last 400 years, and as it has grown each movement has been denounced as infidel in the age in which it commenced although that movement, in relation to succeeding movements had been one which from our point of view we might almost call of an orthodox character, because it is impossible to get the human mind at first to throw off the shackles, and distinguish between them. It is with human thought

the same as with physical muscle—the more you exercise it the stronger it grows. Voltaire and Paine were persecuted, Spinoza and others, truly noble, were burnt, Campanella and Pomponatius were sent to prison, but if you trace the history of their time you will find that the progress of heresy was unchecked. And take from the 16th century, when there was springing up in Sicily a Campanella; in the north a John Giovanni Bruno, who spent his life from boyhood in sunny Nola, coming to Switzerland and talking to the people in Swiss, coming to France and talking in French, to England and talking English, to Bavaria and Wurtemberg talking German, to Poland and talking Polish, and then back to Vienna, and into the dungeon, and to the stake, where he was burnt to win the liberty of speech we use to-day. If Christianity could give the liberty of speech we have to-day, why did it bum the first men who used it? Why did it trample on them, gag them, bum them, starve them? If the e was any civil liberty in this church, in this creed, why did it not show it? (Applause).

Mr. KING: —I regret on this occasion that our expected course has been interfered with, but we have done the best we could under the circumstances. Mr. Bradlaugh's throat is not in favourable condition for the work he has engaged to perform, and I am satisfied with his withdrawal from a portion of the debate, if there be a withdrawal, as stated by Mr. Slater on Mr. Bradlaugh's behalf, from other lectures and engagements. It would be unfair on our part to raise any objection, if that feature of the case is to be carried out. I regret that we have not had something like a definition of Secularism to-night. The first part of the question is, "What is Secularism?" and then "What can it do for man that Christianity cannot?" So far as I can gather my opponent has simply told us that Secularism is not a system. It is a difficult question to answer, apparently. He says that the Secularism of to-day may be something different from the Secularism of ten years hence. But it would have been quite as well had he told us precisely what it is to-day—what it is for the present time—(Applause)—then if we live ten years hence we can ask how much it has changed—how much it has improved—in the interval. But we have not been gratified with that information to-night, and I don't expect to be gratified with it throughout the discussion.

But what is Secularism? Who can tell? Mr. Holyoake *originated* it and Mr. Bradlaugh is *President* of the *National Secular Society*. Yet only a few weeks ago they met in *public debate* to settle this very question, and parted leaving it as unsettled as ever, each intimating that the other does not understand it. In the *beginning* Mr. Holyoake created Secularism. It was this way. Socialism, under the headship of R. Owen, had had its innings and been fairly stumped out. Far larger in organization and membership and *wider* in its activities than the present Secularism, as also equally fierce in its denunciations of Christianity and bitter in its hatred of Christians, it died by the force of public argument and the failure of its efforts to set up model farms and communistic societies, and to inaugurate a "new moral world." So complete was the collapse that it became necessary for infidels to abandon old terms and create a new name for the old infidelity in the hope of deceiving the public by pretending that Secularism was a new name for a new thing. The communistic "New Harmony" of old Socialism turned out a common possession of bitterness, destitution, and confusion, and the *new* thing with the *new* name (Secularism) after some twenty years of active existence, sets up its

founder and its president in a platform fight, to determine what it is, which they utterly fail to do; whereupon one of the two comes here to-night to tell us what that Secularism is which the other (its founder) intimates he does not understand and is unfit to represent. In that debate Mr. Holyoake *affirmed*, and Mr. Bradlaugh *denied*, that *the principles of Secularism do not include Atheism*. Mr. Holyoake said—"It is this which Secularism attempts by founding a dominion of reason where all who think are free and all who are true are sure, asserting its own principles, but not assailing others—needing neither to assail nor condescending to assail theological systems. Secularism keeps its own ground by studying the means which nature places at the disposal of man. It commands resources of self help—in a utilitarian rule of morals it finds guidance. It establishes personal desert by service and veracity. In all these principles there is *perfect independence of Atheism*." Then he goes onto say that "neither the existence nor the non-existence of God—neither the mortality nor the immortality of the soul—that none of these doctrines are in any way necessary—that they are *separate and independent* from these Secular tenets." All this is very plain and very liberal, and, so far as I can see, leaves *me* perfectly qualified for membership in a Secular Society, for certainly I *do think* and I *am true*, and opinions as to God and immortality do not disqualify. But, on the other hand, Mr. Bradlaugh is illiberal, strait-laced, narrow-minded, and as exclusive as the veriest bigot that ever walked the earth. With him not only is Atheism essential to Secularism, but where Atheism is not there can be *no* scheme of morals, and every man who believes in a future life and judgment after death is immoral; or, rather, he goes further and declares it *immoral* to admit the possibility of such future life and judgment. His words are—"I say it is absolutely *immoral* and absolutely unsecularistic to admit the *possibility* of conduct in this life being the subject of trial, judgment, and sentence after death and in some future world." Lower down he adds—"You cannot have a scheme of morality without Atheism." In the debate with Mr. Harrison he said—"Secularism is Atheism. I have said so for the last thirteen years of my life." Thus Bradlaugh and Holyoake are at opposites. In the debate Mr. Holyoake cited Mr. Watts (who is now secretary and lecturer to the National Secular Society) as dead against Mr. Bradlaugh. He says—"That the question of the existence of God, being one of conjecture, Secularism leaves it for persons to decide for themselves. Atheism includes Secularism but Secularism does not exact atheistical profession as the basis of co-operation. *It is not considered necessary that a man should advance as far as Atheism to be a Secularist*. In reply to this Mr. Bradlaugh intimated that, further on, Mr. Watts had said something different. If that be the case we can put it thus—Holyoake against Bradlaugh; Bradlaugh against Holyoake; Watts against both of them, and also against himself. (Cheers.) Here, then, is a dilemma. How are you to know which is right, seeing they have no standard of appeal? And which Secularism am I to deal with? Mr. Bradlaugh is *here*, Mr. Holyoake is *not*. I will, therefore, deal with that of the man who is present, and leave that of the absent one to take care of itself. The principles of Secularism, then, DO include Atheism. As then he is not a Christian who does not embrace the principles of Christianity, and she is not a Teetotaler who does not embrace the principles of Teetotalism, so he is not a Secularist who does not embrace the principles of Secularism. And as the principles of Christianity embrace belief in Deity, and the principles of Teetotalism total abstinence from intoxi-

cants, and as the principles of Secularism embrace Atheism, so no man can be a Christian who is not a Theist—no one can be a Teetotaler who does not abstain, and no man can be a Secularist who is *not an Atheist*. This being the case, I shall in this debate refuse to recognise any man as a Secularist who is not an Atheist, and I shall refuse to place to the account of Secularism work done by persons who believe in Deity. So then where there is no *Atheist* there is no *Secularist*, and where there is no *Atheism* there is no *Secularism*. "What, then, is Secularistic work? That is to say, *properly and distinctively* so, according to Secularism as defined by Mr. Bradlaugh. Why, *most certainly* that and that *only* which *only* a Secularist can do—which only an Atheist can perform. Whatever work, then, I, or any other Theist can accomplish, is not (in the *proper distinctive* sense of the term) Secularistic work—that is to say, not work which in any special and exclusive way appertains to the National Secular Society, nor to any similar association. Secularism talks much of its "*Scheme of Rights, Principles, Work, and Moral Basis*. But Mr. Bradlaugh's Secularism has no rights peculiar to it, save one. As *men* these Secularists have many *rights*, but as Secularists (that is, Atheists) only one—the *right to express their opinion against Deity*. Of distinctive principles they have only *one*—that man, or rather that some men, do not know that a God exists. Of work, properly their own, they have none, save that of propagating their *one* distinctive principle. As to moral code, or moral basis, *distinctively theirs*, they have none, and can have none; for Secularism, being Atheism (and, therefore, nothing more than doubt or denial of Deity), has no code of morals to offer. The consequence is, that when we examine its alleged rights, principles, work, and morals, nothing is found save that which belongs to those who are not Secularists, or that which is purely fanciful, as when Mr. Bradlaugh declares all men immoral who admit the possibility of rewards and punishment after death. Take as an example the SCHEME OF RIGHTS given by Mr. Holyoake. He says—
"Secularism builds on the foundation of four rights:—

1. The right, to think for one's self, which most Christians now admit, at least in theory.

2. The right to differ, without which the right to think is nothing worth.

3. The right to assert difference of opinion, without which the right to differ is of no practical use.

4. The right to debate all vital opinion, without which there is no intellectual equality—no defence against the errors of the State or the pulpit."

Now, what have these four rights to do with *Atheism* more than with *Deism*? Why are they put down as the rights of Secularists? That is, why are they presented as the *distinctive* rights of the Atheist? Put them as the rights of *man* and I have nothing to say against them. Why, did not T. Paine assert and maintain these four rights? I mean not as to the exact words, but did he not act in the full spirit of them? Yet he was not an Atheist, and, therefore, were he still living could not be a Secularist, on Mr. Bradlaugh's theory. I claim these *four* rights for *myself* and for *every* man, and I act upon them, and I am taught by Christianity so to do. The command to me is, "*Prove* all things, and hold fast that which is good." These, then, are *not* the distinctive rights of Secularism, as defined by Mr. Bradlaugh, for, as we have seen, it has but one right—that of asserting Atheism. Take the PRINCIPLES of Secularism as given by Mr. Bradlaugh in the National Secular Society's Almanack. This Secular creed consists of *four* articles, and commences with—"This Asso-

ciation declares that the promotion of human improvement and happiness is the highest duty. " Of course the association may declare just what it thinks proper, and the principles thus proclaimed may really be those of the men of whom the association is composed. But there is nothing distinctive of Atheism in this *first* principle. A hundred different societies, with not an infidel among them, might avow it. I avow it and act upon it. The *second* principle on the list I cannot adopt—*i. e.*, that "*all* theological teachings are powerfully obstructive of human improvement." I hold that some theological teachings are powerfully promotive of human improvement. But Paine could have subscribed this principle, or, if not, then "theological teachings" do not include mere Theism, and the proposition, in that case, is merely the one *distinctive* principle of Mr. Bradlaugh's Secularism—ATHEISM. The other two set forth, that every individual ought to be well placed, well instructed, and usefully employed—that there should be civil and religious liberty, and that it is the duty of every individual to attack the barriers to equal freedom, thought, utterance, Ac, Why, what is there in all this distinctive of that Secularism which is Atheism? I see nothing in Nos. 3 and 4 not held by the churches in Birmingham in which I minister. Then let us glance at the work pointed out by the executive of the National Secular Society as *especially* deserving active attention—obtaining a system of National Secular compulsory education—the disestablishment and disendowment of the State Church, and placing all religions and forms of opinion on a level before the law—the improvement of the condition of the agricultural classes—changing the land laws—substituting for the hereditary chamber of peers a chamber of life members elected for their fitness—the investigation of the causes of poverty, &c. Now, in all this there is nothing distinctive of Secularistic—*i. e.*, Atheistic—work—nothing that any man need go outside Christianity in order to be able to promote—nothing that an Atheist can do better than a Theist—nothing but what believers in Christianity are engaged in promoting—nothing but what I, myself, approve. Take for instance National Secular Education. Is the President of the National Education League (Mr. Dixon, M. P.) an *Atheist*? He is a man of note as to *piety* and *belief*. Why, so far is this work from being, in any special way, that of the National Secular Society, that Mr. Holyoake intimates that Secularism of Mr. Bradlaugh's type has been a hindrance to Parliamentary progress. Take the disestablishment of the State Church. Are the leaders in this work Atheists? Is the Liberation Society an *infidel club*? Is Mr. Edward Miall an *Atheist*? Is the Central Nonconformist Committee (which is now rendered permanent for the purpose of action till unsectarian and secular education is provided for the whole land) *Atheistic*? It is something *worse* than absurdity to parade this kind of work as appertaining to that *Atheistic* Secularism whose only distinctive work is disseminating Atheism. But now let us turn to the Secularistic *theory of morals*. I do not mean that *moral code* which cannot be constructed without Atheism. That is not out yet, or at least I have not met with it. It does not, however, follow that it has no existence. It may be moving about in quiet—travelling by underground railway—keeping company with that "uncomfortable book," the commendations of which, by Mr. Bradlaugh, so sorely troubled Mr. Holyoake. But this *Secularistic, Atheistic, Moral Code* ought to be given to-night! These ten years it has been called for, but it is not yet forthcoming. Mr. Hutchings, in debate with Mr. Bradlaugh, intimated that one of his reasons for entering upon that discussion was that of *dragging* out of his opponent a plain statement of his moral

code. But he did not succeed in getting it. Mr. Bradlaugh answered, "Have I not told you, that *that is right which is moral—that that is moral which brings the greatest good to the greatest number.*" This is about equal to a certain confession of faith of which I have read. "*Patrick—What do you believe? —I believe what the Church believes. What does the Church believe? —The Church believes as I believe. What then do you and the Church believe? —Why, we both believe the same things.*" (Applause.) Now, it may be admitted that *morality will produce the greatest good to the greatest number*; but the required answer must specify those actions which *will* and those actions which will *not* promote that good. But, leaving this point till we see whether Mr. Bradlaugh will enlighten us, we briefly notice the "*Theory of Morals.*" Mr. Holyoake puts it thus—"*That there exist guarantees of morality in human nature, in utility; and intelligence.*" Now, surely we are entitled to ask—How, if these guarantees exist, immorality has come to prevail? A guarantee which does not secure what it guarantees is a mockery and snare. In human nature there exist *no guarantees* of morality, or immorality could not exist. From *whence* came the prevalent immorality? It did not, according to Mr. Bradlaugh, come from *God* nor *devil*, for neither of them exist. It comes then from man and, therefore, from that very human nature which is said to have guarantees for its non-existence. Shall it be said that human nature has not yet attained the required acquaintance with utility, and that the requisite intelligence does not exist? If the intelligence does not yet exist, of course human nature is *without* it, and that which does not exist cannot be a guarantee of anything. But how long must human nature wait before that amount of intelligence is possessed which really will guarantee morality? According to the lowest calculation, man has been here some 6, 000 years. According to Mr. Bradlaugh's fables he may have been here millions of years. Surely the intelligence might have been developed by this time. (Applause.) And if not, what reason have we to conclude that human nature will ever find herself in possession of these imaginary securities? But there is utility. Yes, and *positive* proof that *utility* is no such guarantee. Does not the profane swearer admit that there is no utility whatever in making himself a blackguard? And yet he does so. Does the drunkard dream of utility in drunkenness, which starves his children and breaks the heart of his wife? He understands *fully* the inutility of the thing, and his intelligence completely comprehends the results, and yet he goes on in the road to ruin. Go to our prisons and dens of crime—*ask* the inmates their views of the immoralities they commit, and you will learn that human nature often shudders at its enormities—that utility (in any moral application of the term) is not alleged, and that often those who live a vicious course possess intelligence which condemns, but does not save them therefrom. The moral basis, then, of Secularism is a quagmire, and those who follow its blind leaders will find themselves overhead in the bog. Now, in view of all this, what should I gain by becoming a Secularist? Its scheme of rights offers me *nothing*, for I already exercise them. Its statement of principles (excepting that which involves the advocacy of Atheism) I can, as a Christian, accept. Its programme of work is one for the accomplishment of which I have already put forth considerable effort. Its moral basis is immoral nonsense, and *u* it were not so, it offers me *nothing*; as whatever guarantees there are in nature apply to me as much as to the Secularist. If I throw in what Mr. Holyoake calls "*Its practical result*"—the discovery that "*Science is the Providence of Man.*" I still get *nothing*, for science does as much for me

as it does for the Secularist, and Theists have done far more than Atheists to promote scientific discovery. Secularism is like unto a man advertising to give new clothing to all comers, but who, when you apply, presents you permission to use your own wardrobe upon condition that you become Atheists. (Applause.) This everlasting cry of science, as though it had some exclusive connection with Atheistic Secularism, is a *cheat*, a *nuisance*, and an *absurdity*. One would suppose that all scientific discovery and progress came from Atheists. But, was *Roger Bacon* an Atheist? Was *Columbus* an Atheist? Was *Copernicus* an Atheist? Were Sir Francis Bacon, Galileo, Kepler, Sir Isaac Newton, Faraday, with a host of others too numerous to mention, Atheists? No! Not *one* of them. Away then with all your Secularistic cant about science, until it can be shown that scientific discovery has been advanced *exclusively* by Atheists, or at least till the world's roll of science promoters (from the remote past down to the present) shows its numerous pages of atheistic names only here and there broken by a solitary Theist. (Continued applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —The advantage in having a speech, prepared before-hand, read without reference to the discussion is, I presume, that we have before us the matured thoughts of the other side, even supposing they bear not the slightest relation to the subject at issue. I suppose it is a matter of small thought for my opponent to make blundering statements of the arguments put very ably forward by Mr. Harrison, and to utterly misrepresent what I said in the Hutching's debate. The Hutching's debate you can buy and read for yourselves, so I won't weary you by reading it to-night. First, having written it down, Mr. King tells you that I did not tell you what Secularism is, and having read over the first two points quietly he shirked the others and went on to something else. First he told you that I explained nothing about Secularism, and then he gave you the answer fitting to it. He had prepared the different sheets of his paper, probably, without the remotest knowledge of the line of discussion for to-night, and that will account for the contradictory nature of his argument. I fancy that it would be as well if in a speech prepared before-hand he had left out the impertinences about "blind leaders" and all that kind of thing. I know how in the warmth of debate one might make use of rather strong sentiments; but, unless he desires to provoke retaliation, I do not think they should form part of a speech prepared in the quiet of a study, and particularly by a Christian. Mr. King says—asking what is Secularism? — that I hare not told you what it is, and he takes upon himself to say that Mr. Bradlaugh will not have a Secularist who is not an Atheist. It would only have been fair had he quoted that portion of my introductory remarks to the Holyoake and Bradlaugh debate alluded to. Here it is—"If in the course of the debate I appear to have said anything to lead to the impression that I am only prepared to accept as co-workers in our free-thought propaganda, men and women who are already Atheists, then I desire to be allowed to state clearly my views. I hold that Atheism is the logical result to all who are able to think the matter out, but I do not hold that every person with whom I come in contact is or need be expected to be so advanced. Some get rid of one or two of the shackles of superstition; some get rid of many; very few indeed get rid of all. So soon and so long as men and women are prepared to work for human improvement and recognize the fact that theological systems and teachings are barriers to its attainment which have to be broken through, so soon and so long are they

eligible to be members and co-workers in our free-thought associations. There is no narrow church, or hard-and-fast line creed, for those who enrol themselves as co-workers. The only work we teach is work for human redemption." (Applause.) Now, I think it would have been only fair had Mr. King read you that quotation, for it is hardly worth while to attempt to misrepresent my views. Mr. King will probably find it somewhere stated that Mr. Holyoake and I separated from our debate, each saying that the other did not understand anything about Secularism, and therefore knew nothing about it, for I do not remember any such thing—(Laughter)—and I took part in the debate. Mr. King, when he rises, will perhaps inform us where he read this. But supposing Mr. Holyoake and I differ on certain points, is it an objection to a system because two prominent advocates in it were at difference? If so, then that will be an equal objection to Christianity. (Hear, hear, and hisses.) Why hiss? the question for dispute is "What is Secularism and what can it do that Christianity cannot?" and I am simply showing to you the ridiculous character of the argument adduced by the champion of Christianity. (Hear, hear, and hisses.) I would be extremely loth to suggest that there is not the most extreme unity between every clergyman of the Church of England in this neighbourhood and Mr. King, unless it will help my argument. How monstrous to put it as Mr. King has, because in twenty years' time the two principal men connected with Secularism or Infidelity have met in discussion? Were there not frequently little squabbles between Paul and other apostles in their teachings, within twenty years after the death of Christ? I think this kind of weak stupidities had better be left out of the debate. I do not pretend you will ever get two prominent free-thinkers to agree on all topics, and that is why I was careful in putting it that there is no hard-and-fast line by which every free-thinker can be bound. If anything of that kind can be put it is simply the grossest absurdity. It is utterly untrue for Mr. King to say that Socialism and the communistic system failed, for the co-operative institutions in Lancashire and elsewhere to-day are solely the result of Robert Owen's propaganda in this country. I am not, and never professed to be, a disciple of Robert Owen. I admire him as one of the great men of the world, living a pure and true life, and working hard and honestly for the redemption of mankind. Mr. King says that Socialism was tried in various forms and did not succeed. If the endeavour to apply a principle, unless it succeed in every instance, is to be taken as proof of the utter failure of the principle, what a tremendous argument that is against Christianity, because the diversity of sects have failed in every instance except one. What comes of its schisms and squabbles? Take the Roman phase, or the Protestant phase, or the Nonconformist phase, or any other phase as proof positive. I don't stand here to defend Socialism any more than it is one of the heretic Secularistic movements of the time, which, as I have already pointed out, are always considered more infidel at the time they exist than they are afterwards. Why, what audacity of the speaker on the other side to ask if Bacon was an Atheist. I did not say that Bacon was an Atheist, though Bacon had that charge made against him by one writer; all that I meant is that bigoted men charge men with Atheism who are more advanced than themselves. But, says Mr. King, the Socialistic movement having failed, Secularism aims in a new name given to it, to deceive the public. Well, I do not care to take the trouble to defend that. All I can say is this, that nothing within Mr. King's own knowledge can be more unfair or more untrue, because whether the men who adopted the name of

Secularism adopted it wisely or unwisely, it is quite certain that the men who went to gaol for the utterance of their views were men who could not have done it deceptively or dishonestly—they were men who left their wives and children sick, sad and dying, enduring the cold misery of the world and poverty. I say, without respect to the choice of the word Secularism being wise or not, that the man does not know Mr. Holyoake who pretends to say that it was a dishonest one. (Applause.) I will tell you why I don't think it is a wise word. Let the name be the best that could be chosen. If the word Infidel or any other harder word had been selected, it were better to move it out and knock it back. Mr. Holyoake perhaps calculated upon a greater amount of humanity amongst the religious bodies than they can possibly have. But, says Mr. King, notwithstanding Mr. Holyoake invented this name, Mr. Bradlaugh is as exclusive as the veriest bigot. With the statement of Mr. Bradlaugh in his hand he says so. Well, can anything be more wickedly untrue as a representation of my opinion? Having made a distinct declaration, in so many words, setting forth my views, Mr. King **states** precisely the opposite of what my views are. I suppose that arises from writing out his speech before-hand. Mr. King made a wonderful attempt at being funny, when he said that Mr. Holyoake contradicted Mr. Bradlaugh, Mr. Watts contradicts both, and also contradicts himself. Unfortunately, Mr. King in all these cases gave his own views. The debate is printed and can stand for itself. I do not care to be dragged into any sort of a discussion as to what are Mr. Watt's or Mr. Holyoake's views, because I quite admit the possibility of every second free-thinker expressing different views and general thoughts on the subject; but what I contend is this—that we have a basis of morality as distinct as you can possibly wish, and that basis of morality I have put to you. Mr. King says that that is changing about, and that the greatest happiness for the greatest number is only a play upon words. That is not so, because in the Hutching's debate the question followed—"How are you to know what will promote the happiness of the greatest number?" and the answer was clear and distinct—"By the best knowledge of the best men of the times, which changes every hour of the day, and by which you alter your conduct." In proof of this, look at moral legislation which is far different now to what it was 200 years ago, and must necessarily be so. It is the merest pretence to say it doesn't. My opponent took the trouble to say that Thomas Paine could not be a Secularist. That is not true. But I will take up the subject from the point at which I leave off, having exhausted my time.

Mr. KING: —I did not put Mr. Bradlaugh before you as holding that men could not be members of the National Secularist Society unless they were Atheists; not for one moment did I state or entertain such an idea. I read from Mr. Watts a widely different statement. I know, and everyone knows, that a large number of Secularists, probably the majority, do not declare themselves Atheists. It is one thing to admit men into a society who are not Atheists, and it is another thing to do so logically. Mr. Bradlaugh clearly laid it down that Secularism includes Atheism. Then, if the principles of Secularism include Atheism, that person is not a Secularist, according to Mr. Bradlaugh's definition, who does not embrace Atheism; and, therefore, if you admit him into your society he is not what he professes to be, and not what your President's definition requires him to be, because he does not accept the principle of Secularism as avowed by Mr.

Bradlaugh. Leaving that point I am somewhat surprised to learn that the various Lancashire Co-operative Societies are infidel institutions. I did not know it, and I think the leaders, committees, and members of those Co-operative Institutions will be equally surprised at the information given by Mr. Bradlaugh. The socialistic, communistic arrangements of R. Owen were essentially infidel, and they failed. They are not to be found in the Lancashire Co-operations of this day, and Secularists cannot claim the present institutions. They are not associated with Atheism, nor are they essentially infidel. I recommend Co-operative Societies, and when they were started in Birmingham I gave what little assistance I could by dealing with them, and so on, in order to support and encourage them. They are good, they progress considerably, but they are not essentially, nor necessarily, atheistic, nor infidel, and I know not an association of the kind in Lancashire, which is an avowedly atheistic or socialistic institution. The enterprises entered upon by the Socialists failed—were abandoned; whilst those without Socialism, without the infidel element have succeeded. I insist that Socialism has failed entirely. Why, if ten years hence you find the National Secular Society disbanded; if ten years hence you found no halls open for lectures under the designation of Secularism, you will be justified in saying that Secularism has either died out or been put down. Now the Socialistic propaganda came entirely to an end. The thing was done with. There was a lull in infidel advocacy—a period of quiet—and then came forth the Secularistic attempt at re-organization, need not attempt to tell you what progress has been made in that direction. Socialism as propounded by Robert Owen completely failed—its very name was abandoned, its advocates betook themselves to other employments. After a time Secularism came forward. Was it the old infidelity with a new name? I suggested that it was the old thing with a new term, but that my opponent indignantly denies. Very well, let him have it his own way for the present. But then, if Secularism was a new thing what became of the old one? If it had not failed why did Infidels set it aside and bring in the other? (Applause.) Was it because it was too successful—were they getting on so well and so fast that they could not stand the success? No, no! the whole thing was smashed up so soon as its true character was known and men set themselves to expose and oppose it; and so it will be with the present Secularism. (Applause.) My opponent tells you that my speech was prepared beforehand. Yes, and I have a good deal more prepared beforehand, because I did not expect to hear much that is new. But I did not commence, nor did I conclude with what I had before prepared. Still, I am somewhat surprised to find so little that my before-prepared speech does not completely cover. Mr. Holyoake has most certainly intimated that Mr. Bradlaugh does not understand what Secularism is. Why did they debate if they were agreed? And certainly the debate did not end in an agreement. Mr. Holyoake continues to assert that Secularism does not, necessarily, contain Atheism. Mr. Bradlaugh, on the other hand, does not give up the opposite position. Then, Mr. Holyoake did, in that discussion, denounce Mr. Bradlaugh as not understanding Secularism, and as taking in regard to it a decidedly injurious course. Turning to the question of morals, we have asked for Mr. Bradlaugh's moral code. He will not give it. We have demanded it, and he meets us with a general declaration concerning "the greatest happiness to the greatest number. " Very well. But we ask, what that is which will produce that result? We demand an answer. Let him give it in his next speech, and let us grapple with it. But our demand will not be answered.

He said it is—what? Why what it will not be ten years hence and therefore he will not tell us what it is to-day. (Hear and laughter.) Now, we grant our Secularist friends full liberty to change their moral code when they are tired of it, but in the meantime let them tell us what it is to-day. (Applause.) Tell us the things that are held to be immoral because they produce evil and not good. Let us have their two tables of morals; one of the things we should do, and the other of the things we should not do. I do not ask him to tell us what will be the Secularist's moral code 100 years hence, when we have done our work, and left these things in the hands of our successors. But, as our opponent will not give us what we thus reasonably ask for, we must find it out for ourselves. We must take the testimony of those advocates of Secularism who have been admitted into the inner temple, and who know the secrets of the *Sanctum Sanctorum*.

First, then, a few words from Joseph Barker. He was editor of one part of the *National Reformer* while Mr. Bradlaugh edited the other part—each having control over his own section. But Barker denounced Bradlaugh on account of the demoralizing tendency of the literature he recommended, and that not only subsequently to declaring his re-conversion to belief in Christ, but while he was yet printing against the Bible. In his *Review*, which he started after leaving the *National Reformer*, he speaks of the section of Secularists that then adhered to Mr. Bradlaugh as the “*Unbounded Licence Party*; ” and he says, “The weekly organ of this party (*National Reformer*) is the most beastly and brutal, the most loathsome and revolting, paper we have seen. The books it recommends are the most demoralizing we ever read, That many of the party would commit murder, even to punish differences of opinion and freedom of speech, we have no doubt, if they could do so without risking their lives. We know they will swindle and rob, and as for profligacy, they not only practice it, but openly advocate it in its vilest forms. And if such men do not commit murder, it is not for want of a natural fitness for the work, but for want of the opportunity of doing it without danger to themselves. ” Now, concerning “*Barker's Review*, ” from which this quotation is made Mr. Holyoake wrote in his “*Secular World*. ” “We do not intend to exclude *Mr. Barker's Review* from the list of papers doing useful work on the side of Freethought, though the uncertainty of his views—repulsively Atheistical yesterday, half Wesleyan and half Tory to-day—make him difficult of classification. ” I cite this to show that Barker's testimony against the “*Unbounded Licence Party*” was given while he was yet editor of a paper classed by Mr. Holyoake as doing useful work on the side of Secularism. But at the very time that Mr. Holyoake thus classed Barker's paper, he repudiated the *National Reformer* on account of its violation of decency and its tendency to destroy Secularism. Mr. Barker, ^{says}—that he ceased to edit his half of the *Reformer* in August 1861, having been editor about eighteen months, and that, in the *Reformer* itself, he repudiated the demoralizing effects of the literature recommended by Mr. Bradlaugh in the other half of the paper. But what took place after Barker ceased to be connected with the *Reformer*? Why, Mr. Holyoake took his place, or, at least, became part editor, controlling one part, while Mr. Bradlaugh conducted the other. But what followed? In May 1862 (nine months later) Mr. Holyoake issued the first number of a new paper, *The Secular World*, and therein he sets forth, that in becoming part editor of the *National Reformer* he stipulated for the exclusion of all advocacy and introduction of that peculiar *Social Science*, which, as we have seen,

had previously so called out the indignation of Mr. Barker. He also gives as his reason for terminating his connection with Mr. Bradlaugh, in conducting the paper, that the stipulation had been broken and the demoralizing elements again obtruded. In his first article Mr. Holyoake says—"During our connection with the *National Reformer*, we made it a primary condition, that all advocacy and introduction of the *Elements of Social Science* should be suspended, and that that book should in no way be put forward as a representative book of the Secular party. Our connection with the paper closed with No. 98. Up to that time the exclusion we stipulated for, was observed, but in No. 99 of that paper the editor hastened to feel the pulse of a correspondent, to prescribe fresh air, gentle exercise, careful diet, and a course of Sexual Religion." Passing over a few lines, Mr. Holyoake adds "This course must give the public the most unfortunate impression that the conductors, as the Author of the Biglow Papers would say,

'Have thrown to the wind all regard for wat's lawfle,
An' gone in for sumthin' promiscu'sly awfle.'

This unhappy and official prominence to that uncomfortable book, renders it both an act of duty and of decency to institute a new organ for the Secular party." (Time, Applause).

Mr. BRADLAUGH:—If my opponent will leave out prophesying from his speeches and confine himself to facts, it would prove infinitely better. If he doesn't give over prophesying, I won't prophesy what I shall or what I shall not do in the course of this debate. Therefore any sort of slur in that innuendo may fairly fall back on the Christian which uttered it. But my view on morality is supplemented by a better man than myself, whose words, to the extent they go, I shall adopt. The creed which he accepted as to morals is Utility, or "The greatest happiness principle—that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. By happiness is intended pleasure and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain and the privation of poverty. The theory of life in which this theory of morality is grounded is that pleasure and freedom from pain are the only things desirable as ends; and that all desirable things are desirable either for the pleasure inherent in themselves, or as means to the promotion of pleasure and the prevention of pain." Now, I shall undertake, if challenged on any particular line of conduct, to apply that rule to it, and the way I shall apply it applies to a variety of human relations promoting pleasure and preventing pain; whereas the Bible injunctions in this respect promote pain and prevent pleasure. (Hear, hear.) I will now follow through the rest of the speech of my opponent. Mr. King stated that the only right which Secularists have is that of propagating and asserting A. theism. He further stated that I admitted that the principles of the Secular Society did not go to that extent, but that no man, unless an Atheist, can accept the principles. Logic, indeed! What I said was, that the logical result of doubt is Atheism. There were many men in the world who thought differently. Some thought it was Unitarianism, and other men landed in Mohammedanism or other "isms" of the world. My view is the logical result—Atheism. But so far from declaring that every man must be an Atheist, all I want men to recognize is the utility principle—the promotion of human happiness and human improvement as indispensable duty; and hence all the theological teachings of the world are positive barriers. But Mr. King says that some theological teachings are bad, but wo

declare that all are bad. I am not going to contrast Mohammedanism with Secularism, but I am prepared to show that Secularism can do that which Christianity cannot. (Hear, hear.) And mark, my opponent has not replied to my arguments on the condition of woman, slavery, and upon education, but he introduced Mr. Barker, Mr. Holyoake and "Social Science." But let us see what Mr. King says about the co-operative institutions being atheistical. How did I introduce co-operative stores? Mr. King states that Secularism is a renewal of Socialism which failed. I stated that Robert Owen's Socialism did not fail, for the result of it is the co-operative societies you have to-day. (Applause.) Can Mr. King venture to show that during the 1800 years Christianity has been established stores were first set on foot through the influence of Christian teaching? Robert Owen did not fail; no man fails who leaves so large an impress as Mr. Owen did on the world, so as to modify some of its future thought—who leaves so much of an impress on the world to guide to some extent its action. And I claim that you have the result of Robert Owen's teachings in the co-operative stores, and that Christian teachings never brought them, and never could or would have brought them. (Applause.) Well, then Mr. King states that the right to think and to utter thought, claimed by Secularists, is not exclusive—Christians admit it, and, I suppose with some little qualm, he added—at least in theory. But they do not admit it in theory. I think they admit a little more in practice than they do in theory. The right to think is positively denied, through Christian Acts of Parliament absolutely forbidding us to deny the truth of Christianity. And I ask you, what is the use of truth if you must not utter it? Mr. Justice Montague Smith pleaded against me at Exeter, and said, "Mr. Bradlaugh has a right to hold any opinions he pleases, on condition that he keeps them to himself." (Laughter.) I won't condescend to waste more time in debating this point. Christianity, Mr. King says, teaches you to "Prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good." Yes, but it also teaches, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." What is the use of proving all things when, if you do not believe certain things, you shall be damned. Well, then, Mr King was good enough to take up the Secularist programme of work, and he says, "What is there in this work that I cannot endorse?" That is not the question—What is in the work that Christianity cannot do? The question for debate is, "What is Secularism, and what can it do that Christianity cannot?" And no doubt it would be extremely convenient for ray friend to avoid it, but I shall not allow him. Curiously there were only two things that Mr. King commented upon; the others he seemed purposely to leave out. Now I shall have to come out, because he dealt with these terrible "Elements" in what he knows to be a wickedly false way. I do not want to fasten harder or harsher terms, but depend upon it if that sort of language is to go on, there will only be one man in the audience who will have cause to remember it by the time the debate is closed. (Hear, hear, and hisses.) Why hiss? Am I to be charged with all kinds of violence—with a wife and grown up daughters, and not retaliate? I will show you how I will retaliate before I have done. (Cheers, and renewed hissing.) What! To hiss—

Mr. SLATER (interposing): —If you who hiss and you who cheer will cease we may expect to maintain order. Unless this is done I will show you an example of making a noise. We intend to have order; in fact, we must have it. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —(resuming)—What about the compulsory system of education? Could Christianity have introduced that? No. For the last 1800 years it left the mass of the people in ignorance, and whether it be infidel work or not, it was certainly infidels who were the chief leaders in movements for encouraging it. Why is it if you take up, as I have done, the bulk of the literature of the last 60 years on the education subject, that you find that the opponents of Secular education have been the principle representatives of religious bodies? It is no use pretending to say that these religious people were in favour of national education, because the very end of Secular education is to give men the ability to think, and to think perhaps differently from their teachers; while the end of the Church is to limit the whole of thought within the lines of particular creeds. Take next the question of the dis-establishment and dis-endowment of State Churches—a measure for placing all religious bodies on an equal footing—and our friend had the coolness to tell you that the Liberation Society went for that measure. When did it go for the repeal of the Blasphemy Laws? Never. Whether Establishment or Non-conformist they never were more liberal than when they went for those tilings touching their own Church, and within the narrow bounds of their creeds. They never advocated that all should have the same civil rights; but there never will be freedom until all have equal civil rights. (Hear, hear). The Secular Society is the only society agitating for the repeal of that law. There are no leading religious societies in England, except some of the Unitarian body, who can be relied upon to defend a measure in Parliament for the repeal of the Blasphemy Laws; and they were under them until they became so strong that a Special Act exempted them. Why did not Mr. King deal with the question of the condition of the agricultural classes? Was it because I dealt with it in my first speech, or was it one of the things he had not written down, or was it that it did not suit? He told us that there was not much new in it, and yet this is one of the things he has not told. Where is there anything in Christianity to improve the agricultural classes? According to my code you must try to improve them, because if one class in the country is ignorant and depraved, it will be for our injury; and it is part of our morality to redeem them for our benefit. Each elevation of their condition is an elevation and an improvement of our own. (Applause).

Mr. KING: —I was wishful to meet Mr. Bradlaugh on this question, and should have been exceedingly dissatisfied if our discussion had not embraced it. I wanted to say, in his presence, all that I have said elsewhere on this matter of morals. In Manchester, since my lecture here, Mr. Bradlaugh denounced me before a public meeting as a *Blinking* coward, as having been, here and in other places, saying things in reference to his moral position that I would not dare to say before his face.

Mr. DUCKWORTH: —I would rather you do not introduce such matters.

Mr. KING: —It has been already introduced by the other side.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —I was just going to rise to order, and say that what I said in Manchester was said in Mr. King's presence and when he was

able to answer, and I have never anywhere said anything in his absence derogatory to him at all. *

Mr. DUCKWORTH: —What I wish to put before the meeting is, that it is what is said here and here only that I wish the disputants during the time allotted to them to deal with, and, therefore, I must object to anything being brought forward from any other public meeting.

Dr. SCOTT: I submit that Mr. KING, without preface, can tell us what he knows about this morality.

Mr. KING: —I was merely expressing my gratification at having this question under discussion to-night, because I am determined to say in his presence whatever I have said before in his absence. What I have said, I have said in good faith, believing it to be the simple truth, and I shall repeat it with that conviction, and I pledge myself to this, that if I am shown that I have, in any particular, misunderstood or misrepresented the matter, that I will stand wherever I have intimated anything of the kind and recall it. I only want the subject fairly before us, and fairly understood. I then return to my reading from Mr. Holyoake, and as I was interrupted in the middle of a paragraph, I will repeat the last part of it. In retiring from the *National Reformer*, he speaks thus: —“During our connection with the *National Reformer*, we made it a primary condition, that all advocacy and introduction of the *Elements of Social Science* should be suspended, and that that book should in no way be put forward as a representative book of the Secular party. Our connection with the paper closed with No. 98. Up to that time the exclusion we stipulated for was observed, but in No. 99 of that paper the editor hastened to feel the pulse of a correspondent, to prescribe fresh air, gentle exercise, careful diet, and a course of Sexual Religion.” Passing over a few lines, Mr. Holyoake adds “The course must give the public the most unfortunate impression that the conductors, as the Author of the Biglow papers would say,

‘Have throwed to the winds all regard for wat’s lawfle,
An’ gone in for sumthin’ promiscu’sly awfle.’

This unhappy and official prominence to that uncomfortable book, renders it both an act of duty and of decency to institute a new organ for the Secular party, which shall enable it to take its place in the press of the country, in terms which shall raise no blush if they command no assent. If we are to be broken up and extinguished as a party, let it be by our own act. Let Secularists first take their character into their own hands, and if they choose to die, let them die self indicated, and not be ignominiously suffocated by what the public must regard as the carbonic gas of vituperation and Holywell Street. Not to establish a paper now, which represents the principles and defends the interest of the Secular party, will amount to the public abdication of that party in England, and would seem like the desertion of the ancient party of supporters of freethought in England in the hour when it is publicly compromised.”

Thus Mr. Holyoake sought to save Secularism from the compromise and destruction Mr. Bradlaugh was bringing upon it. Now, I have given you no opinion of my own on this point, but solely what has been said by Mr. Holyoake. I do not say that he was mistaken. I have examined the book, and hold that he has rightly judged it. But, as I said before, let it

*See Appendix No. 3

be shown that I am wrong, and I will make any reparation, and now is the time for Mr. Bradlaugh to defend himself and exculpate the book. Mr. Holyoake's is a very serious indictment against Dr. Bradlaugh and the *healing* pages of his Family Deformer. *Holywell Street* is the London mart for filthy and obscene books and pictures, such as Lord Campbell's Act renders it criminal to sell, and Mr. Holyoake called upon Secularists to forsake the *National Reformer* and institute a new paper, rather than be suffocated by what the *public must regard* as the *carbonic gas* of vituperation and Holywell Street. He also says—"We are sorry to see the new edition defaced with the terms of which we complained before. If an author designed to bring Freethought into contempt, and to excite against it, and apparently justify, the accusations of critics, he could not do it more effectually than by the mischievous phrase, 'Sexual Religion.' What can you reply to those who charge materialism with grossness if this phrase be accepted? Any superstition is preferable to a 'Sexual Religion.' Surely physiological truths can be brought into respect without this reactionary exaggeration. Without in any way impugning the intentions or convictions of the anonymous author, we doubt now the *moral tendency* of his book. We agree with the principles subsequently enforced in these pages by Mr. Newman, that *there are considerations higher than health. We doubt whether celibacy leads to disease to the extent this book appears to assume. Next, if it does, we agree with Mr. Newman, that physical disease is often preferable to moral. Both have to be avoided as far as possible; but, if we are limited to a choice of evils, the physical is the lesser.* We wish some writer of wider knowledge and more judgment would treat these grave questions. *The medical moral of this book has appeared to some (who are) eminently entitled to deference, to be, that seduction is a physiological virtue. If this be so, a more dangerous license to vice has never been suggested.*"—Reasoner, May 1857.

Next, Mr. Bradlaugh asks why I did not attend to other items of secular work. Well, I do not know how I could possibly deal with more than the whole of them. I said I could accept the whole, excepting only the advocacy of Atheism. He asks why I did not refer to the state of our agricultural labourers. I did refer to them. I am as anxious to improve their condition as he can be. If Mr. Bradlaugh demands a change in the Land Laws of this country, I also demand changes—if Mr. Bradlaugh demands the abolition of the Hereditary Chamber, I wish for a change in that direction too. I can plead for this kind of work, as my work, as much as Mr. Bradlaugh can claim it as his, and, therefore, I object to have it put down as peculiarly and expressly the work of Secularists. I have already been doing something in connection with it, and am willing to the utmost of my power to do more. (Applause.) Mr. Bradlaugh represented me as saying that Christians admit the right to think for oneself, but as also qualifying the admission by the words "at least in theory." But he mistakes. The qualifying words are not mine, but Mr. Holyoake's. I merely read them as he prints them. (Laughter and cheers) I affirm the right not merely as theory but demand it in practice for all. I claim the right to think, and I give it to every man—Atheist, Deist, or whatever he may be. If Mr. Bradlaugh hands to me a petition for the repeal of the Blasphemy Laws I will sign it. I stand intimately associated with 500, 000 persons in Christian fellowship in this country, in our Colonies, and in America, and

believe there is not a man in the whole membership who would not do so, or who desires to prevent men from affirming their disbelief. I would not have a man inconvenienced for the utterance of his honest conviction—

neither by the people nor by the government; and further, I would sweep from the statute book everything that interferes with proper freedom in the expression of opinion. Christianity does not authorize the putting of any man in a position which prevents him from expressing his opinion. It grants to all the right to think and bids us prove ail things. It tells us the consequences of disregarding things that we are commanded to do, but still it says prove them—ascertain whether they are true or not. If they are not, then of course you will not accept them. You have, then, according to Christianity, a right to think, a right to contend—in an honest, fair, and truthful way, for what you hold as right. There is, then, nothing distinctive of Secularism here, and nothing but what as Christians we claim the right to exercise. Then I am asked why this Christian nation did not do the work of compulsory education. Because the nation is not Christian—that is why. At the time when the question “What is Christianity?” was discussed we had readings from the *National Reformer* which our friend seemed not to like, which were declarations, not of Christians defining Christianity, but of men from his own side, pointing out that the groundwork of Christianity had been overrun by a priestly despotic system—an ecclesiastical despotism which took its place. And what has it done? It has brought men to the stake, imprisoned, fined, confiscated property, not only as regards the Atheist, but more so and chiefly in reference to true Christians who dared to stand up for Christianity in its primitive simplicity and original purity. You may just as well ask me why a certain effective medicine does not cure people who do not take it. We do not hold ourselves responsible for Christianity when adulterated by other systems. Unhappily we have had to do with that ecclesiastical despotism, which from the *National Reformer* I have shown has taken the place of Christianity in our land. (Applause)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —So far from objecting to the *National Reformer* being read, I fancy, according to the report of the previous four nights’ debate which appeared in the *Bury Times*, that I then thanked Mr. King for the goodly advertisement he had given to it. The quotations he then made were the most sensible portions of his speeches. (Laughter). I was delighted to find that some portion of the literature which occupied his time had been so useful, and I should have been the last to have raised any sort of difficulty in the way of continuing that very good course for himself. Mr. King’s memory misleads him. Now, what does he mean about the *Elements of Social Science*, because he has not the excuse of going into this for the first time, and I have never in his absence used any hard words about him, either here, or in any other place. I never did so, except in the case of one man. Barker I have. * Except him I have never insulted any living man behind his back. It is fair and honourable to say what one has got to say about any other person before his face. I applied the phrase to Mr. King in reference to his assailing a living woman in her absence; and I think he deserved it. Now let us come to the *Elements*. But he has not ventured to show that the views he put forth were the views Mr. Bradlaugh held about them; nor has he ventured to show how they were associated with Secularism. I have views on mesmerism, but those views are not to be charged on Secularism. I have views on geology, I have views on physiology; but are these special views of mine to be charged on the movement? Unquestionably not! Are these my views on these *Elements*? They are not pretended to be

*See Appendix No. 3.

mine; and why has he not read you my views? It is the act of a mean, contemptible libeller, who has had nine years to think over the libel, and who does not bring forward the words of the man he is debating with. Do you see the trick? It is a trick to try and make me say something unpleasant on the Malthusian question against Mr. Holyoake. Now Mr. Holyoake and I have never disagreed on any point except on this; we hold our individuality respecting the question, and I believe his views are utterly incorrect, but I won't answer for anything that Mr. George Jacob Holyoake has said. He is perfectly qualified to defend himself. I am no priest and have no right to sit in judgment on him in this debate, and if Mr. King means that I have ever taught that seduction is a physiological virtue, he lies in his teeth; or that any word that I have ever written in relation to any book ever printed is capable, by any dexterity, of being twisted into it, he lies in his teeth. I have daughters. I have a wife, and I speak for the women of our movement, and I say if Mr. King had told the truth he would have told you that I have not adopted the Malthusian question, nor advocated the question of Social Science in its details, but that I have pointed out errors in it, and that I have never in any fashion taught any doctrine so abominable as he put before you to-night. (Disapprobation.) Excuse strong words, but only strong words will meet it. But is it wrong to teach seduction? Listen, sir, to this, and do not tell me that I have provoked it. Deut. xxi. 10-14

—"When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the Lord thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive, and seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife; then thou shalt take her home to thine house, and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails; and she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife. And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her." Mr. King, who is a great scholar, will be able to tell you that the word "humbled" means "deflowered." And that is not the worst I could read to you out of that Book. And that is the Christianity which tries to improve woman's condition. Why did not Mr. King quote from the rules of the Secular Society in support of the arguments he presented. Rule 6 reads, "The investigation of the causes of poverty in all old countries, in order to see how far an equal distribution of wealth or more radical causes may operate. The discussion, in connection with this, of the various schemes for social amelioration, and the ascertainment, if possible, of the laws governing the increase of population and produce, and affecting the rise and fall of wages." Why you know that the only instances in which references have been made to the *Elements of Social Science* has been when this population question has been dealt with; and if my words are read to the audience—not half a sentence cut out (as Joseph Barker did)—you would have an opportunity of knowing better how matters stood. And Mr. King, most unquestionably, ought to know better, for he has had an opportunity of reading the various pamphlets written on the subject. If he has read them he is a worse libeller than Barker, who only quoted half a sentence. And he should not shelter himself under a man who dare not meet me in debate, because in 1861 I printed in the *National Reformer* my desire to debate this question of

population. Dare my opponent tell me that because I have expressed views on this question that I am to be open to such calumnies? Will you do with me as men—bigoted Christians—did with Lord Amberley when he dared to go into a discussion on this subject in a learned society, when he was placarded in that lying way Christians will do when they dare not go into the truth, as wanting to murder little babies? Why, Mr. King knew, in his heart of hearts, how wickedly and utterly vile is the whole of the insinuation he has dared to throw on me in connection with the *Elements of Social Science*. He knew that the Secular party had no more to do with it than with Lyell's *Geology*, or Spinoza's *Epics*. About two-thirds of it is a medical book. If you want to know who has circulated it, David King has caused to be sold, in Lancashire and Yorkshire, more copies than any other man. The booksellers state that they receive more orders for the book since Mr. King has spoken so much about it in his lectures than they ever received since the publication of the work. I believe it is a book penned with a pure intention. As to the medical portion of it, my physiological knowledge is not sufficient to enable me to express an opinion, but the questions on population propounded in it I am sure are right. It is the same view as Thomas Robert North and John Stuart Mill supported; it is a work that most of the best men who study the question are advocating to-day; and it is simply mean and contemptible, and utterly vile, for a man to hold it up as a vile book, and deal with it as my opponent has dealt with it. I am told by Mr. King that he will sign a petition for the repeal of the Blasphemy Laws. I know he said so; but how many petitions has he or his party sent in for the repeal of the Oaths Laws, the Press Laws, and the Game Laws? All the petitions remain in the House of Commons, and if Mr. King will state how many of the 500, 000 Christians he is associated with appended their names to petitions for the repeal of any of these laws, I will take the trouble of going over them to ascertain the fact. How was it left to the Infidels to break the last of the shackles on the Press? And how was it that I was robbed of £1, 500 in endeavouring to repeal the Oaths Laws? I tell you that your Christianity does not and cannot work these reforms. And then Mr. King says this is not a Christian country. Well, if so, it is not for want of preachers and churches; it is not for want of colleges and means for screwing the brains out of the people. Oh, there are 500, 000 Christians scattered all over the world with whom Mr. King is particularly associated. Is this 500, 000 a round number, or has a census been taken, or where shall we find them? Don't let us mock one another. You know, sir, that Christians did not do the work until the Infidels had started it, and then you come forward and claim it. When was the co-operative system worked until Infidelism did it? And then you, when you see the system flourishing, you call it a Christian institution. First you hindered the planting of the system and then when you found it prospering under the care of Infidels you patted it on the back and claimed it as one of your own planting. I ask if that is a manly and fair way to argue the subject? It is perfect moonshine. I opened this question of "What is Secularism?" calmly, deliberately and fairly; but my opponent has shuffled about and has not replied to the points I raised. The Rev. Canon Hornby (Bury) said that Mr. King was so weak an advocate of Christianity that it was deemed necessary to bring down the Rev. C. J. Whitmore from London—but if the one is black the other is dark-brown—(Laughter)—to remedy the deficiency in the debate. (Disapprobation.) What! is it not as fair to quote Canon Hornby against Mr. King as to quote Mr. Holyoake

against Mr. Bradlaugh? (Applause, and disapprobation.) Why, this sort of thing is monstrously absurd. If Mr. King is not able to deal with the question at issue, let him dispense with his stale libels; if he cannot defend Christianity except by throwing out innuendo, better bring the discussion to a close at once. I don't deny that I might differ with Mr. Francis Newman on the population question; but Mr. Newman in his study could not conceive the horrors of vice, the baby-farming, and the terrible murders perpetrated all around. If you Christians won't deal with the suppression of these stupendous evils, we Infidels will still go on and try and redeem the world from the degradation and misery Christians leave it in. (Cheers.)

MR. KING: —Mr. Bradlaugh asks me why I did not (or the people connected with me) sign petitions for the repeal of the Oaths law. He volunteered to examine the petitions, and when he undertakes that work he will find my name there. (Applause.) Sheets were brought to the chapels in which I minister, and announced from the desk, and signed there. Mr. Bradlaugh should have been a little more diffident, and have asked if I had signed them. This is my answer to his question why we did not do it. He says that David King has been the cause of selling more copies of the "Elements" than any other man. I regret that (if it be so) in one sense, but not in another. The book was in circulation, and that largely, but secretly, and I would rather have its circulation fair and open than by the underground process that has been going on in connection with it. When the thing comes fairly out and people handle it, when they know what it is, then will they be prepared to do something in order to stem the demoralizing influences that arise from it. But in this wretched underground circulation, that is going on, the thing cannot be grappled with. I did not enter into the matter without first asking myself what would be the result of exposing the book. I saw clearly, of course, that it would lead to some increase of circulation. I had simply two evils before me, and I deemed that the smaller one. It will be the same with the book as it was with the Socialistic Societies—a knowledge of what they were doing destroyed them. The thing only requires to be understood in order to rouse the moral sense of the country. Mr. Bradlaugh talks about things insinuated against him. I have insinuated nothing against Mr. Bradlaugh. The words I used are Mr. Holyoake's, not mine. (Cheers.) Can Mr. Holyoake insinuate so much against the man who sits there? I merely read his words and gave you his description of the book. A man may demoralize society by recommending an immoral book, but he himself may not be guilty of any of the infamy which that book contains. Mr. Bradlaugh says I have charged him with immorality. I have never intimated that he is guilty of immorality, unless we count ib immorality to recommend demoralizing books. I never ventured to charge him, for I know nothing against his morality. He may be, for anything I know, a most moral man, or he may be the very opposite. I know nothing about him in that respect. I deal with the fact that he recommends highly demoralizing literature and mainly causes its circulation. I deem it a mere subterfuge to tell us that he is objected to simply on the ground that he advocates the views of Malthus. Nothing of the sort. Malthus would have scorned to handle that filthy book. Malthus's name must not be associated with it. Let Mr. Bradlaugh write his own views, if they are merely those of Malthus, and he will not have a word from

me. I could agree with Malthus (I am not saying that I do) and at the same time say all that Mr. Holyoake has said about this abominable book. Therefore, it is a subterfuge—a cheat, to put the case as does my opponent. I very much object to the association of names of John Stuart Mill and Malthus with this book, and I do not believe that Lord Amberley looks with the slightest favour upon it; and if not, then I say it is a fraud to endeavour to attach to it the weight of their names. Then you are told by Mr. Bradlaugh that somewhere I have made a very had allusion to the wife of some secularist. Well, many of you know that I made that attack in this place. It seems to have made our friend terribly ill. He says he talked about it in my presence only, but I was not present at the Annual Meeting of the Secularists, recently held in London, where he attacked and abused me in my absence, as reported in the *National Reformer*. He alleged that I made a cowardly attack on the wife of Christopher Charles. But there is no such person as Christopher Charles. The person who sometimes goes by that name is Charles Cattle, of Birmingham. I showed you in my lecture here that the name Christopher Charles, Esq., was put upon a Secularist placard to cheat the public by giving a false position to the chairman, but I made no attack on the woman. I merely made mention of one fact which was honourable to her rather than the reverse. I told you that the wife of Mr. Cattle, who was advertized as Christopher Charles, Esq., kept a not over large bonnet shop. This I did not to discredit her, for honest labour in shopkeeping is no disgrace to anyone, but solely for the purpose of showing the status of the man and thus illustrating Secularist squire-making deception. (Laughter and cheers.) Is that, then, a scandal, us attack on a woman's character? I said, that if her husband's salary needed supplementing it was a virtuous and praiseworthy act on her part thus to supplement it. I would take such a woman by the hand anywhere, for labour is no disgrace to man or woman. Therefore the alleged cowardly attack which he talks of in this way, and also in the *Rational Reformer*, without giving particulars, is simply the statement of a fact as to an honourable position occupied by the woman, and implying nothing discreditable, but on the contrary, that which is highly creditable to her. (Cheers.) Mr. Bradlaugh asked whether his views on Social Science, or on any other topic, are to be charged on the party, or upon the Secularistic Society. Possibly not, unless that society may please to conduct its operations in such a way as to become to some extent, really responsible for his views. If they please to take the man who recommends most infamous books, and to make that man their President—if they please to retain in the position of Editor of their representative paper the man who first drives out Mr. Barker and then disgusts Mr. Holyoake by his recommendations of demoralizing literature—if they please to have advertized in the pages of their paper, week after week, a number of small priced pamphlets, which directly urge their readers to obtain the disgusting book referred to—if they please to put the thing in that form, then they do become, to a very considerable extent, responsible for the views of the man whom they make their President and their Editor, and they cannot clear themselves from the consequent responsibility and infamy. I said before that I desire this matter to be understood. I desire to understand it it I do not. I have expressed my conviction in the matter. Mr. Bradlaugh asks why I did not read what he has said about it. I cannot read two or three things at once. What he has said is part of what he calls my written speech, but you shall know what he has said, I assure you. You will have it to-morrow night.

I intend then to show you what the book contains. We shall go a little into that matter, quite as far as my opponent will be prepared for. If, then, what I have already said on the subject be a libel, it is in what Mr. Holyoake has said, because, at present, I have said nothing about it except in the words of Mr. Holyoake himself. (Applause.)

WEDNESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 26, 1870.

UMPIRE—MR. DUCKWORTH.

CHAIRMEN—For Mr. KING, the Rev. J. WEBB; for Mr. BRADLAUGH, Mr. THOMAS SLATER.

Mr. KING: —On the last evening in entering upon the discussion of this question I endeavoured to state what Secularism appeared to be, as gathered from the statements of Mr. Bradlaugh. I put before you his affirmation, that the principles of Secularism include Atheism. I urged that as he is not a Christian who does not embrace Christianity; as he is not a Teetotaler who does not embrace total abstinence, so he is not a Secularist who does not embrace Secularism. And further, that as Christianity embraces a belief in the Deity and Teetotalism embraces total abstinence from intoxicants, so Secularism embraces, according to Mr. Bradlaugh, the principles of Atheism, and that, therefore, I should not in this discussion recognize any man as a Secularist unless he be an Atheist; so that where there is no Atheist there is no Secularist and where (here is no Atheism there is no Secularism. I would not take this ground with Mr. Holyoake, because he denies that the principles of Secularism necessarily embrace Atheism. But I do take it with Mr. Bradlaugh because he affirms the opposite to Mr. Holyoake and, therefore, I hold him to the logical result of his own affirmation. But my opponent speaks as though he could not understand my plain dealing with this matter and represents me as putting forth the idea that he would not co-operate with Secularists who are not Atheists. Of course I intimated nothing of the sort. I am quite aware that a great proportion of Secularists are not Atheists, but then I was dealing with my opponent's definition of Secularism—dealing with what he asserts in reference to it, and holding him to the logical consequence of his own position. I pointed out the difference between Mr. Holyoake and Mr. Bradlaugh on this question. But I thought it better to take the Secularism of the man who is present and not trouble you with that of the gentleman who is absent. You will remember, then, that in going over the ground I looked at the moral basis of Secularism and at its scheme of rights. I pointed out that these rights are not distinctive of Atheism; that they are not in any way peculiar to Secularism; that I claimed to exercise the four so-called rights of Secularism—the right to think, the right to assert difference of opinion, and so forth—that I adhere to them; practice them; plead for them on behalf of all men, and hold them absolutely as in accordance with Christianity. (Hear, hear.) In like manner I called your attention to the principles of Secularism as put forth in the Secular Almanack, I showed that with one exception they could be accepted by Christians. I then went to the line

of work—the work marked out and paraded as appertaining to Secularism—and I endorsed the whole of that work, except so far as it implied the advocacy of Atheism. National secular education, change in the character of the House of Peers, the introduction of better Land Laws, the disestablishment and disendowment of the State Church and such general changes that all might stand equal before the law in reference to religious opinions. I urged upon your attention that I accepted the whole of this work, and not only so, but that I was willing to do it so far as circumstances permit, and I have been doing something to promote most of these great, and good purposes. I, therefore, decline to recognize the rights and work claimed by Secularists as at all distinctive of Secularism. We then proceeded to consider the moral basis of Secularism; taking Hr. Holyoake's statement of the case—"that there is in human nature guarantees of morality in utility and intelligence." I argued that if there were in human nature guarantees of morality we could not have immorality. I asked Mr. Bradlaugh how immorality came and whence it came? He could not attribute it to God, because he does not believe in the existence of Deity. He could not attribute it to the devil, because he does not believe in the existence of a devil. Where did it come from, then? It can only have come from human nature, and if it thus came of course there can be no guarantees against it in that human nature from which it comes. Then as to Mr. Bradlaugh's code of morals. I did, perhaps, an imprudent thing last night when I ventured to turn prophet, because I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet; but I ventured to predict that he would not give us his moral code last night. But I have nothing, as yet, to regret in regard to the prophecy, because it has been fulfilled. (Laughter.) Well, then, having been thus far successful, I venture the assertion that he will not, during this debate, produce his moral code. As I have not been able to get his code of morals, and having only received, in its place, a statement as to the results of morality, I must proceed to look a little into that demoralizing literature which has so largely gone forth, in consequence of the recommendations of Mr. Bradlaugh and the assistance of the *National Reformer*. Of course I fully join with Mr. Holyoake in regard to this matter. He does not only denounce what Mr. Bradlaugh recommends, but even goes the length of intimating, that any superstition—and he is not a lover of superstition—is preferable to this Sexual Religion. It was then objected, on the other side, that I am not right in attributing these things to Mr. Bradlaugh. But why am I abused? In fact I have simply given you Mr. Holyoake's statement, as sustained by that of Mr. Barker, and if wrong is chargeable on any one it must be on Mr. Holyoake. Mr. Bradlaugh's storm of abuse against me is most inconsistent, seeing I did but repeat what Mr. Holyoake affirmed. (Applause.) Let him deal with Mr. Holyoake like a man. Why insist upon treating his sayings as though they were harmless and abuse me for merely repeating them. (Hear, hear.) Well, then, in reference to the literature so denounced by Mr. Holyoake and others—the literature, as it has been called, of the "Unbounded License party,"—I proceed to note, that about the old Socialist movement there was one thing, in this particular, which recommended itself to me; it was open, frank, and manly; its statements were put forth upon public platforms and printed with the names of the men who wrote them, and, therefore, they could be got at and grappled with. And I believe, as the result of that openness, Socialism came to a close. It failed and was crumpled up and done with so soon as the public came to understand its morality and when its Sexual Religion was fully under-

stood. On the 64th page of the debate between Mr. Bradlaugh and Mr. Hutchings I read thus, as from R. Owen: "For people to be trained to say *my* house, *my* wife, *my* estate, *my* children, or *my* husband, *our* estate, and *our* children; or *my* parents, *my* brothers, *my* sisters and *our* house and property, is most ignorant and selfish, and that wives, children, &c., should all be as common as in a flock of sheep or in a herd of swine." Now, you are not to think I imply that Mr. Hutchings quoted this and that Mr. Bradlaugh acknowledged the sentiment. Nothing of the kind. I do not attribute it to Mr. Bradlaugh. I give it as an illustration of the kind of thing put forth by the old Socialist movement; and I insist that if anything in that direction is to be advocated in connection with the Secularism of to-day, it ought to come in an open way and not in an underground manner. (Hear, hear.) I complain of the kind of advocacy against which Mr. Holyoake protests, which has not been characterized by ordinary manliness. Now, the literature against which I speak, and against which Mr. J. G. Holyoake inveighs, gains its circulation very largely through the medium of the *National Reformer*. Mr. Austin Holyoake has a good deal to do with matters connected with that paper and has used the *National Reformer* frequently, if not constantly, for advertising certain papers and pamphlets adapted to pioneer the way of the work denounced by his brother, J. G. Holyoake. The *National Reformer*, then, is the agency by which his small pamphlets (designed to promote the circulation of the larger work) are brought into circulation. For instance, in his "Large or Small Families," on the first page, he gives a list of books tending in this direction and finishing with the one in question—about which Mr. Austin Holyoake says—"It has had the honour of reviving a subject which had become dormant from the close of the Socialistic agitation of 1844." By the bye, you may note here that Mr. Austin Holyoake says that the Socialistic movement closed in 1844. Movements of that kind usually close from one of two causes—either because they have gained their end or have failed. Now, certainly, the end proposed by Mr. Owen's Socialism has not been gained. He proposed to produce a "New Moral World," and the old immoral one is still here. Yet it closed, and, therefore, it failed, which, however, Mr. Bradlaugh denied last night. But I leave him to settle that with Mr. Austin Holyoake. But to return to the pamphlets. On the first page of this little paper of Austin Holyoake's, and on the last page he recommends for further information, in reference to this matter, another penny tract. That tract on its first pages, on its last, and in the middle, largely quotes and recommends the same abominable book in the highest possible terms. Then in another penny book by the author of the "*Elements*" (therein recommended), we read "That about one third of the births in Paris are illegitimate. This is not in itself a proof of licentiousness, it is only a proof that the institution of indissoluble marriage is held in far less estimation in France than in this country." (Shame, shame). Now I ask what is the moralizing, or rather demoralizing effect of that teaching? We now turn to the *National Reformer* of August 28th, and we find another book reviewed by Mr. Bradlaugh. It is a book by one Richard Harte. Mr. Bradlaugh comments upon it thus: "With Mr. Harte's view as to what ought to be essential in the inception, duration, and termination of the marriage contract we cordially concur." So then I take it that, in this particular, we are enabled at once to ascertain Mr. Bradlaugh's views in reference to the inception, duration, and termination of the marriage contract. We shall, therefore, refer to Mr. Harte on this point. He defines marriage thus—"That union

of the sexes which is most in accordance with the moral and physical necessities of human beings; and which harmonises best with their other relations in life." Now that is one of those Secularistic definitions which leaves the subject undefined and the hearer no wiser than he was before. It compels us to reply, "Oh yes, but what kind of sexual union is that which is thus concordant with men's best moral and physical necessities?" There is sexual union in the farm yard and in the pig sty. Is it that? If not, is it in any way or measure approached in that direction? The definition given by Mr. Harte does not define anything, but leaves the entire question open for such enquiries as we have just suggested. But let us hear Mr. Harte further. Turning to page 26 we read—"Love is a combination of three sympathies—the moral, the intellectual, and the physical. And since it is impossible to develop these sympathies, or even to be certain that they actually exist without the experience of intimate association, it is imperative that marriage should be, to a certain extent, a matter of experiment. Not only are human beings exceedingly liable to judge wrongly in matters of love, but moreover they are liable to develop in character unequally and in different directions; therefore the dissolution of marriage should be as free and honourable a transaction as its formation." That is, that two persons live together as man and wife for some time to know whether they suit each other. (Laughter, and shame). Then again Mr. Harte writes—"The dissolution of marriage should be as free and as honourable a transaction as its formation." Well then, any person would be at liberty to enter into a marriage contract to-day, and equally at liberty to revoke the contract to-morrow. That is the result as I understand it. If not accurately interpreted, I shall be glad to be corrected. On page 47 of the same book we read (of course I understand I am now reading Mr. Bradlaugh's sentiments) thus—"Far from making all women prostitutes, the effects of freedom to dissolve the marriage contract at will, " (that is whenever you please), "would, by reason of the pecuniary and social independence it presupposes, make prostitution impossible." I only quote this to show that the theory is, that marriage should be dissolved at will—that we should be free to marry one day, and as free to dissolve the union on any subsequent day. (Hear, hear from Mr. Bradlaugh). My opponent says "Hear, hear" so that I presume I do not misunderstand him and that we are going on so far, all right. Then turn to page 66, and read "Finally there can be little doubt that much of that *a priori* contempt and hatred for free love which has hitherto been a fruitful source of want of self-respect in the classes deemed disreputable, and consequently of their degradation, is disappearing from the philosophy of our time." Here then you have free love coming into vogue. On the next page we read—"And we may conclude that, even if the effect of the changes I have advocated be to cause all women to become little better than prostitutes; that, at all events, they will also have the effect of putting all women into a much better position than wives." Now, I confess I do not understand what this means, unless it is that now the position of the wife is worse than the position of the prostitute. Thus, then, we have what this book sets forth in reference to marriage, and which Mr. Bradlaugh heartily endorses. Now, it is only fair to state that Mr. Bradlaugh is not responsible for what this book contains beyond this one topic—marriage. It was only on this point that he endorsed it. Mr. Bradlaugh warmed up very considerably last night when I read Mr. Holyoake's statement that the *Elements of Social Science* seemed, in the estimation of some people, to imply that seduction is a sort of physiological virtue, and in a

very violent way he designated it a lie in my teeth, whatever that may mean. {Hear, hear, from Mr. Bradlaugh. } But I was simply reading Mr. Holyoake's statement, therefore if there be any lie about it the lie is Mr. Holyoake's and not mine. (Applause.) Here, in this book. [Mr. Harte's] we have something said about seduction. On page 81 we read—"The evil effect of seduction lies in the treatment that society accords to the seduced woman. Were she no longer consigned to misery and degradation, there would be little or no evil effect produced by yielding to the promptings of love. " Passing a few lines we read—"Where there is no punishment there is no crime; neither seducer nor seduced should be punished for the seduction. " Now, certainly, this is strange doctrine. I cannot accept the theory that "where there is no punishment there is no crime. " You say that murder is a crime, and the law awards punishment. But if you annul the law and say there shall be no punishment for murder, will the nature of the act be changed—will murder be less immoral and less wrong? Is not the idea of this author perfectly absurd and extremely demoralizing? I insist, without at all affirming that Mr. Bradlaugh holds this item of the book—that he does damage to society by recommending the volume that contains it, without distinctly making known what he repudiates and what he accepts. (Hear, hear.) We now turn to the *Elements of Social Science*. We quote from page 425 these words—"The merit of all men is, in one respect, equal; " in another part of the page, "As the true moral principle is not 'Love this man and hate that one,' so it is not 'reverence this one and despise the other,' but have an equal reverence for all, no matter what they are. " Wed. now, that is a very hard lesson—I think I understand what it means, but I confess I cannot see my way to put it into practice. If you tell me to love the sinner I may do it; I may hate the sin and love the man; but if I am asked to reverence and esteem the murderer as I would do the philanthropist I cannot do it; and if the thing were done we should at once break down all distinction between vice and virtue and open the flood-gates of immorality. (Applause) I judge then that these principles of sexual union and crime, if brought, into operation, could only prove most decidedly injurious and most fearfully demoralizing. (Applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —There are several fashions of lying; one is the lie direct, when a man pretends to read from a pamphlet and omits about four-fifths of it in order to give an incorrect notion of the rest. The lie of suppression has been followed in several instances in the quotations from Mr. Harte's book. Unfortunately, I have not a copy of the book with me and I must take the other—the lie direct. The lie with regard to the "*Elements*" I shall be able to combat in each case, and I will give you the following words from the book: —page 424: "A reverence which depends on accidents is unworthy of our attention. Which of us can tell to what lot in life he might have been born, or reduced by circumstances? Whether he should inherit a noble fortune, power, talents, virtues; or be born in a garret, amid rags and wretchedness, constitutionally prone to disease and crime, from being ill suited to contend with surrounding circumstances? As long as reverence is to be given merely to fortune's favourites, to the rich, the powerful, the virtuous, the intellectual, what is it worth? Who can tell that he will possess it? Alas! those who are born without these advantages need our reverence, love, and assistance, most of all; so that we may in part make up to them for the niggardliness

of fortune. And after all, to him who looks beneath the surface, the merit of all men is, in one respect, equal." Mr. King, in his quotation, actually left out the words "in one respect." Why the lying is contemptible and scoundrelly. (Hisses.) But I have not finished the sentence. "For all strive towards good in a measure exactly proportional to their natural powers, and to the suitability of their external circumstances. While this accidental reverence is the rule of our actions, no man is safe, no man can depend upon his fellows; do what we may we are constantly exposed during life to the contempt of others, which must always degrade us. As the true moral principle is not 'love this man and hate that one' so it is not 'reverence this one, and despise the other,' 'but have an equal reverence for all,' no matter what they are. While the philosophic mind should ever keep in view this great principle, so should we strive in every way to make it generally felt throughout society, by removing as far as possible those obstacles, which oppose the dignity, the freedom, and the independence of mankind; for it is upon the universal possession of these great advantages alone, that a state of satisfactory mutual reverence can be based." Now I ask you could there be a more contemptible specimen of lying by innuendo than that to which you have listened with regard to that page from which the quotation was made; and we have had it worse, for while pretending to compliment Robert Owen for plain speaking this man has repeated extracts taken entirely without reference to the context. He was purer-minded than Mr. King, or any of his followers ever can be. Aye, my opponent may well look at the page now; he should have read it from the page before, instead of lying. ("Don't get vexed.") Don't get vexed!—

Mr. WEBB: —I suggest to Mr. Bradlaugh that it is exceedingly undesirable to use such expressions—the one disputant to the other.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —Is it not worse to charge a man with encouraging prostitution than with uttering a lie?

Mr. WEBB: —I was just going to say that if Mr. King applied such terms to Mr. Bradlaugh, as Mr. Bradlaugh has to him, I should rebuke him, I feel it is not suitable that such phrases be used. (Applause.)

Mr. SLATER: —I understood the terms meant something. If they are not to be applied to us, why are they used?

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —If Mr. King has not meant that I encouraged books that advocated prostitution, then his language had no meaning at all. If such was the meaning, the only answer we can give is that it is a wicked and deliberate lie and I will prove it. I am asked not to be warm and I say suppose your women were assailed by a vile man who, dealing with dead Robert Owen even—(Hisses)—I repeat, a vile man dealing with dead Robert Owen—(Hisses)—a vile man, I repeat, who, dealing with dead Robert Owen, could not go to Robert Owen's own words, but must take fourth-hand Hutching's quotation of Taylor, who quoted Bardsley as to what Owen said. I ask if this is not the worst of all vileness which could possibly be adopted? * Then he says that at least Mr. Owen was open in the inculcation of his views and Mr. Bradlaugh is not. Let us see, now,

* See Appendix No. 4.

how the debate stands. I opened with a fair statement of Secular principles and the basis of Secular morality. The basis of Secular morality has not been touched. Mr. King ventured to tell you that I gave some of the results. I did nothing of the kind. He asked for a creed and I told him to apply the principles. He has not ventured to do it, but he has repeated, to occupy your time, a great part of the speech of last night and then he says that he quoted Mr. Holyoake, and if there was lying Mr. Holyoake lied, and why did not Mr. Bradlaugh abuse Mr. Holyoake? First, because I am debating with David King, and secondly because Mr. Holyoake never put by innuendo that which Mr. King put by innuendo to me. Mr. King says that he did not mean to imply that Mr. Bradlaugh was immoral, but that he circulates the vilest immorality! Well, if I can distinguish between the two things—being personally immoral and giving circulation to that which leads to the vilest immorality, I shall require to take a different stand to that which I take to-night. Then I must use no hard words. Last evening you heard the words cheat and subterfuge, and I should like to know whether the word liar is the harder of the three; and the words cheat and subterfuge were used most impudently, because all that I said was that Lord Amberley had been attacked because he had taken part in a debate on this question at which I was present. I myself heard Lord Amberley say that this book—the *Elements of Social Science*—is the best book that has been written on the subject and ought to be in the hands of every working man; and he said that in my hearing and in the presence of some seventy or eighty of the most respectable physicians in the city of London; so that, so far from its being a cheat or subterfuge, I did not try to put it upon him at all. It is only when men object that I feel bound to tell them of the lie. I will tell you what I shall do to-night. For every attempt to put filth upon me I will read an equally filthy thing from your Bible, and it will be seen who will come worst out of it. It will not be my fault. I do not, like some men, on visiting a palace, go to the back of it and, finding a cesspool, say “oh, here’s a cesspool, the people here advocate cesspools.” You must not put it that this is the character of our system, it is only the character of my opponent’s vileness, which only inclines into the lowest and filthiest parts and takes up that which is most congenial to its own nature. (Hisses.) We have had a most unfair and uncalled for introduction of the name of Mrs. Cattle into this debate. It was dragged in by Mr. King, who complains that I called him a slinking coward because he attacked a woman behind her back, and after I had explained that, he repeats the attack here, and says he did not mean anything by it. Why, Mr. King knows that to label a woman in her business as an infidel is the best thing that could possibly be done to ruin her, and it is a part of the “starving out” policy—a policy which will only fall upon this man’s own head, and which no one but a man contemptibly vile, without honour or honesty, would try to do. Mrs. Cattle had done nothing that her name should be introduced, before this audience, as a proof that Secularists tell lies. Christopher Charles Cattle was announced on a placard to lecture as Christopher Charles, Esq. It is common enough for lecturers and others to assume a *nom de plume*, and does that justify a man in trying to ruin another’s business? It was mean to do so, for her bonnet shop was as respectable as Mr. King’s chapel, and her bonnets are as respectable as his congregation. And this is the sort of argument that the prize champion of Christianity, in this town, brings to uphold the truth of Christianity and refute Secularism? Now let us go, if you please, to the reference made to Mr. Watts. I did not remember the par-

ticular passage, but to my astonishment, in looking at it, I find it is exactly the opposite of what he said it was. I'll read it to you. Mr. Watts, quoted by Mr. Holyoake says that "The question of the existence of a God, being one of conjecture, Secularism leaves it for persons to decide for themselves. Atheism includes Secularism, but Secularism does not exact Atheistical profession as the basis of co-operation. *It is not considered necessary that a man should advance as far as Atheism to be a Secularist.*" That is precisely in accordance with what I read to you last night, and what Mr. King did not venture to contradict, and I ask if it is not utterly monstrous to make such utter misrepresentations. We have next to do with a review of a book written on marriage by Mr. Harte. As usual Mr. King thinks it the wisest course to suppress the whole review excepting one sentence. Let us see for a moment whether the English people are quite so clear as to the marriage contract as is supposed. Here to marry certain forms have to be gone through. Where I was last week in this kingdom. If I had simply said to a woman, "I, being unmarried, before three people, take you as my wife," that woman would have been my wife according to the law, if I had lived with her one day afterwards as my wife. I refer you to the case of Longworth, in which a woman was held to be not a wife after a solemn ceremony had been gone through, and yet another woman, who had gone through the same ceremony in another church was held to be a wife; and I ask you whether the marriage contract in this country is as clear as Mr. King would have us think. And I declare that a woman who sells herself to an old man for money, or title, is as much a prostitute, despite the ceremony of the marriage, as any woman who sells her person in the street. (Hisses). You may hiss, but I hold that the woman who sells her person in marriage for money, does not get any additional sanctity in the sale by getting a clergyman to mumble a few words to the couple. The affectation of chastity is worse than open profligacy. Now my friends permit me to put to you the very abominable course taken in this debate. If I had had a fair, a respectable, a manly opponent, taking a fair view of our principles and of their consequences, then I could not have complained however far anything might have been forestalled; but when a man suppresses the whole of the arguments in connection with which this marriage question arises, knowing what they are, I have a right to complain. He knows that the purpose of the book called the *Elements of Social Science*—good, bad or indifferent—he knows that the purpose of the book, from beginning to end, whether it be right or wrong, is to deal, as Malthus tried to deal, with the existence of poverty and the evils arising in connection with it in the world, and nothing could be more utterly vile than to urge that this is a secular book, any more than Nicholls on Astronomy, Lyell on Geology, Forbes Winslow on Insanity, or any other of the many books which have been reviewed in the *Reformer*. "Oh," but says Mr. King, "the party elected you their President, and they are responsible for you." That would be perfectly true if we had Thirty-nine Articles as a creed which our members are to believe, no less and no more, but it is not true when all the creed of the Secular Society is included in certain principles, and there are positive declarations in connection with them that no man connected with the movement has the whole truth on any subject—no man is so false but that some truth is in him, and may be made of advantage. I admit that in the case of Mr. King it will be reduced to the most infinitesimal point possible—(Laughter)—but still, even in him there will be found some small amount of truth if you will look for it. The writer of this

book points out that there is a tendency in the population to increase faster than the means of subsistence, and that the want of food acts as a check; and poverty, prostitution, crime, ignorance, and disease are all traceable to over-crowded and over-populated cities, as the writer thinks, and I think too; but the bulk of the Secular party at present, are anti-Malthusians, because the tendency of political thought in England has been to regard the doctrines of Malthus and those who followed him as doctrines directed against the people and not for them. I have done something to net these matters stated, because I believe that we shall never get a perfect and complete reform for the masses until, in addition to the evils that press immediately upon them, they go deeper and deal with the things out of which those evils grow, and this hook does it. It deals with the sexual relations, because prostitution is to be found in every one of the old cities. It deals with marriage, because that lies at the root of all the evil. Mr. King asks if the marriage contract is to begin at will and end at will, Why not? Under what conditions is it not? Why should it not? What is to be the motive by which it should be determined? Why should two people be doomed to live together when the life of both has become obnoxious and hurtful to one another? It has never been considered immoral for rich people to buy divorces; bishops and rich people generally need them; why should not the poor people have facilities towards that end? It is utterly untrue that the facility for divorce will provoke vice. Where that facility appertains there are fewer crimes of adultery than where facilities for divorce do not exist. But this cannot be dealt with by talking here. If this man wants a fair debate on this question I am willing to meet him on the question—"Is the law of population laid down a true law, and what are the remedies for the poverty that exists in the country?" That would be a fair question, but to say that the *Elements of Social Science* is the text book of Secularism is a lie without qualification, or to say that I have recommended it without qualification, except as one of those works on political economy, written with a view to the redemption of the masses, is equally a lie within the knowledge of the speaker. I will read you now a portion of the xxi. chapter of Exodus—"If a man sell his daughter to be a maid-servant, she shall not go out as the men-servants do. If she please not her master, who hath betrothed her to himself, then shall he let her be redeemed; to sell her unto a strange nation he shall have no power, seeing he hath dealt deceitfully with her. And if he have betrothed her unto his son, he shall deal with her after the manner of daughters. If he take him another wife, her food, her raiment, and her duty of marriage shall he not diminish. And if he do not these three unto her, then shall she go out free without money."—Ex. xxi. 7-11. As Mr. King is a great scholar, he will know that the word "deceitfully" in the Douay or the English version meant "deflowered." There is no mistake about it. The next verse puts it very clearly. Does it not mean that after a man has bought a girl, paid for her as his wife, and then does not like her, he may turn her out into the world? It is just the same as in the passage I read to you from Deuteronomy last night. If a man take a woman as his wife, and then find that he had no delight in her, he shall "Let her go," having humbled her, and the words of the verse before that showed that he had previously deprived her of her virtue. And yet we are asked about Richard Harte recommending people to live together before they are married to see whether they like it or no. Now, I put it whether the *Elements of Social Science*

and Richard Harte's work would not be an improvement on that which I refer to, because both of them put it that a woman is to be the victim of the caprice and lust of man, because she is not strong enough to resist him, and then is to be cast out upon the world. Richard Harte's book, or the *Elements*, are at any rate an improvement on these laws of Christianity, which are diabolical, inhuman, and damnable, and therefore against which I plead. (Cheers and hisses.) I confess myself that anybody who does not want to be shocked had better not stop, because I intend to pay back coin by coin any filth that may be cast at me out of the pages of this book, which contains matter so terrible that nothing can justify it. I should not have alluded to these things were it not for the utter, vile wickedness of this man, endeavouring to pass these things off in the way he does. (Hisses.) Take if you please a passage from Judges, and here I confess it is so horrible that I cannot trust my tongue to read it, but will leave it with you, I mean Judges xix., and the conduct recorded therein is so infamous, so disgusting, so depraved, and so brutal that I cannot read it, but yet there is not one word against it from the other side. A man to save himself puts his wife outside the door, and lets her be put to death, and finds her on the door-step next morning. Why I am so terribly and horribly grieved that this kind of thing should be deemed a fitting way for such a debate, that if it was possible to heighten my feelings of contempt and abhorrence for the utter unscrupulousness of the advocate, this alone is required to do it. It is not alone his dealing with Malthus, but he has not ventured to tell right out what he meant, but sheltered himself by saying "No, I don't say this; it is Joseph Barker and Mr. Holyoake who say so. " No, it is Mr. King who has insinuated it, which is viler still; and I have got him here and I will nail him down, dealing with him as such people deserve. And if all his quotations are to be like the one read from the 425th page of the *Elements of Social Science*, if they are to be taken without reference to the context; to be dragged out of the books without reference to what comes before and after; why then any sort of crime may be put upon anybody connected with it, and I say it is simply infamous that such a style of quotation should be permitted in such a debate. (Applause and hisses.)

Mr. KING: —(Hearty cheering): I do not like calling men liars. (Hear, hear). There is a better way—prove the lie. (Applause). And now let Mr. Bradlaugh take his book in hand, and we shall see who is the liar. My quotation is from the tenth line of page 425. He tells you I left out a clause. I read: "As the true moral principle is not, *love this man and hate that one*, so it is not, *reverence this one and despise the other*, but have an equal reverence for ALL no matter what they are. " Thus I read, and Mr. Bradlaugh stands up and charges me with leaving out a clause from that passage. (Mr. Bradlaugh: Hear, hear). He can take the alleged lie back to himself. (Applause). He commenced quoting from the previous page. The passage he referred to precedes the one I read. (Applause). Well then, Mr. Bradlaugh talked about Lord Amberley. I do not like to call a man a liar, but I prefer to prove the lie. (Loud Applause). My remark in reference to Lord Amberley last night had no special nor exclusive reference to Mr. Bradlaugh's remarks in this debate in reference to his lordship, I am not quite sure, but rather think, that Mr. Bradlaugh used it in reference to Lord Amberley after my allusion to him, but whether or not, I referred to Lord Amberley chiefly in reference to things said previously and elsewhere. The names of Lord Amberley and

Mr. John Stuart Mill have been associated with this abominable book. Then mark, you have not only been told that those gentlemen admire the book, but, in the case of Lord Amberley, Mr. Bradlaugh has here declared that his lordship has spoken of it most highly. I denounce this as false, and I do so on Lord Amberley's own authority, whose letter, addressed to myself, I hold in my hand. (Loud and prolonged cheers). His lordship writes:—

"With the book you mention, *The Elements of Social Science*, I am indeed acquainted but I regard it with the strongest disapproval. The author's ideal of society appears to be a state of unlimited licence, happiness being obtained by the indulgence of degrading passions. I contemplate such teaching with the utmost aversion and I consider the wide circulation of the work which contains it the more to be regretted because its pretensions to medical authority (to which I am convinced it has but little claim; may easily mislead unwary or un-instructed readers.

Should any one attribute to me in your presence any sort of agreement with this pernicious work, I authorize you to contradict the statement in the most emphatic manner."

Now, Sir (addressing Mr. Bradlaugh), what about your nailing down lies. (Laughter and continued cheers). Let us have that nailed down, Sir, if you please. (Renewed cheers). You make assertions in reference to Mr. Mills and others; but after the evidence adduced in the case of Lord Amberley the audience can believe your statements, can they not? (Laughter and cheers). Then Mr. Bradlaugh tells us that I misquoted Mr. Watts. I did not quote from the book report, I quoted from the *National Reformer*. (Hear, hear and applause). The words I quoted are here (holding up a copy of the *National Reformer*). Mr. Watts is an accredited lecturer of the National Secular Society, and he says very distinctly, that the question of the existence of God being one of conjecture Secularism does not exact Atheism. I shall again read his words as I read them before, that Mr. Bradlaugh may compare as I proceed. He says "That the question of the existence of God, being one of conjecture, Secularism leaves it for persons to decide for themselves. Atheism includes Secularism, but Secularism does not exact Atheistical profession as the basis of co-operation. *It is not considered necessary that a man should advance as far as Atheism to be a Secularist.*" That is what I quoted from the *National Reformer*, before, and there it is. H it is not right Mr. Bradlaugh, I suppose, is responsible for putting it there. (Hear, hear.) Next he tells us that marriage in this country, in regard to its arrangements, is not what it should be. Very good. We shall be very happy to make improvements, but is the improvement to come in the shape of two persons agreeing to a temporary sexual connection and presently separating? Is this free love system to be the improvement? Does it follow, that because our marriage arrangements are not all they ought to be—that because there is diversity between the marriage laws of England, Ireland, and Scotland—that it would be better to adopt his free love system and flood the nation with demoralization. Then he stated that an injustice is done him because I suppress the fact that this book on Social Science, in its main feature, is devoted to the advocacy of the Malthusian Doctrine. I did no injustice there, because, for the purposes of this discussion,—do not understand that I do so really—I accept all that Malthus taught on the subject. Well, taking the ground of Malthus, my abhorrence of this hook is in no wise lessened. (Hear, hear.) The means recommended therein for the realization of the end which Malthus deemed desirable are entirely opposed to everything he wrote, and the whole difference is here. Malthus proposed no immoral means, this book proposes means the most degrading and demoralizing. That is the real difference, and when you understand that difference you

understand what I have uttered in this debate and why I am justified in charging my opponent as I do. (Applause.)

Then we have certain alleged features of Christianity presented as off-sets to this abominable book. But I require that whatever is presented by my opponent on this score shall belong to Christianity—that is, that it shall be found in the teaching of Christ and His apostles. And with regard to this principle I shall have just about time to read and to adopt (so far as this discussion is concerned) a page or so upon the right use of Old Testament facts.

“The biblical infidels, who follow, with less ability and more extravagance, the footsteps of Paine, ignorantly presume that their strength lies just where they are weakest: I mean in their attacks on Old Testament saints and the Bible character of God through them; together with the Jewish wars and national history. Now, if these constituted the Bible; if our argument were in defence of Judaism, and not of Christianity—to which Judaism is the historical introduction—there would be some colour of propriety in attacking such points; and then the contest would be on this subject—‘Whether they deal fairly by Judaism, —whether they state it as it really is; and then, whether Judaism was not fitted for the Jews in their circumstances?’

This discussion on Judaism had better be held with a learned and pious Hebrew, and would require on the part of the infidel four qualifications, which platform infidels seldom discover. First, an acquaintance with the state of the world when Judaism was instituted; secondly, a full knowledge of those circumstances in Jewish history, which are selected for criticism thirdly, an insight into the collateral and prospective uses of Judaism in relation to mankind at large; and lastly, —what infidels have never shown, —the objector would require to understand, and not to misrepresent, the character of God as revealed in Judaism, and the Old Testament generally.

The falsehood on which they invariably proceed, is the assumption that the entire life and actions of Old Testament heroes are accepted and endorsed by Jehovah as true morality, according to the Bible.

If Abraham is called a friend of God, then it is assumed that his failings must be regarded as Divinely approved; so with David, Solomon, and others.

The infidel never discovers, or never states, the respects in which those men are accepted of God, and having made the Bible endorse their sins, the infidels wickedly proceed upon this ignorance to assume that the Bible teaches us that we can now follow the example of Old Testament saints, in their failings, and be accepted of God. In other words, they find our commandments in the sins of men under a former dispensation,

Thus their entire fallacy lies in taking Judaism for the Bible; the introductory history for the thing which is introduced; they do not stay to ask whether Christianity—which is the Bible in its completion—was not introduced just because the law of Moses failed; nor whether that law was not a mere parenthesis between the promise of Christ and His coming; for, if they enquired into this they would find that the imperfect historical development of the Jews is discovered by the perfect development of the gospel.

But they argue against Judaism as if we advocated it for us, and seldom come to Christianity; or when they do, they enter into such grotesque mistakes and absurd criticisms on figurative expressions of general principles, as to amaze the intelligent, and perplex the ignorant.

Since, therefore, their main stress is in attacking the Old Testament,

and they are either incompetent or unwilling to give a sensible and candid moral criticism of the book in relation to its times; and do not understand or neglect to point out its temporary and introductory nature, as the history of a local religion and the foreshadowing of a universal and perfect one, to which all the Old Testament historically and prophetically tends; since they thus miss the mark, and live by misunderstanding and misrepresenting what is obsolete, or rather what never was the law of Christians, and never constituted the scope of the Bible as an entire revelation;—they confess by this course, that they object to what is laid aside, whilst they are incompetent, morally and intellectually, to appreciate the ends it served to those to whom it was given, and the proper use of it to us who read it as a historical and prophetic introduction to that which constitutes the complete Bible, the Gospel of God concerning His Son.

We need only remind them that we are not Patriarchs, not living in those times, nor accepting those examples as our complete standard; that we are not Jews, nor living in Judea under Moses; and that by 'the Bible as our rule of faith and practice,' we do not mean half of it, but the whole, and the whole only as it presents itself in its relation to us. We do not mean Judaism, *that* is in the Bible, but it is abolished in the Bible; abolished for the Jews, it never was imposed on us, except by infidels, and never was intended to be.

The Bible, as a whole, regarded as our present living rule of faith and practice, does itself supersede all Jewish rites, and all imperfect examples by giving us Christian principles and an example that is perfect.

How we are to judge morally of ancient heroes by then times, and how we are to judge of God in His acceptance of them, is a separate subject; that indeed would require no explanation, if freethinkers had used their common sense in Bible history. " (Loud applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH:—Mr. King commenced by stating that his quotation from the *Elements of Social Science*, began with the tenth line on page 425, and that what I have read to you was from the previous page. I think I have accurately stated what he said. He began reading from the fourth line, omitting part; and I did not read from the page before. I began with the paragraph nearly at the bottom of the page, and read to the end of the paragraph, so that Mr. King was wrong in both of his statements, and if this debate is ever printed the matter will speak for itself, to those who like to look into it. The words are "The merit of all men is equal," and then all the words are omitted to the tenth line, when Mr. King went on again. Next with regard to Lord Amberley. What I said is, that I was present when Lord Amberley said what I have stated. I did not say what he has written since. (Laughter.) The evidence that I am not wrong is that the speech is reported. There is a powerful corporation called the *British Medical Association*, which has a journal called the *British Medical Journal*, and the speech was reported in this as I have stated; and it has been reported in fifty or sixty other papers. ("Question. ") I am not here to bandy words with every indecent person in the audience who chooses to interrupt me. The files of the journal in question will show how the matter stands, and if the speech is not there I shall simply have added one more lie. If it is there, Lord Amberley must have changed his opinions between the date of his speech and the date of that letter, or he has forgotten what he said. There can be no mistake about it because Mr. Laurie, Lord Amberley's tutor, read a paper, and I spoke

during that debate, and the *Elements* having been referred to Lord Amberley left the chair to follow my speech, and used the language which I have mentioned, and which was reported in the *British Medical Journal*. If I have made an error it is a strange one, and was shared by the journal at the time, and I don't remember that Lord Amberley wrote to the journal to contradict it. I don't remember it, —and I only ask by the reporters will remember precisely what it was that Lord Amberley said about this book. He said he considered it one of the best books ever written on the subject, and that it ought to be in the hands of every working man. That, I know, was what he said, and what was attributed to him at the time.*

Now, I don't know why Mr. King read Mr. Watts's speech, for he read exactly the words that I did. I suppose he had some point in it, but the words agree because the type is the same, the book having been printed from the *Reformer*.

But we are told you ought not to quote any portion of the Bible that does not relate to Christianity. But how much does relate to it? The whole book, or only what Mr. King presents to us. And what does that mean? Why, that everything inconvenient must be thrown overboard. ("No.") Then does it mean that everything that is not repealed by Jesus must be read? If so I will trouble Mr. King to say what it is. If not, who is to be the judge? I don't deal with the actions of the patriarchs, but with express enactments. I put it as distinctly as possible—that even in the New Testament there is language used which is so horrible that no person can read it. I refer to Rev. xvii. 4, as a sample of the abominable style to which I allude. But I object that no man has a right, so long as the law of this country declares that the Bible is to be believed as God's revelation to man, and his guide to salvation—no man has a right, in defining Christianity, to get up and say we must only take a part, as the other related only to the Jews. The ten commandments are not to apply to us to-day, and Exodus ii. is indefensible, it cannot be defended, it has to be abandoned; and, therefore, Mr. King says he has nothing to do with it. I put it to you, that this is one of the most monstrous ways of dealing with this question; because it really amounts to this, that in the early part of the debate we had prophecy quoted from the Old Testament when Mr. King thought it suited his purpose, but the moment I quote anything from it, he says that is Judaism and applies to the Jews, and it is too abominable to accept. Then we go on to the question whether Christianity can do Secular work. Mr. King says it can, and he says "I signed petitions for the repeal of the Oaths Laws." If you did, they were Secular petitions, because only those came from Birmingham. Then I ask why Christians did not originate such petitions themselves, and not leave Secularists to do the work; and why, after 1800 years, did they leave this work undone, if it were a kind of work that Christians could do? The work ought not to have been left to us to do at all if it were part of your mission to do it. It is of no use to say you endorse the action; it is work you have left the Secularists to do. If you endorsed the Secular view against the Land Laws, how is it that you have left no trace of your work? How is it that large estates are increasing and small farms diminishing, and poor people are becoming more pauperized? How is it that a powerful Christian community of 500, 000 people, with whom you are connected, with others sufficiently numerous to carry any measure—(and I presume that some of the 500, 000 are in this country)—how is it you have not got a change in the Land Laws and made your mark about it? If you have

*See Appendix No. 5.

endorsed the action against the Land Laws and think it a right work to do, how is it that the Land Laws to-day are the worst possible? If it be true that this is your work, the Land Laws should not now want changing at all. If there are in the Christian sects some millions of people, why haven't they done the work, if it be a Christian work? Nay, will Mr. King quote me the text of Scripture in which they are to do the work? Because, as the Book is to be our guide, we must take the whole Bible as it applies to us. Will he point out where it will help you? Take the question of the extinction of the Chamber of Peers—Christianity will not help us to accomplish that, because Christianity tells you to be obedient to the powers that be, which are of God, and to submit yourselves to higher authorities, telling you, in fact, to be subservient, and put up with wrong here in the hope that it will be remedied hereafter. It is not enough for Mr. King to say I accept these things, I endorse these things. Here is this work, which Secularism, heresy, infidelity and free-thought does do, and which Christianity, as such, cannot do. I urge, further, that Christianity has made the very evils heresy has been called upon to reform. If it is true that Mr. King was as much against the Press Laws as I was, how was it that an infidel was the last to resist them and the last to remove the last shackles? How was it that Mr. King did not try it? It is utterly useless to say "I endorse what has been done," after you have left it for somebody else to do. Take the old struggle for an unstamped press, and you will find that it was such men as Robert Carlyle, Hetherington, Watson and Cleve who went to gaol to get for you the cheap press you have to-day. It is all very well to come here now and endorse such work, when you left infidels to do it. The thing is simply monstrous. Take the Test and Oath questions. Can you have any sort of notion that man can stand equal before the law, when at the present moment (and no sort of agitation is being carried on against it even by the party to which Mr. King belongs) there is an Act of Parliament rendering me, on conviction, incapable of being party to or defendant in a suit—incapable of receiving a legacy—incapable of being the trustee even of my own children, or guardian for them; and yet Mr. King says, "I endorse the opposition." But why not do the work? I have been put to an expense of £1, 480 to carry my cause, in consequence of these laws, and had to take my case to the highest court in the realm in order to carry it. If Christians agreed with me, why did they not carry the laws, and not talk about the country of starving me out when starvation enough is put upon me by this robbery. Only half a word more, and I have done. In this last speech I have refrained from any word that can be called coarse or vile, because there was refrainment on the other side. I shall shape my language by the language of my opponent. (Applause, and hisses.)

MR. KING: —Returning to the *Elements of Social Science*, we read—"Whether the children have been born in marriage or not is a matter of comparatively little importance.

"Marriage is based upon the idea that constant and unvarying love is the only one which is pure and honourable, and which should be recognized as morally good. Love is like all other human passions and appetites, subject to change, deriving a great part of its force and continuance from variety in its objects; and to attempt to fix it to an invariable channel is to try to alter the laws of its nature. Youth, when the passion is strongest, is especially prone to change, according to the beautiful

command of nature, who intends that our experience should be varied, and our different faculties and emotions culled forth." (353, 354.)

"Marriage is one of the chief instruments in the degradation of women." (355.)

"The icy formality of the marriage ideas is a constant damper to the enjoyments of youth; it spoils the social pleasures between the young of both sexes, and casts a chill upon that intimacy and close sympathy which they should have for each other." (356.)

"The complete *exclusiveness* of marriage gives rise to very great evils. Both men and women, but especially the latter, often fall desperately in love with *one object*, and if they cannot have the *full* and *sole* possession of this they resign themselves to despair." (357, 358.)

"Let those who will marry; but those who do not wish to enter upon so indissoluble a contract (*either on account of their early age, or from a disapproval of the whole ceremony*), *should deem it perfectly honourable and justifiable to form a temporary connection*. If they refrain from *undue procreation, rear their children carefully, &c.*" (376, 377.)

"If a woman is to have only two, or at most, and in comparatively rare cases, three children, she can easily gain a livelihood for herself, and, therefore, requires no protection nor aid beyond what the laws afford to each of us. Why should she tie herself indissolubly to one man for life; or, on the other hand, why should a man do so?" (375.)

"The noblest sexual conduct, in the present state of society, appears to me to be that of those who, while endeavouring to fulfil the *real* sexual duties, enumerated in a former essay, live together openly and without disguise, but refuse to enter into an indissoluble contract of which they conscientiously disapprove." (505.)

Here you have inculcated variable love and marriage terminable at will to accommodate it. Marriage also is characterized as spoiling the pleasures of the young of both sexes, and marriage is denounced as a chief degradation of women. You *have it declared* perfectly honourable to form temporary sexual connections, and that it is a matter of no particular importance whether children are born in wedlock or otherwise, and that the noblest sexual conduct is that which dispenses with marriage. In addition to this (263, 270) it is stated of prostitution that it is "A mode of life which is by no means void of virtue, and of value to mankind." "It should be regarded as a valuable temporary substitute for a better state of things."

Now, this is the morality that the President and the recognized organ of the National Secular Society are chief agents in bringing home to the firesides of Secularists: Can anything be more debasing or more subversive of true morality? It was in view of these and similar horrible perversions that that cautious thinker and writer, W. H. Gillespie, wrote, on page 24 of his "*Argument for the Moral Attributes of the Supreme Being*" the following note:—

"Indeed, had it not been that our Atheists are at work in practically defending, yea, actively pleading for the right to be the doers of unnatural impurities (though the idea of *guilt*, as attachable to such enormities, is, in company with the idea of *sin*, out of the question in their case), a motive bracing me up to the required pitch might have been awaiting. But our British infidels and their American cousins have been busy for a good while in theorizing and philosophizing speculatively in behalf of doctrines leading directly to the actual commission of deeds which we believers account unnatural vices; and a sufficient reason for my utmost effort in

opposition was not to seek. A sufficient reason, a reason more than sufficient, lay at my door, in the shape of unmentionable *pollution on system*. When crimes against nature are sought to be reduced to system, and are recommended for practice, who, having the ability to utter a telling protest against the iniquity, shall dare to be silent."

Leaving, then, this matter, we come to the Bible, and I say that we Christians do not object to Secularists quoting from the Bible, but what they quote must appertain to Christianity and be a constituent thereof. The laws and institutions of the former economy were never given to us. They were given, under peculiar circumstances, only for a time, and were afterwards repealed. I am asked how I, as a Christian, claim the ten commandments if the Jewish law is not enforced upon us. I claim nothing of the sort. (Hear, hear.) One of the ten commands enacts that the Sabbath day is holy, and is to be kept holy. Now, that is the Saturday, and I never attempt to keep it. (Applause.) I have, as a Christian, all the great principles of those commandments (with the exception of the purely ceremonial one of the Sabbath day) binding upon me by re-enactment. If you ask whether I am allowed to steal, I reply, "No, for the act is forbidden in the law of Christ," and to commit adultery is a sin against the laws of the kingdom of Christ. (Hear, hear.) As a Christian, am I not under the commandment which forbids theft? I answer, no! not so far as the Jewish law is concerned. But I am under the law of Christ, which required that men steal no more, and which, in various ways, forbids all dishonesty. (Applause.) If you ask whether, by not acknowledging myself under the Jewish law, I escape the prohibition against adultery, I answer, that I am under law to Christ in this particular also, as He forbids, not only the overt act, but also the state of desire which leads to it. (Hear, hear.) So with murder and other sins forbidden by the ten commands. Thus, then, the great principles of these commands are re-enacted under the Christian dispensation, and it is because the observance of the Sabbath day on a Saturday is not re-enacted that I do not observe it and never intend to do so. (Applause.)

My opponent asks why I, as a Christian, do not assist in certain work he alludes to? How does he know what I have done? If he presume to know, why does he not give evidence that I have done nothing to promote such work? What right has he thus to presume, when he can know nothing of what I have been engaged in? For years I have been connected with men in Birmingham who are bound together in the determination to send representatives to Parliament to work out the just liberties of the people. (Hear, hear.) We are working in that direction, and have sent to Parliament the men most likely to give effect to our desires. (Applause.) He then asks why we have not sent independent petitions for the repeal of the Oath Laws. We have sent up to Parliament, on several occasions, petitions praying for the amendment of the Oath Laws, and none of these petitions we presented came from the Secularists. This agitation for the repeal of the Oath Laws was taken up long before Mr. Bradlaugh took part in the movement, and Mr. Holyoake told Mr. Bradlaugh that very much had been done in the matter before he put his hand to it. (Applause.) Then we are told that the old Socialist movement has not failed, because some element of Robert Owen's advocacy has taken root and survived in co-operative societies. But granting that (but no one can show that present co-operative societies in any way emanated from Robert Owen), still the question remains—Where did Owen obtain the benevolent and co-operative elements of his

system? If existing co-operative societies are to be attributed to him because he urged the idea, must we not go a little further back? And if by so doing we find that Owen did not originate, but merely adopted what Christianity had suggested and led others to adopt, then, I suppose, we shall have to give the credit otherwise than to him. I ask, then, from whence Owen obtained much of the good that existed in his system? And I answer, unquestionably from Christianity. (Hear, hear.) Now let me read from the debate between Alexander Campbell and Robert Owen. On page 161 Mr. Campbell says:—

“I will, therefore, ask Mr. Owen to answer this question, —Did he, or did he not, some forty years ago, originate this theory from his own observations of human nature; or was it suggested to him by circumstances which Christianity threw around him in Scotland? That his theory originated in the religious circumstances at that time existing in Lanark, we have good reason to believe. It was the Christian benevolence of Mr. Dale which prompted him to invent a plan for the education of the children of the poor by instituting a system of co-operation. Mr. Dale was thus enabled to sustain five hundred children at one time, who were collected in the manufactories which he controlled, and were there maintained and educated by his philanthropy. And to these circumstances, instituted by Mr. Dale, is Mr. Owen indebted for his new views of society. ” Thus, then, co-operation was exhibited to Mr. Owen by an eminent believer in Christ and, therefore, Owen merely adopted and carried forward what Christians had used before him. But my opponent may say that I have only given Mr. Campbell’s account and that Mr. Owen would not have admitted his indebtedness to Christianity. But if Mr. Bradlaugh is prepared thus to respond he may save himself the trouble, as I have Mr. Owen’s own admission. In reply to Mr. Campbell he says (p. 163), “I deem it my duty to concede everything I can to an opponent. I, therefore, most readily concede to Mr. Campbell that the Christian religion was the foundation of the Social system. ” Thus, then, we have Mr. Owen against Mr. Bradlaugh, and proof that co-operative enterprise neither commenced with Socialism nor Secularism. What, then, shall we say of this Secularism, which clothes itself in our garments and boasts of work that is not in any way distinctive of it? We will say, that when born, its parents had not provided for it a rag of clothing and, consequently, its nurses steal our raiment to hide its nakedness. They lay bold of our deeds and claim, as distinctively their work, that which is common to us as men, and in the doing of which Christians have been the most laborious and successful labourers. They claim the men who have suffered as the pioneers of liberty. But while we do not deny that some Infidels have suffered in the struggle to gain for the many their rights, I insist that they are but few in comparison with the believers who have endured confiscation of property, imprisonment, exile, poverty and death as a result of their heroic determination to wage conflict against wrong and oppression. (Applause).

Let us now turn to Mr. Bradlaugh’s endorsement of the demoralizing book to which you have been referred. I read his own words from his tract “*Shelly, Malthus, and Jesus*. ” He says of the author of the book—“His work I especially recommend. From its price it is within the reach of most working men, and it is from the pen of a man who is thoroughly versed in the subject he deals with. I write more with a view of inducing Secularists to read his book, than with the notion that I can benefit them by the promulgation of my own views upon this important

theme. ” (Hear, hear, from Mr. Bradlaugh). Now in that recommendation we have not one word of caution, none of reservation; not a sentence warning the reader that most demoralizing elements are therein contained. Mr. Bradlaugh denies having given unqualified commendation, but I could never desire a commendation of any book of mine more unqualified than that contained in the words I have read. There is not a hint of exception on his part to any portion of it, and no one could possibly suppose from his words, that its practices carried out, would reduce society to the utmost degradation. He sends it forth, by his commendation, without a single implied exception to the licentious doctrines it contains. He will, perhaps, insist that he has not given unqualified commendation, but I have read you such commendation in his own words. But he should know that nothing less than unqualified repudiation on his part of the immoral portions I have read, will at all meet the requirements of the case, so as to clear him. (Applause). If he will not give that unqualified condemnation of the parts in question (and then he could no longer recommend the book at all) he must remain branded by the strong language of Mr. Holyoake, who, on account of the treatment of this wretched literature by Mr. Bradlaugh in the *National Reformer*, called upon Secularists to sustain a new paper, that the public might not come to the conclusion that Secularism was in process of suffocation from the immoral literature of Holywell Street. (Applause).

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —Mr. King objects to quoting what does not belong to Christianity, but he does not object to quoting from books not belonging to Secularism. I don't object to his quoting any book he pleases, but I object to his quoting what does not belong to Secularism.

He has given you a novel and charming view of the ten commandments. He did not hold the ten as the ten commandments. He holds all of them except one, which has not been re-enacted, “Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, ” &c. I dare say that is re-enacted, as Mr. King says so, by Jesus, but, perhaps, he will find me the particular part of Scripture where that has taken place, and then we shall understand the ground he has taken. These ten commandments don't apply to you unless they are re-enacted, and particularly this one about the Sabbath, so that all this about in six days the Lord made heaven and the earth and rested the Seventh-day which was thenceforth hallowed, has nothing to do with Mr. King, and all the clergy who rail at you as Sabbath-breakers, your champion tells you are only guilty of impertinence, for the law applied to the Jews, and docs not apply to you in any fashion at all. (Hear, hear).

Now I am not going to read to you the whole of the passages Mr. King read from the *Elements*, but I'll ask you to read the whole at your leisure. I am not going to read any, but permit me to say that I am not going to repudiate the *Elements*. I have no connection with the book which needs repudiation. I believe it to be one of the very best books I ever read, written by a man more competent to write upon the subject than any man I have ever seen. I believe that the book was written in a pure and honest spirit, and I don't intend to retract one syllable that I have ever said about it. I say that it is not, and never has been, a Secular Text Book; I say that my views on Malthusianism are not held by the general body of Secularists any more than other of my views, but I urge that certainly there is much less ground for Mr. King quoting this book, than there would be for my quoting the Old Testament, because the Church of England by its

official representatives and by the statutes of the realm, declares the Old and New Testaments part and parcel of Christianity. So that if I am not justified, and Mr. King objects to my quoting anything but what belongs to Christianity, how much less is he justified in quoting from this book? "Oh," but he says, "I'll read from '*Jesus, Shelley and Malthus*.'" What was the object of that pamphlet? Nothing but to put before you that population has a tendency to increase faster than the means of existence, and it shows the views of Jesus, Shelly, and Malthus upon it, and I take the book in question up in the course of my investigations, as a cheap and good one. Necessarily, in a book dealing so much with medicine, with the whole in fact with this question, there is much that is utterly unfit to read before a mixed audience, and I do not say anything about that, for I do not understand it. But Mr. King did not say whether I was right, when I stamped down the lie as to page 425. Perhaps he will remember that at page 505 he began again in the middle of a sentence. "On the contrary" being omitted. I read this in justification of the author, who was misrepresented, not in justification of Secularism. I read from the author views about which I can give no opinion, but with the general statements he makes as to the condition of society in England, and in France, Germany, Italy, and Spain I agree, and if this book is, in any sort of fashion, an exemplification of the endeavour to promote human happiness which Secular principles have taught, the question comes, how is it that Christianity has not remedied the evils of poverty and prostitution? How is it that it has left them to be dealt with, in the nineteenth century, in such works as this? It is, to say the least, extraordinary, but let us take the author. He is answering Professor Newman, and he says: "With respect to Professor Newman's strictures, I shall only remark that in one place he makes the assertion that I have denied *chastity* to be a virtue. But this depends upon the definition given to the word. In the popular sense of the word, chastity is usually understood to mean complete sexual abstinence for however prolonged a period, except during the married state. Benjamin Franklin, however, defined chastity to mean, 'the regulated and strictly temperate satisfaction, without injury to others, of those desires which are natural to all healthy adult beings.' The late Mr. Robert Owen defined it in a similar manner as 'sexual intercourse with affection.' If the word be understood according to the definition of Franklin and Mr. Owen, then I consider chastity to be a very great virtue; but chastity, in the sense of prolonged sexual abstinence, I cannot but regard as an infringement of the laws of health, and, therefore, a *natural sin* either in man or woman, though doubtless in the actual state of society there are certain cases in which it is unavoidable." And don't forget, Mr. Morley Punshon went to Canada to marry his deceased wife's sister. He was enabled to live honourably with her as his wife there, but a few thousand miles would have made all the difference, for had he done so in England it would have been regarded as fornication. I ask you to listen to this—"On the contrary, the noblest sexual conduct, in the present state of society, appears to me to be that of those who, while endeavouring to fulfil the *real* sexual duties, enumerated in a former essay, live together openly and without disguise, but refuse to enter into an indissoluble contract of which they conscientiously disapprove." Now, I don't stand here to defend the writer's view, but I declare that it is a great deal more vicious for people to stand before the altar and bind themselves to live together "till death do us part" for the sake of money or position. It is more honourable to live together without a marriage tie, so long as

you do your duty fairly and honourably to one another. (Hisses.) The doctrine we lay down is that the man who, having a wife (and I call every woman a wife who lives with and has children to a man), turned her out to die, was a bad man, just as Abraham was a scoundrel; and the man who endeavours to fasten the *Elements of Social Science* upon a party, when he knows that it is only used in connection with the advocacy of these Malthusian questions, and reads lines taken out of the book without reference to the context, and passages without reference to the bearing of them, is a person whom it would be impossible to characterize too harshly, and I have already characterized him as he deserves. Let us see the position in which the thing stands. I ask if Mr. Xing did not convey a wrong impression as to the oath fight in which I have been engaged. I put it to him, and he said he had signed one petition, or so I thought he meant; but he says it is not within the last few years. He says that much was done before Mr. Bradlaugh put his hand to it. Well, I only pretend that I succeeded where others failed. I don't put it forward as a special thing for myself, but as the work of the party. They helped me to fight it. I only put it that the burden of the fight had fallen on me, as an illustration of what Secularism had done and Christianity failed in. Of course, Carlyle, Southwell, Watson, Hetherington, and Cleve had gone to gaol before. Seven hundred went to gaol in the early part of the century for opposition to the press laws, and to endeavour to circulate free thought. I don't pretend to take any other honour than that of a mere soldier in the fight, but I say that Christianity made the restriction which we have had to overthrow. (Hear, hear.) But let us see how, according to Mr. King himself, the question resolves itself. He says the question is "What is Secularism—what has it done that Christianity cannot do?" He won't permit me to put the whole of the Bible in as a Christian book, and yet despite the very curious way in which he speaks of it, seeing that he holds by it only as it relates to us. While he won't permit me to quote the Bible against him, he persists in quoting a book against me which has no principle that is brought into our principles at all, and only at worst one of those special principles that are held by me in common with other men. Well, but he says, you are the President of the Secular Society. And am not the Thirty-nine Articles and the Ten Commandments endorsed by the great Christian party? He asks me what I repudiate. I never repudiate until I find reason for it. Well, I don't agree with many of the views propounded by the writer here, because I have not been bold enough to profess to express an opinion on many of the facts on which it is based; but I am sure it is a pure book; a purely written book, and none but a filthy, evil-minded man would find anything filthy in it. (Cheers and hisses.)

MR. KING: —Last evening I intimated a desire to repeat, in Mr. Bradlaugh's hearing, all that in my former lectures here I had charged upon and quoted against Secularists. In accordance with that desire I have been careful to read from the *Elements of Social Science* everything important which I then quoted, as also the testimony of Mr. Barker and that of Mr. Holyoake, against the course taken by my opponent, thus putting forth in his presence all that I urged in his absence. You who were present at the lectures know that I have put the case in this debate even stronger than I did then. There is, however, one other witness whom I have not yet cited, but whom we heard on the former occasion. I mean

John Henry Gordon, formerly Secular lecturer, but now a Baptist minister. He describes the process by which he was led to abandon Secularism, and his experience is worthy your notice. I read from his *Repudiation of Secular Principles*, published 1862. He says:—

“Although, brief as my career had been, comparatively speaking, I had lectured in most parts of the country, North, South, East, and West, it was not until last April that I lectured in London, where, if there is not such a pretence of organization as prevails in the provinces, all the professional advocates of popular unbelief, or Secularism, reside. Now, I am not going to say anything personal of those six advocates, one lady and five gentlemen, except that, if you want to know anything about any one of them, ask all the rest, and you will very soon find out something curiously irregular, if not directly immoral; but I am going to say that, intensely to my sorrow as a Secularist, or, rather, intensely to my sorrow as an earnest and devout well-wisher for human progress and peace, I found all those persons, more or less, tearing each other to parts and pieces, just like so many Celtic cats. Mark you, I am saying nothing against, or about, their character as individuals; nor am I associating with them those many estimable unbelievers who, in London and elsewhere, refuse to have anything to do with one or other of them, as they may happen to be acquainted with the parties. * * * * *

“Need I tell you—surely not—that these things set me a thinking once more. At any rate, be it known unto you that these things did set me a thinking again; and that, on returning to my own home, into which it was my ambition that no corruption should ever enter, I questioned myself, and that with a fearful sharpness:—‘John Henry Gordon, what is it, after all, to which you have allied yourself, your name, your all? Is it possible that you have connected yourself with the advocacy of a principle, or principles, which, when and where best appreciated, and best, or worst, practised, do not prevent, but provoke, the committal of those actions which, otherwise considered, are looked upon as false and foul? You saw so-and-so do so-and-so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so—you know that such a person did such a thing, and such another person such another thing—and so on, and so on; but, at the same time, you know that the same people were loud and active in the same movement, so called, as that with which you have allied yourself. Consider, then, whether or not such things, so foul and false, were done by virtue of, or by violence to, those principles which the committers of them profess to maintain, and which you, in common with them, profess and maintain also.’ Even so, I say, I questioned myself day after day and week after week until, in good time I clearly saw that, however virtuous and worthy might be the lives of the great mass of those professing Secularists, who knew next to nothing about Secularism, *the man who reduced Secularism to its logical conclusions, the man who practised the philosophy of its precepts, was a man who could justify any action it was his pleasure to commit, and who, under cover of that justification, could make any action pleasing in his sight!*

Believe me I started, and that with horrible dread, at this discovery. I could not believe it, and with throbbing brow and burning throat I resolved to consider the matter again and see if I could not put it right, and by putting it right put myself right too. Again and again, therefore, I considered the matter. I looked at it this way, and that way, and every way. I looked at it all round, indeed; but here, there, and everywhere, on its surface and in its centre, I found nothing but repetitions of the horrid discovery I had already made. You must excuse me, however, if

in addition to my mere statement, I take the very case I took, and carry you through the very process of mind through which I went, in coming to the conclusion already stated. You will then be able to judge for yourselves whether or not that conclusion is a righteous one; and all that I ask you to do is, first, to remember the statements of Secular doctrine already made; and second, to give me your strictest attention.

Our illustration, then, shall be one of an action which, ordinarily speaking, would be called murder, and which, ordinarily judging, would be accounted a crime, and that of the foulest dye. In the way of Secularist A's advancement there stands a man, of whom could he but get rid, his future success would be not only more speedy but more successful; and, mark you, 'the good of this life' is A's 'primary object of pursuit.' He knows of no other, he does not acknowledge any other, he sneers when you hint at another; and his whole energies and abilities are concentrated in the present pursuit of present pleasure. But, then, as we have already supposed, B stands in his way, and A cannot get on so long as B does stand in his way! What can A do, however? B is hale and hearty, and actually promises to survive the man who wants him away; but, as Secularist A believes 'that material means constitute the true method of human improvement,' certain material agencies speedily suggest themselves to him. Say, for instance, the thrust of a knife, or the quenching draught of poison! 'Ah,' says his reason, 'but you may be found out, and that will certainly not promote the good of your present life! However, there is no other life, you know; and, therefore, your risk is only that between losing a little and winning a good deal. I would try, then; but, you know, you must not be found out.' *For that, indeed, is the only crime known to Secular, or natural, morality—the crime of not being able to avoid discovery!* Do what you like, but do not be found out in doing what you like! Lie, steal, or kill, but do not be known to be a liar, thief, or murderer! If you get found out, indeed, you are a fool, and, as such, deserve to be confined; but, if you can avoid being found out, you are a successful man—you have promoted your good in this life—you have, by material means, improved yourself—and, as such, you are entitled to all praise and honour."

Such is the testimony of one who has passed through the inner temple of Secularism, and who, consequently, speaks from experience. Mr. Bradlaugh turns upon two of my quotations. Well, I think it must be admitted that the quotations were fair and very accurate if not very acceptable, inasmuch as only two passages have "been challenged. It is not in the latter case at all implied that I have in any way changed the reading. Mr. Bradlaugh was pleased to read a previous portion, and to leave off where I began. (Laughter.) The statement is here, and the case is self-evident—"The noblest sexual conduct, in the present state of society, appears to me to be that of those who, while endeavouring to fulfil the *real* sexual duties, enumerated in a former essay, live together openly and without disguise, but refuse to enter into an indissoluble contract of which they conscientiously disapprove." That is as I read, and there is nothing preceding it which casts the shadow of a doubt on the sentiments expressed in those words. I am asked why I did not return to the former, as there, as alleged, I omitted two words from the lines I read. I omitted no words. I read a few words from the preceding portion, and I passed to the other passages, intimating that I had passed from the one to other. We have, therefore, the quotations practically unchallenged, and you have a fair sample of what the book contains. But Mr. Bradlaugh

said there were various matters in the book with which he did not agree. Will Mr. Bradlaugh be good enough to inform us what he repudiates and also what he agrees with in the passages I have read to you? (Hear, hear.) I have understood him as not repudiating any passage I have read. And I ask him to say, when he next rises, what portions of the book he does repudiate. (Hear, hear.) He says that there are matters of medical science, and upon which medical gentlemen might differ. But the passages I have read are not such, but clear and distinct in themselves. . Let him tell us which of the passages I have read he denounces as tending to demoralization, and which he would expunge from the book? He refers to the marriage of the Rev. Morley Punshon with his deceased wife's sister. Of course there is a difference between the marriage laws of America and those of England, but in England there is an agitation for alteration in the marriage law, as many see no reason why a man should not marry the sister of his former wife. But what has that to do with the advocacy of temporary sexual arrangements? There are no such temporary alliances legal in America. What has Punshon's case to do with it? He did not go to America to marry a wife for three weeks, and then come back to marry somebody else. (Hear, hear.)

Nothing of the kind. (Applause.) Then I am again asked, in reference to the petitions to Parliament for the repeal of the Oaths Laws. I did not imply that I had anything to do with the la9t petition. But I told you, in my former speech, that petitions were sent up signed by the people with whom I worship. Mr. Bradlaugh told us that all those petitions were issued by the National Secular Society. We have only Mr. Bradlaugh's word for that. I told you that independent petitions had been presented to Parliament, and I also told you that some members in connection with us have suffered because they would not take an oath. I have never taken what I consider to be an oath, and Mr. Holyoake would not take an oath, but Mr. Bradlaugh wa9 willing to swear on the Bible in which he did not believe. (Laughter.) Thus you see that oaths are no security, and hence my desire to abolish them. Then he tells us about people who went to gaol for the privileges we now enjoy. I know that a good many thus Buffered to establish the liberty we now enjoy in this country, but the great proportion of them were not Atheists, nor Secularists, nor infidels of any sort. I know what the Pilgrim Fathers suffered for conscience sake, when, after suffering here, their perilous crossing the ocean led to the planting of that great Republic on the other side of the Atlantic. (Hear, hear.) I know that men like John Bunyan suffered imprisonment because they would not yield to the forcing upon them the domination of the State Church. And I know that it is to those men that we owe, to a large extent, the liberty we now possess. If some men, not believers in the Bible, came forward and asserted their right to express their opinion, and suffered in consequence, then I honour them and their work. I honour them for their manliness, but I do not honour them for their irreligious principles. I honour all who have suffered in the defence of truth and right.

Mr. Bradlaugh, in alluding to the ten commandments, asked where the commandment in reference to not worshipping graven images is re-enacted. It is re-enacted in all the prohibitions to idolatry which are to be found in the New Testament. (Applause.) It is not re-enacted in the words of the Jewish Law, but we have the thing prohibited in the New Testament which that law forbade. There we have the prohibition renewed. Idolatry is clearly forbidden in the New Testament. The worship of images is

idolatry, and, therefore, the worship of images is forbidden; and, consequently,, the making of images, to fall down and worship them, is clearly and absolutely prohibited. (Hear, hear, and continued applause.)

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —I say that in no part of the New Testament do you find any re-enactment by Jesus of any portion of that commandment about graven images, and I say that that is just one of the class of arguments that we have had all through. They are statements of the wildest nature possible. Now we have something supposed to be very clever innuendo about the oath. He says Mr. Bradlaugh did not mind swearing by a God whom he did not believe in. But I will tell you what Mr. Bradlaugh did mind doing, and that was telling a lie about it; and he told the Judges of the Court of Common Pleas that if they insisted upon his keeping his hat on, or any other stupid form, and would by that consider him as pledged to speak the truth he would do it, but he would prefer any sensible form. The law was that I should go to prison if I did not take the oath. It was not the same for Mr. King, because the law has been for many years, that if I have a religious objection to taking the oath I need not take it, but that if I did not take it, from any other than a religious objection, I was incompetent for a witness. It was not alone the oath; it was a question of the competency of an infidel witness. And see how carefully that question of blasphemy was dealt with while we were under the question of the repeal of the law. Then Mr. King tells you that the Pilgrim Fathers went to found a Republic. I believe they went to do nothing of the kind. They went out and there was great unpleasantness between them and the Quakers, but I think the Great Republic came long after. Did it not?

Mr. KING: —Certainly it did.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: —It was rather a late issue. I think most of them were rather in favour of a monarchy than against it. Were the lathers justified in going against the king? Must they not obey the powers that be? Mr. King will have nothing from the Old Testament but what suits him, and there is much in the New that he won't refer to. I have read you passages about obedience, &c., and all these he has treated with the greatest unconcern. In fact Mr. King has read through a lot of writing and print and hasn't paid the smallest attention to anything that has fallen from me. But he says that Mr. Bradlaugh has only objected to two quotations. I ask you to go home, and read page by page, and you will find in many instances lines selected without reference to the context. I showed that Mr. King commenced one reading from a previous section. Now he says it is much the same. That is not my way of dealing with it. I made a distinct statement that he read a passage omitting a portion of the words from it. Now he wants to know how much of the *Elements* I will repudiate. I tell him at once—if the book teaches that a man has a right to take a woman for three weeks, and then get rid of her without her consent, I repudiate that. If the book teaches that a woman having a child is living with a man, the man had a right to get rid of them, I repudiate that, distinctly and thoroughly. But I don't believe it does teach it. Now to enter on the marriage question, and to ask how much I repudiate of the book, after I have repudiated it as a Secularist book, is grossly un-

fair; and the only reason why I have expressed the opinions I have about it was to show that although Mr. King was cowardly enough to try to fasten upon the Secular party a book which they had nothing to do with, I had my own views about it, independent of Secularism, and was prepared to say what I had always said about it. I have never said anything about it that I am ashamed to own before my own wife and daughters, and what is contended by many writers, that it is unfair that there should be an indissoluble tie for the poor, which is easily dissoluble by the rich. It is contended that there should not be one law of morality for the one and another for the other. It is contended that there should not be one marriage law for England and another for Scotland. It is contended that there should be one law to regulate these unions all through the land. It is contended that if people find themselves unfit for one another, there ought to be a means of putting an end to the union, and that is contended by some of the men of high positions in Christian life, as well as by this author; and I urge that nothing could be more unfair, nothing could be more unmanly, nothing could be more untrue, than to call this book the Secularists' Bible, or the Secularists' text book. The Secularists have no one book as their Bible, no one book as their text book, but, as I intimated in my first speech—and that has never been dealt with—they gather from the best men of the world, of every nation, and of every clime, and endeavour to apply the best wisdom to searching out the best forces that shall promote human happiness. Has Mr. King touched the basis which I put for Secular morality? No! He has been challenging me to produce a code, but he has never ventured to say that the basis was a bad one or untrue, or that he has a better. What has he done? He has read from Gordon to show that crimes are committed; but did he venture to show it by any Secular principle? This was what Gordon said after he had gone over to the other side, after he had broken faith with and left the Secularists, and wanted to conciliate the Christians. But if I attack this, he will say, Mr. Gordon is responsible, I am not; but a man who dresses himself in a filthy garment can have no excuse. I strike the coat, and I make the back that is under it flinch under the blow that I strike. Let us see what this debate has been, so far as it has gone. We have had six nights of it, and I ask if anyone can be brought to Christianity by it? What dignity, or bravery, or courage has it brought out? There has been nothing but filth all through. Mr. King says, how am I to know about the petitions issued by the Secularist Society. Well, at any rate, until he knew differently, he might have taken my word. How does Mr. Bradlaugh know? Because he went to the House of Commons and looked them over week by week for the *National Reformer*; because the Committee of the House of Commons asked Mr. Bradlaugh which of the series of petitions he would prefer being printed, and they printed Mr. Bradlaugh's petition. Mr. King put it last night, that if Mr. Bradlaugh was giving up his other lectures he should be satisfied to postpone the completion of this debate. Now there should not be this continual looking down. Let him rise to the level of a man. I don't like giving filth for filth. Look bravely up, and you may leave the world better than you find it. I know nothing more cowardly than for Mr. King to shelter himself behind another man. I say what I have to say for myself; if I am attacked, I don't hide myself behind another. Well, will the debate bring anyone to Christianity? Will it bring anyone to the Church? Will it make anyone understand these questions better than before? When I asked for a statement of what had been re-enacted, you call it an

infidel trick to crowd in so many questions, that time would not allow you to answer, and then you gabble over a lot of stuff that you wanted to go into the report. If you thought it a right style of debate I don't complain; you have done your best. It is a sorry best I admit. I entered on this discussion without any desire to enter it, and I shall leave it without regret. I am bound to take part in it for three nights more. I shall do it sorrowfully as I have done hitherto. I only want to meet the true, and the noble. I don't want to meet tricksters, who do no honour to their cause, and no honour to you. (Hisses). In the last speech last night, I was called a cheat and a subterfuge, and my friends sat quiet; leave me to finish in a few minutes what I have to say. I have met men in debate whom I have learnt to respect, notwithstanding all their defects, Dr. Bailey at Birkenhead, and Mr. Harrison at Newcastle—both were brave and manly foes, and left behind them the impression that they were trying to promote the truth. But I ask if anybody listening to us these two nights would not see that there has been the greatest avoidance and getting away from everything manly. Mr. King says he does not allege anything immoral in Mr. Bradlaugh's conduct. He may be the most moral or he may be the most immoral—he knows nothing either way. But why this double edged innuendo of the worst kind? Then he said as to what he stated about Mrs. Cattle that he did not mean any harm, but she does keep a small bonnet shop. Well, I will take care that his advertisement of Mrs. Cattle's small bonnet shop shall be as good as has been given for the *National Reformer*. You have increased its circulation, you have sold many dozen copies of the *Elements*. I have counted fourteen in this hall; you have done good for that book anyhow; you have brought people here who would never have come otherwise to hear this debate. In all this there is a gain, and with that I leave the debate—the only redeeming feature for the six nights which I have had so sorrowfully to waste. (Applause and hisses).

Mr. Bradlaugh moved a vote of thanks to the Umpire and the Chairmen. The proposition having been seconded by Mr. King was passed.

END OF THIRD SUBJECT.

APPENDIX.

No. 1.

Again and again Mr. Bradlaugh charged his opponent with abandoning the Authorized Version of the New Testament and with quoting some other. The whole is a mean subterfuge. Mr. King never once proposed to change the translation, not even in a single word. He referred to 1 Cor. xiii. as sustaining the doctrine that faith without love is worthless; but, in so-doing, he did not quote any word or phrase, but merely gave the chapter as authorizing the doctrine. In the entire debate he referred to but one Greek word, and that not for the purpose of changing the translation, but as supporting the rendering of the Common Version. Mr. Bradlaugh repeatedly demanded to know what Version Mr. King would take, and why that one in preference to any other. It was replied, that the Common Version had not been departed from, and was not likely to be, but that if it were Mr. Bang would give good authority for the change and fall back upon the document which the King's Translators had to do with. Then it was insinuated that there was no such document, and Mr. King was charged with pretending to quote a "particular document" which had no existence, whereas he never either quoted or pretended to quote a single sentence. So, according to Mr. Bradlaugh, the Translators translated from *nothing*. Mr. King used the word "document" in the sense given by Webster: "Anything furnishing proof or evidence," and the Greek text, used by the Translators, can be referred to in evidence of the correctness or incorrectness of their rendering. Mr. King has referred this matter to Dr. Angus, President of the Regent Park College, who has been designated one of the Board to which is committed the revision of the *Authorized Version* of the New Testament, now in progress. Dr. Angus writes—

"My dear Sir—Our *Authorized Version* was made from *Beza's Edition*, which is substantially the same as Stephens' of 1550 and 1565. The *Textus Receptus* belongs to 1621, and is substantially the same as Stephens' and Beza's, differing only in few places, which are unimportant. All these Editions exist, though scarce and dear.—Your, &c..
College, Regent's Park.

James Angus."

No. 2.

Mr. King's allusion to Papal territory transferred to Victor Immanuel was several times by Mr. Bradlaugh used to cover his inability to grapple with facts. All that Mr. King's argument required him to sustain was that there had been, at intervals since the time of Napoleon I., a withdrawal of Papal territory from the persecuting power of the Pope. In this sense only was it necessary for Mr. King to be construed. But Mr. Bradlaugh fell back upon a more restricted application of the words than was needful, and insisted that Papal territory had not been transferred. But Mr. Bradlaugh has been to Italy, and he ought to know. Yes, but the Pope and Cardinal Cullen may perhaps know as much of Italy as Mr. Bradlaugh. Let us hear them:—

"The Florentine Government have invaded, without any provocation, the small remnant of the Papal territories which had escaped their rapacity when plundering the States of the Church in 1859."

"In 1859, he (Napoleon III.) encouraged the Sardinians to seize on the greater part of the States of the Church, and guaranteed them in the possession of their stolen property."

The above is from Cardinal Cullen's Letter to the Clergy and People,

APPENDIX.

October, 1870. The Epistle Encyclical of Pius IX., December, 1870, contains the following:—

"You are well aware how in 1859 the chief cities of the *Æmilia* were stirred up to rebellion by the Piedmontese authorities, who sent in writings, conspirators, arms and money; and how, not long afterwards, assemblies of the people having been convened and suffrages having been taken, a pretended plebiscite was got up, and by that trickery and pretence our provinces situate in that region were wrested from our Paternal Government. You are already acquainted with the fact that during the year following the said Government made prey upon other provinces situate in Umbria and in the Patrimony, and turned them to their own profit, alleging crafty pretexts, and with a large array attacked by surprise our troops... and routed them."

The above must suffice. Of course Mr. Bradlaugh may be correct as to the non-transference of Papal territory, but in that case Mr. King, the *Cardinal* and the *POPE* are entirely misinformed. But even then Mr. King's argument is unshaken, for that territory has wasted away and is now entirely gone.

Vehemently did Mr. Bradlaugh assert that he had never, in Mr. King's absence, "used any hard words about him, either here or in any other place." But Mr. King happens to possess *verbatim reports* of his lectures which disprove his statement. It is, however, not needful to produce them, because the *National Reformer* proves the assertion only another case of wilful untruth. In the *National Reformer*, October 2, 1870, in a report of the Conference of the National Secular Society, Mr. Bradlaugh reports himself as "*commenting on the cowardly attack upon Christopher Charles's wife by David King of Birmingham*" Certainly Mr. King was not then present.

No. 4.

Mr. King quoted from the *Hutchings and Bradlaugh Debate* a few words attributed by Mr. Hutchings to Robert Owen. Mr. Bradlaugh did not denounce Mr. Hutchings as a "vile man" for so doing, but he applied that phrase to Mr. King for quoting them from that debate. Why denounce the one and not the other? The reader will find on p. 29 of the last part of this debate, the words cited by Hutchings. Let him compare them with the following from Owen's Manchester Lectures, and he will see how much injustice was done by quoting the words in question—

"But the single family arrangements are hostile to the cultivation in children of any of the superior and ennobling qualities of human nature. They are trained by them to acquire all the most mean and ignorant selfish feelings that can be generated in the human character. The children within those dens of selfishness and hypocrisy are taught to consider their own individual family their own world, and that it is the duty and interest of all within that little orb to do what they can to promote the advantage of all the legitimate members of it. With these persons it is my house, my estate, my children, my husband; *our* estate and *our* children; or my father, my sisters; and our house and prosperity." P. 36.

"Is there any sexual crime or prostitution known, or imagined to exist, among any tribe or species of animals, except man? We reply that we know of no other animals who fancy there is any crime or vice whatever in continuing their species as their nature directs, or which do not follow the instincts of their nature, and no evil ensues. Do they act wisely or viciously in their sexual intercourse? Most wisely; and if they were to act otherwise their conduct would soon become as unwise as vicious, and immoral as the past and present conduct of the human race." P. 68.

No. 5.

Since the debate Mr. Bradlaugh has been applied to for the date of the *British Medical Journal* which contains Lord Amberley's commendation of the filthy book in question, or for the date of one of the other "fifty or sixty papers" into which it had been copied, but he could give no

APPENDIX.

information. Lord Amberley was again written to by Mr. King, and replied thus—

“Sir, —In reply to your letter of the 3rd instant, I hare to say that the speech alluded to by Mr. Bradlaugh was made at the Dialectical Society on July 1, 1863.....

With reference to Mr. Bradlaugh’s aliened quotation, I may observe that I do not believe I made any mention of the *Elements of Social Science*, and most certainly not in the terms stated by Mr. Bradlaugh. I am not at all surprised to learn that he ‘cannot give’ the number of the *British Medical Journal*, since the report referred to by him contains not the most distant allusion to the work in question. This will be sufficient to show you with what extreme caution Mr. Bradlaugh’s assertions must be received. In conclusion my present estimate of this book is not the result of a change of mind since 1868. —Yours faithfully, AMBERLEY.”

The date thus supplied enabled the *Journal* to be procured, and there, certainly, in the number for August 1st, 1868, is the speech of Lord Amberley, but no mention of, nor allusion to, the book in question, nor reference to any book; nor anything which can be supposed in any way to refer to it; nor anything incompatible with his lordship’s strongly expressed repudiation of the book. Thus the matter might be left as clearly settled, but as Mr. Bradlaugh cannot be put down while the possibility remains of covering his defeat by assertions which, for want of witnesses, could not be proved untrue, and as he still insists that Lord Amberley did, in his presence, thus commend the book, it was deemed well to refer to the gentleman who read the Essay in connection with which Lord Amberley’s speech was made. That gentleman (Mr. Laurie) writes to his lordship thus—

“I am convinced you said nothing about the book called *Elements of Social Science*. But the opinion quoted by Mr. Bradlaugh and attributed to you was delivered by himself after your lordship had left the meeting.”

Thus Mr. Bradlaugh imposes his own worthless recommendation of a most filthy book upon the assembly and comes before the public boldly attributing his own words to Lord Amberley. But that the case may not admit of a loophole for escape, the following testimonial has been obtained from gentlemen who were present when the very Honourable President of the *National Secular Society* says he heard Lord Amberley say the words he himself uttered after his lordship had left the room.

“Whereas, at a meeting of the London Dialectical Society held in 1868, Lord Amberley has been reported to have pronounced a favourable opinion on a work entitled the *Elements of Social Science*, etc., this is to certify that his lordship made no allusion whatever to the work in question.

We seize the present opportunity of further declaring, most emphatically, that his lordship’s remarks on the purely philosophic axiom of the Rev. Dr. Malthus were *not* of the character subsequently ascribed to them by some of the Medical and Conservative Journals. His lordship simply and fairly stated the proposition and calmly criticised its bearings on some practicable solution of the social problems of the day, namely—poverty and crime, including the horrors of infanticide. We, who were present, heard nothing that could possibly offend the most sensitive ear of any reasoning creature; but *much* that evinced an earnest consideration of the subject from a truly humane point of view.”

J. STUART LAURIE, *formerly* II. M. Inspector of Schools, &c.
DAVID NASMITH, of the Middle Temple, Barrister at law.
JOHN STEEL, Medical Superintendent, Guy’s Hospital.

Having settled the question in relation to Lord Amberley, Mr. King thought well to ascertain how far Mr. John Stuart Mill has been fairly represented by the frequent use of his name in connection with the book in question. The result is the following letter—

“Dear Sir, —I have most certainly never on any occasion whatever, in public or private, expressed any approbation of the book entitled *Elements of Social Science*. Nor am I likely ever to have done so, inasmuch as I very strongly object to some of the opinions expressed in it. You are, therefore, quite at liberty to say that I am not correctly represented by any one who asserts that I have commended the book. —Yours very faithfully, J. S. MILL.”

Thus this wretched case of falsification of testimony and boldly impudent imposition is completely exposed.