

THE FREETHINKER

EDITED BY G. W. FOOTE.

Sub-Editor—J. M. WHEELER.

Vol. VIII.—No. 27.]

JULY 1, 1888.

[PRICE ONE PENNY

COMIC BIBLE SKETCH.—No. 250.



DOCTOR PAUL.

And there sat a certain man at Lystra, impotent in his feet, being a cripple from his mother's womb, who never had walked: The same heard Paul speak: who stedfastly beholding him, and perceiving that he had faith to be healed, Said with a loud voice, Stand upright on thy feet. And he leaped and walked.—ACTS XIV, 8-10.

GLADSTONE ON INGERSOLL.—II.

GLADSTONE more than once accuses Ingersoll of being "shallow," but what could be shallower than the reply that Jesus said nothing about family relations, and not a word against slavery, because it would have been absurd to issue "a sort of *Code Napoleon* embracing education, progress, scientific truth, and international law"? Slavery and the family relations are *moral* questions, and was it not to improve our morals, as the clergy say, that Jesus condescended to teach us? Was not the Mosaic law a very minute "sort of *Code Napoleon*"? And if Jehovah was full and precise under the old dispensation, what absurdity, what contradiction, would there have been if he had been full and precise under the new dispensation?

This method of answering Ingersoll is hardly ingenuous. It seeks to palliate the science of the Bible, but neglects to notice its statements. Slavery, for instance, is repeatedly dealt with in Scripture. It is regulated in the Old Testament and countenanced in the New. "Servants be obedient unto your masters" is a fraudulent translation; the proper rendering is "slaves be obedient unto your owners." Now suppose this, and all other Biblical references to slavery,

No. 361.]

had been found in any other book; and suppose that book, like the Bible, contained not a single condemnation of slavery; would not everybody say that slavery was taught and upheld in it?

That "the Gospel was promulgated to teach principles and not a code" is simply one of those airy assertions in which Mr. Gladstone's article abounds. How does he know what the Gospel was promulgated for? What right has he to state the Almighty's reasons and motives? Might not another person, with equal right, assert the opposite? But this is not all. Gladstone uses this "principles and no code" theory to prove that Jesus taught the exact contrary of his own words. He declares that Jesus taught "the absolute indissolubility of marriage." What then is the meaning of this text?

"Whosoever shall put away his wife, *saving for the cause of fornication*, causeth her to commit adultery" (Mat. v., 32).

If this does not mean that fornication was a ground for divorce, Jesus should have held his tongue till he was able to make his words and his meaning coincide.

After charging Ingersoll with presuming to instruct the Savior of the world, Gladstone accuses him of interpolation. Ingersoll said that the Apostles "conceived the idea of

having all things in common," and Gladstone protests that "in the narrative there is no statement, no suggestion of the kind." What a solemn fuss over a joke! Ingersoll did not say those words were in the text. The believers had all things in common, and he merely thought the idea originated with those who had nothing.

Next comes immortality. Ingersoll holds that the belief was "born of human affection." This is quite erroneous, however. The belief in ghosts originated among savages, who had not the civilised man's memory and prevision, and none of his yearning for "the touch of a vanished hand and the sound of a voice that is still." Yet it is undoubtedly true that the desire to rejoin the loved and lost has cherished the belief in later days. Ingersoll is right as to its development, though wrong as to its genesis. But Gladstone does not attack his weak point. Indeed, he attacks nothing. He simply falls into a transparent fallacy. How is it, he asks, that the Egyptians, who were not a highly intellectual people, held the belief firmly; while the Greeks, who were strikingly intellectual, lost their hold upon it? Ingersoll says the belief was born of *affection*, and Gladstone asks why the most *intellectual* people had the least of it. What logic!

Gladstone's words on the Greeks are worth quoting:—

"The ancient Greeks, on the other hand, were a race of astonishing, perhaps unrivalled intellectual capacity. But not only did they, in prehistoric ages, derive their scheme of a future life from Egypt; we find also that, with the lapse of time and the advance of Hellenic civilisation, the constructive ideas of the system lost all life and definite outline, and the most powerful mind of the Greek philosophy, that of Aristotle, had no clear conception whatever of a personal existence in a future state."

What is this but an admission that the most gifted people in history had a large fund of supernaturalism in its youth, which gradually disappeared as it attained to manhood? Does not this case show that religion and civilisation are incompatible, and that as the one advances the other recedes?

Ingersoll's chief position, in his letters to Dr. Field was this, that belief is independent of the will, and that, consequently, "there is no opportunity of being honest, or dishonest in the formation of an opinion." This doctrine Gladstone ventures to call "a plausibility of the shallowest kind." But surely this contemptuous description is quite indefensible. Ingersoll did not invent or discover the doctrine. It has been held by a long list of illustrious thinkers, and Gladstone therefore applies the epithet "shallow" to some of the greatest names in the history of philosophy.

The fact is, Gladstone is in a complete muddle. He neither understands Ingersoll's position nor his own. He does not see that in admitting that "error and honesty are compatible" he is going over to the enemy. If belief depends on the will, error and honesty cannot be compatible; if error and honesty are compatible, belief cannot depend on the will.

"Likes and dislikes" enter into our judgments of persons and causes. Of course they do. But who can help his likes and dislikes? They are born with us. They are parts of our nature, and they help to determine the will itself. Were it otherwise, every man would be a mystery to himself and everyone else.

Gladstone cites a number of illustrations. "Did Napoleon," he asks, "judge according to the evidence when he acquitted himself in the matter of the Duc d'Enghien?" What confusion, to be sure! The very charge against Napoleon is that, to gratify his ambition, he shot a man he knew to be innocent. Gladstone argues as if expressions and opinions were identical. If one man believes another to be guilty, he is honest in acting on the belief; he is dishonest if, believing the man to be innocent, he acts as though he were guilty. Actions may be honest or dishonest; opinions can be neither.

Take another illustration. Republican and Monarchical principles, says Gladstone, have been struggling through history; and will any one say that moral, or immoral, causes have had nothing to do with the adoption of sides? Of course they have. Men have sometimes espoused causes for personal ends. But the very admission shows their *opinions* were not involved. Gladstone's illustration, as against Ingersoll's argument, is meaningless, unless it implies that either Republicans or Monarchists are scoundrels. If honest men can take either side, a good heart does not necessarily lead to a right opinion. Gladstone himself has

taken different sides at different periods of his life. He was once an earnest Tory, he is now an earnest Liberal. A few years ago he said the Parnellites were marching through rapine to dismemberment; he now says they are noble patriots and real Unionists. His opinions, therefore, have changed. And what has changed them? Is Gladstone, at seventy-eight, more moral than he was at seventy-five? No, the change has been wrought by fresh light.

Gladstone's crowning illustration is the worst of all. He takes Thuggism, and asks "Was this an honest error?" Of course it was in the case of every earnest Thug. He believed it right to murder people, and his opinion was honest. His doctrine was inconvenient for travellers; but so was Torquemada's doctrine inconvenient for the poor wretches he burnt, and John Calvin's for the unfortunate Servetus. The Thug was as respectable as any Christian persecutor. But Mr. Gladstone is a Christian, and of course he is not likely to look at the subject in this light. He actually cries out that if Thuggism was an honest error "it is plain that the whole foundations, not of belief, but of social morality, are broken up." Here again he does not see the difference between opinion and action. If a Thug thinks we all ought to be dead, he has a right to his opinion; but if he tries to kill us we have an equal right to protect ourselves. Society guards against lunatics as well as criminals. Who is going to hold out his throat because another man thinks he ought to cut it? While the law of self-preservation lasts society will seize manslaughterers, whether they kill for profit or on principle.

Finally, Gladstone charges Ingersoll with gross inconsistency; for while arguing that belief or disbelief is not a proper subject for praise or blame, he calls the dogma of eternal punishment the "infamy of infamies." But the inconsistency is not in Ingersoll's argument; it is in Gladstone's mind. The dogma of everlasting punishment is something more than an opinion. It is a declaration of sovereign injustice and divine brutality. It affirms what God will *do*, and not what he thinks. It asserts that the Almighty Father will torture his children eternally, for being just what he made them, although he foresaw how they would act. Ingersoll does not say it is infamous to believe the dogma of everlasting punishment. Belief is not a crime, though it is sometimes a misfortune, and in that case Ingersoll would pity instead of hating. But the dogma itself *is* infamous. If false, it libels God and degrades man; if true, it makes God an Almighty Devil, and man the victim of infinite malignity.

But enough, Ingersoll's reply to Gladstone is now in print for English readers. It is worthy of the subject and the man. Seldom has there been such a perfect tomahawking, done with such perfect politeness. "God help Gladstone," we said, "when Ingersoll replies to him." Our anticipations are more than realised, and Gladstone will need all the divine grace at his command to feel easy after such a terrible beating.

G. W. FOOTE.

THE TERRORS OF RELIGION.

CHRISTIAN apologists claim all the good in the world as the result of their religion. When pointed to the evils which have attended the whole course of its history, they say these are to be ascribed to its perversions. How unfair this method is we will make plain by a few illustrations.

Belief in the agency of demons is embedded in the very substance of Christianity. The immense majority of Christ's miracles are founded on this belief. He drives out devils from the possessed, and the demons acknowledge his power. He is himself represented as tempted by the devil, who "taketh him into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple." Again, "the devil taketh him up into an exceedingly high mountain and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world." Of course the belief in evil spirits as the causes of human disease and suffering did not originate with Christianity. It was inherited from savagery. But Jesus did nothing to dispel the superstition. On the contrary, he countenanced it. He frequently rebukes the devils. He makes their agency the subject of a discourse. He asks, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out?" He invariably speaks as if diabolical agency was the cause of the diseases brought before him. Four hundred years before Christ, Hippocrates wrote a treatise combatting this superstition. Jesus sanc-

tions it. He says, "This kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer and fasting." Not only fasting, but mortifications and mutilations, were used by those who sought to weaken the power of evil spirits over the flesh. Jesus himself enjoined bodily mutilation. "If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out. It is better to enter the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell fire."

It was this belief in demons that gave birth to asceticism. The self tortures and cruelties of the monks and fathers of the desert, who made a hell on earth to escape one hereafter, were the legitimate outcome of Christian doctrine. As Mr. Galton points out, the long night of the dark ages was largely due to the celibacy enjoined by religious orders on their votaries. The Church, acting upon the doctrines of Jesus and Paul, discouraged the reproduction of its best members, with results disastrous to the interests of the human race. No one can read the Lives of the Saints without being shocked by the way in which these devoted persons trod on human affection, in order to make their own salvation sure. When the mother of St. Thomas Aquinas besought him to stay in the domestic circle he rejected her love as the instigation of the devil to keep him from the religious life, and he induced his sisters to follow his example. The terrors of religion have been exhibited, not only in the blood of the battlefield and the fires of the *auto da fe*, but in the tears of parted relatives, the agony of hearts harassed by doubt and riven by fear. It is difficult for Freethinkers to realise the anguish and terror caused by real belief in a devil, who might at any moment tempt and ruin the soul for ever. And this devil, mind, is called "the prince of this world" (John xii., 21). He can work miracles (Rev. xiii., 14; xvi., 14), and transform himself into an angel of light (2 Cor xi., 14). How hard the task for finite erring man to combat against fiends, who for thousands of years have held their own against Almighty God? The horrible records of this belief are written in the history of religious mania and the persecutions of witchcraft, a history not to be read without shuddering and tears, and which warrants the affirmation that all the good which Christianity can claim to have effected, from its first promulgation to this hour, can never atone for the injury it has inflicted by this doctrine alone.

But it is not only devils the Christian has to fear. His God is an absolute sovereign, with nothing to hope or to fear from those over whom he exercises dominion. They are but as clay in the potter's hand. He may visit the minutest infraction of his law with the most dreadful punishment, while all reward is a pure matter of grace. Apart from the consequences of original sin, we are told that "every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment" (Matt. xii., 36), and that "whosoever shall keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all" (James ii., 10). None can assure himself that he is worthy of eternal bliss. The most religious person can have no certainty that he will be saved. The yawning gulf of the bottomless pit may after all be his destiny. Hence the doubts and fears which distract those upon whom anticipations of a future life make a deep impression. Heaven is not a remuneration a faithful servant can fairly claim. It is a free gift. Jesus expressly teaches that men when they have done "all those things which are commanded" are still unprofitable servants (Luke xvii., 7-10). And what Christian does all that is commanded; resists not evil; gives to everyone that asks; and, if robbed of a coat, offers a cloak also? Does not Jesus say, "Whosoever he be of you who forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple," and "Many are called, but few are chosen"? "Wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat: because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it" (Matt. vii., 13-14). Appalling apprehensions are the necessary and inevitable fruits of genuine religious belief. It is only the absence of such a faith that can be tidings of great joy.

J. M. WHEELER.

"Mamma," said a little girl, "do all the wicked people go to the bad place?" "Yes, dear." "And all the good people go to heaven?" "Yes." "Ain't some people wickeder than other people?" "Yes, I suppose they are." "Well, I think that the people who are not so very, very wicked ought to go to the bad place only in the winter time."

ACID DROPS.

PROFESSOR MACALISTER remarked at the Missionary Conference that Christ was the great medical missionary, and that grievous mischief had arisen from ignorance of medical matters on the part of missionary pioneers. Thus one missionary unknowingly introduced small-pox, which carried off more than 2,000 victims in the first year of its ravages.

ANOTHER speaker described how the hostility of the Arabs had been disarmed by the almost miraculous cures which science had enabled the mission to effect, "giving sight to the blind, restoring the use of limbs," and so forth. But it is Science that does this, not Christianity. Religion has lost the power it once boasted, and which it still boasts wherever people are ignorant and credulous enough to believe in it.

SOME of the educated Japanese are thinking of adopting Christianity without believing it. Professor Toyama, of the Imperial University, for instance, says: "We Japanese have no taste for religion whatever, and it is impossible we shall ever become a religious people." Other leading minds express similar sentiments, but they think the people may as well believe something or other, and Christianity may as well be that something, as it "seems to be the creed of the most highly civilised nations." These gentlemen also advocate the new religion because they think it will improve music, unite sentiment and feeling, and provide a medium of intercourse between men and women. But surely these objects could be accomplished without the aid of Christianity?

MR. A. S. D. COLQUHON, who has been connected with the M'All Mission in Paris, does not think much of the chances of Protestantism in France. Writing in the *British Weekly*, he says, "The condition of the Protestant Church is, as a whole, woeful to contemplate. They are in a state of lethargy, next to death, and habitually resist every effort to arouse them."

GEORGE GARNER, a "captain" in the Church Army at Stockton, has been committed for trial on the charge of indecently assaulting Florence Walker, a girl of eleven, in the gospel tent of the Army.

THE Bishop of Peterborough says that men are always to manifest a Christian spirit in their politics. But Christ neglected politics, and would have nothing to do with them. Conducting politics in the Christian spirit is like eating pork in the Jewish fashion, or conducting a beer-shop on teetotal principles.

How is legislation to be carried on if politicians vote for their enemy's bills as they would for their own? Are Radicals to study the Tories' wishes as their first duty? Are they to forgive them their Coercion Bills unto seventy times seven? When defeated are they to court still further defeat by turning the other cheek also for an additional blow? If Tories take one popular right are Radicals to give up another also?

DURING divine service at Brezegie, in Galicia, God struck the parish church with lightning. He killed three of the congregation on the spot. Six others were severely injured, and two hundred and thirty suffered to a less degree from the lightning and the falling masonry. A lightning conductor would have been a better preventive against this sudden death and disaster than all the prayers of all the Churches.

THE Vicar of Alborough has had to summon three of his flock for refusing to pay him their "Easter offerings, oblations and obventions." The parishioners responded by holding an indignation meeting and subscribing to pay for the defence. The Vicar wants these compulsory "offerings" for purchasing altar candlesticks and similar trumpery. He is a martinet in ecclesiastical matters, and it is said that in his last parish he prosecuted the sheriff and a number of farmers for smoking in the churchyard.

THE Vicar of a Yorkshire parish advertises for a schoolmaster at the modest salary of £25 a year. Only £20 will be paid in cash, the remaining £5 being made up in children's fees and a "rough" cottage estimated as worth £2 a year. So munificent an offer of course requires a person of some talent. He must play the harmonium and be certificated; he must, above all, be a good Churchman, whose piety and attainments are personally vouched for by two clergymen. The Vicar explains that he cannot afford more because the value of his own living is only £380. It is no wonder that, as he bitterly complains, this advertisement has brought him a number of "rude letters."

THE *Athenaeum* for June 23 prints some hitherto unpublished marginalia by Coleridge on Jahn's *History of the Hebrew Commonwealth*. On p. 98 he remarks:—"God forgive me if it be an evil thought! But had I read the same account in any profane history, I should not have scrupled to consider the deposition of Saul as the result of the Theocratic party's jealousy of their own diminishing influence. How much less heavy do these transgressions of Saul's seem than those related of David."

THE *North Eastern Daily Gazette* says "the undeniable fact is that Christianity is not rapidly spreading among heathen nations." Yet we read that last year 180,000 gallons of spirits were imported at Sierra Leone, while 1,213,000 gallons were landed at Lagos. The liquor was not meant for Mohammedans, who are all pledged abstainers.

THE lion and the lamb lie down together, though we don't say which is the lion and which is the lamb. Cardinal Manning and G. J. Holyoake attended a peace meeting at the National Liberal Club on Monday night, and according to the *Star*, they "exchanged a cordial greeting after the speeches."

BISHOP BALDWIN, of Huron in Canada, who is over here with so many other gaitered "fathers in God" just now, says that the saddest sight in all Christendom is that of a woman who is a sceptic. Yes it is a very sad sight to a bishop, but a very cheering one to those who desire to see woman's emancipation from her worst enemy.

THE Rev. W. F. Armstrong, American Baptist, of the Telugu mission, frankly explained one of the causes of Christian success in India. He said the mission was begun fifty years ago, and for thirty years it was entirely fruitless. But a famine came, and then the people came in thousands to be baptised. They knew that becoming a Christian would ensure them a modicum of rice. Indeed the common name for converts in India is "ricc-Christians."

THERE is something touching in the credulity of your orthodox believer. Whether he be a Catholic bending over a fictitious relic of a real or imaginary saint, or a Protestant gazing on some fancied memorial of apostolic times, he is the same infantile superstitionist. Here is Mr. James Glaisher, for instance, going into raptures over the Pool of Bethesda, which the Palestine Exploration Society has recently "discovered." A big cistern has been unearthed, and it pleases the explorers to call this the Pool of Bethesda. Mr. Glaisher points out in the *Times* that "an apparently uninterrupted chain of evidence from the year A.D. 333 to the year 1180 speaks of the *Probatica Priscina* as near the Church of St. Anne." But such "evidence" can only mean "tradition." Real evidence would have to begin three centuries earlier, and no such evidence exists. Mr. Glaisher does not see that, before any unearthed cistern can be recognised as the Pool of Bethesda, the fact must be established that there was a Pool of Bethesda. According to the Gospel, it was a miraculous pool, periodically visited by an angel, who stirred the waters (perhaps with a stick of sulphur) and made them medicinal. Yet Josephus, who is singularly minute and even garrulous, never mentions this wonderful bath; and outside the Gospel there is not a scrap of evidence that it ever existed. The story is obviously mythical. Mr. Glaisher and his colleagues may believe it, but if they do we fail to see why they should not "go the whole hog," and swallow all the legends of Catholic hagiology.

"THE historical evidence," says Mr. Glaisher, "is as strong as that which connects the Holy Sepulchre with the site adopted by Constantine." Very likely; but that doesn't amount to much. Three hundred years after the Crucifixion the clergy of Jerusalem found their Savior's sepulchre, which nobody had heard of in the interval; and the number of miracles that were wrought at the place is sufficient to stamp the whole business as a fraud. Mr. Glaisher says nothing about the three crosses of Christ and the two thieves which were "discovered" at the same time. These timbers disappeared again, but the Palestine explorers may re-find them and bring them to London, where millions of people would pay a shilling to see them. Even Sunday-school children would forego a pennyworth of toffee and sport a copper for the show.

A LADY was asked to help a boy and girl, whose father was a worthless drunkard. They were represented as "starving and in rags." The lady offered to take the girl abroad as a house servant; but the offer was declined on the ground that the girl would not be able to receive the Holy Communion twice a month. Starvation and rags, with the body and blood of Jesus every fortnight, is preferred to a good home, with only an occasional consumption of deity! But *de gustibus non est disputandum*.

THE *Sun*, Winnipeg, Manitoba, reports the death of Ida Jordan, at Indianapolis. She poisoned her four-year-old son, and cut her own throat with a razor. The *Sun* explains that "she had been interested in magnetic and Christian science."

"CHRISTIAN science" is causing a storm in America. The *London Standard* is severe upon these faith-healers, who go in for praying instead of drugs; but this organ of Tory piety forgets the plain teachings of the New Testament which these poor creatures are honest and idiotic enough to follow.

THE *Christian Commonwealth* explains the biblical contradiction involved in the inspired statements that no man hath seen God at any time, and that various men have seen God at various times. It is a misconception, it seems, that these statements are opposites. They are not antagonisms of expression, but are correlatives. God in his essence cannot be seen, but he can be seen in

such forms as he chooses to assume for purposes of revelation. The Bible never stooped to explain all this, and it is a sign of progress when Christians have to do so in however ridiculous a fashion. But suppose a witness in court used a similar reservation. He swears that he often saw a man, and then when that statement becomes inconvenient he alters his tone, and swears that he never saw him on any occasion whatever. When the contradiction is pointed out by some counsel whom the witness has not power to intimidate or bribe into silence, he merely gets an irresponsible friend to rise in court and explain that the statements are by no means opposites, but only philosophical correlatives. The witness never saw the man in his absolute and essential nature—never visually saw his mind, or soul, or thought, or character, or intellect—but only the external, superficial appearance of clothes and a body, which were not the actual man. What would a judge say? Would he not be likely to commit the witness to take his trial for perjury?

ON Saturday, June 23, some volunteers, who had been camping for a week at South Shields, were to be inspected, and a large number of spectators assembled. For some time previous to the arrival of the inspecting officer the volunteers amused themselves and the spectators by some horseplay, which consisted of "tossing up" first one and then another of their own number. Presently they "went for" some of the bystanders, and among others they "tossed up" a doctor and a policeman; then, seeing a person in clerical attire proceeding leisurely across the ground, they ran and laid hands on him, and, much to the amusement of everybody, they took off his hat, and up he went three times, amid roars of laughter. The appearance of the clerical gentleman was exceedingly funny as he shot up in the air, with his legs one way, and his arms another, and the long tails of his black coat fluttering about with the breeze.

THE *Manchester Evening News* has what is called a "smart" paragraph on the Gladstone and Ingersoll debate. "It seems to be considered," says the *News*, "that Mr. Gladstone has over-rated Colonel Bob's importance, and that it was scarcely worth his while to cross swords with the American Iconoclast. However, it is considered that the Colonel has been badly worsted, and it is hinted that his feelings at present are of a kind to convince him of the reality of a certain torrid locality which shall be nameless." This rigmarole means that Ingersoll "feels hell." But "Colonel Bob's" reply to Gladstone is now published, and the reader can judge for himself whether Gladstone or Ingersoll is "in chancery."

WHY did Gladstone cross swords with Ingersoll if it was not "worth his while"? It was worth his while in more senses than one. The G.O.M. received a big cheque, besides having the pride and pleasure of rushing into the arena to meet a gladiator who had disposed of Judge Black and Dr. Field, and stood without a challenger. As to "Colonel Bob's importance," it is enough to state that his Letters to Dr. Field enormously increased the circulation of the *North American Review*. Thorndike Rice, the editor of that *Review*, is a better judge of Ingersoll's importance than any jotter of the *Manchester Evening News*.

SPURGEON says in his *Sword and Trowel* that "The last issue must be between Atheism in its countless forms, and Calvinism. The other systems will be crushed as the half-rotten ice between two great bergs!" Considering that Mr. Spurgeon laments that he himself is almost the only Calvinist remaining south of the Tweed, the prospects of the final conflict resulting in a Christian victory cannot be very hopeful.

A WRITER in the *Church Times*, commenting on Jael's murder of Sisera, reminds us that it was first prophesied by Deborah, and afterwards applauded by her, and that it is part of the Christian belief that the Holy Ghost spake by the prophets.

THE two City of London churches, St. Michael's, Wood Street, and St. Mary, Aldermanbury, have between them an average congregation of fifteen.

THE Bishop of Manchester says he sees continually, "in all our towns, announcements of lectures on the Christian religion by persons totally unfit to deal with them. Our eight hundred and seventy clergy and two millions and a half of laity cannot answer these men as they ought to be answered." He evidently thinks both the lecturers and his own clergy are in a parlous state. Yet he cut rather a sorry figure himself in the hands of Mr. Symes, at Melbourne. We hope the Bishop of Manchester will appear at some of the Freethought lectures in his city, and answer them as they ought to be answered.

ACCORDING to the Romish legend, St. Modobert kissed his mother's blind eyes and her sight was immediately restored. Protestants reject this legend as a fraud, but they accept another legend which is equally fraudulent and not nearly so beautiful—the Gospel legend that Christ spat on the ground and rubbed the filthy mixture into a blind man's eyes, thereby restoring his sight.

GOD has just drowned 1,500 Mexicans by floods. The town of Leon is for the most part in ruins.

MR. FOOTE'S LECTURES.

Sunday, July 1, Jolly Butchers' Hill, Wood Green, at 11.30, "Salvation"; Hall of Science, 142 Old Street, E.C., at 7.30, "Gladstone in Chancery."

July 8, Midland Arches (morning); Hall of Science (evening). 22 Kingsland Green (morning). 29, Camberwell (morning and evening)

August 5, Pimlico Pier (morning); Hall of Science (evening). 12, Albert Embankment (morning); Hall of Science (evening). 19, Battersea Park (morning); Camberwell (evening). 26, Camberwell

Sept. 2, Manchester; 9 and 16, Hall of Science, London.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

LITERARY communications to be addressed to the Editor, 14 Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C. All business communications to Mr. R. Forder, 28 Stonecutter Street, London, E.C.

THE *Freethinker* will be forwarded, direct from the office, post free to any part of Europe, America, Canada and Egypt, at the following rates, prepaid:—One Year, 6s. 6d.; Half Year, 3s. 3d.; Three Months, 1s. 7d.

SCALE OF ADVERTISEMENTS:—Thirty words, 1s. 6d.; every succeeding ten words, 6d. *Displayed Advertisements*:—One inch, 3s.; Half Column, 15s.; Column, £1 10s. Special terms for repetitions.

J. DARWIN.—We apply your £5 to the fund of the London Secular Federation. This is an organisation, for London work only, of all the Metropolitan Branches of the N. S. S. The Branches remain perfectly loyal to the National Society, but London must do its own work in its own way, like Manchester, Liverpool, or any other city; and the practical union of the London Branches is intended to imply no more than this.

H. H.—Christianity arose when monogamy was firmly established among civilised peoples. Still, the Bible never censures polygamy, nor enjoins monogamy except on bishops. We cannot say, owing to lack of record, whether polygamy was practised by any of the early Christians. If it was, it could only be amongst barbarous converts.

H. WOOTON.—You did well to read a paper on Thomas Paine at the Congregational Debating Society. We are glad to hear that several members vowed to read that great man's writings.

F. A. D.—(1) *Antiqua Mater* is published by Trübner at 7s. 6d. (2) Williams and Norgate's edition of Strauss is, we believe, the only one in the market.

F. CLARK.—That joke about the angels moulting at the time of Jacob's ladder is an old one and has often done duty. We printed it many years ago ourselves.

NEARLY A FREETHINKER.—We have read your letter with deep interest, and hope to hear from you again as Quite a Freethinker.

W. UHRENBERG.—Shall appear.

J. F. HENLEY.—Glad to hear the Hyde Park Branch is so pleased with Mr. Foote's open-air lecture and its results.

C. K. LAPORTE.—Thanks for the cutting. The verse is rather long for our limited space.

J. T.—We are obliged for the batch of cuttings. If you found one man to three women in a Gateshead church, you found more than the usual proportion.

C. BAKER.—Pamphlet to hand, too late for this week. Shall be noticed in our next.

FOREIGN FREETHINKER.—If you want an interview you should make an appointment. It will be necessary to state your name and address.

C. BENTLEY.—We believe the extract is fanciful. The writer confounds ancient and modern times. With regard to an Index for the *Freethinker*, the idea has been suggested before; but the execution would involve a great deal of labor, and those who bind up the volumes must be relatively few.

G. WEIR.—We are pleased with your excellent report from Edinburgh. You deserve great credit for your efforts to promote Freethought. We have read a good deal on Christianity and slavery, but never heard that the Edinburgh Free Church Presbytery passed a resolution in favor of slavery as a scriptural institution during the Civil War in America. We have no hesitation in thinking you are misinformed. You ask us to print the Christian side of the Gladstone and Ingersoll debate, and say that if we only print one side we shall be open to the charge of partiality. But we have no right to print Gladstone's article. We wrote, requesting him to let his article appear with Ingersoll's, but he has declined to give his permission; and, whatever might be legally possible, it would be unjust, or at least unmannerly, not to respect his wishes.

R. HALLIDAY.—Pamphlet sent. Please send all future orders for publications to Mr. Forder, as above.

H. CALASCA.—We are obliged. See "Acid Drops." Thanks for your good wishes.

A. HEMINGWAY.—Sept. 2 is booked for you.

A. J. WHITE.—Thanks for the cutting. We will try to find room for the prayer.

W. TREADWELL.—Verse under consideration. If suitable, shall appear.

R. S. SEAGO.—Papers received with thanks. The debate seems to have caused great excitement in Camberwell.

R. FOX.—Cuttings are always welcome. Shall we return the book by post, or will you call for it? Let us know.

J. L. SIENS says the *Freethinker* can be obtained in Newcastle of France, newsagent, and of Peter Weston, 77 Newgate Street, who keeps a good supply of Freethought literature.

PAPERS RECEIVED.—Weekly Dispatch—Fair Play—Western Figaro—Secular Thought—Ironclad Ago—Liberty—Rock—West Kensington News—South London Press—South London Observer—Camberwell News—Boston Investigator—Open Court—North Eastern Daily Gazette—L'Opinione Nazionale—Thinker—Liberator—Freethought—Lichfield Herald—Menschenthum—Vespa.

SUGAR PLUMS.

COLONEL INGERSOLL'S *Reply to Gladstone*, occupying forty pages of the *North American Review*, is now published at our office. The pamphlet includes a Biography of Colonel Ingersoll, specially written by Mr. J. M. Wheeler, which will be of general interest. Ingersoll is at his very best in his letter to the G.O.M. He compliments him while skinning him, and flatters him while rubbing in the Attic salt.

THE Chapman-Foote debate seems to have created a sensation in South London. The local papers give lengthy reports and editorial comments. Some of the latter are amusing. The *South London Chronicle* says "Mr. Chapman did extremely well," but "in arguing with a specialist an ordinary man has an extremely difficult task." This is rich. Is not Mr. Chapman as much a specialist as Mr. Foote? They take different sides, but each is a professional advocate.

THE *Chronicle* says: "Mr. Chapman, in our opinion, had the best of the discussion in laying down that Christianity must be judged from the character and intentions of its Founder, and not from inconsistent acts done in its name—a point which Mr. Foote entirely failed to deal with." But this is "entirely" false. Mr. Foote did deal with it. He pointed out that he had not troubled to discuss the acts of individual Christians, but only the acts of representative Churches through all the centuries. To describe heresy and blasphemy laws, for instance, such as all Christian countries have maintained, as "inconsistent acts" is to say that the tree is not to be judged by its fruit, which is flying in the face of Jesus Christ himself.

THEN the *Chronicle* contrasts "Christian sweetness" with the "cold, bitter and savagely cynical disposition" of Freethinkers. But it is a Christian who speaks, and anybody can give himself a good character. Mr. Chapman has publicly thanked the Camberwell Branch for the courtesy and good feeling he met with; and this *fact* outweighs any quantity of vaporing.

MR. CHAPMAN writes to the *South London Observer*, denying that he confessed to being worsted in argument. The editor replies that he did, and says "if he has forgotten it others have not."

ON the debate itself the *Observer* remarks that Mr. Chapman was ill-advised to "risk battle with an arch-apostle of Freethinking," and that his good motives "cannot condone the folly of the adventure, nor mitigate the mischief which must result from a defeat which was inevitable."

THE *South London Press* appears to think the disputants showed a sad want of incivility, and is especially angry with Mr. Chapman for "his very flattering remarks" from the pulpit on his opponent. "Mr. Foote," it says, "is no doubt a very fine fellow, but really is not Mr. Chapman Foote-ing it just a little too much?" Despite the fact that both disputants gave their time, and paid their own expenses, the *Chronicle* thinks they were like rival showmen. Tut, tut, man! Showmen stick to the gate-money.

ANOTHER part of the *Press* gives a criticism of the debate by another hand, extending to nearly two columns. Like the *Chronicle*, it objects to Christianity being judged by the acts of Christians. What, not if the Christians were representative? Not if they acted in the name of the faithful? Not if they were supported by the overwhelming majority of the followers of Christ? Not if they quoted the Bible to sanction their deeds?

WHAT right have Christians to dictate how Christianity shall be judged? Were such a right conceded to prisoners in the dock, there would never be a conviction. He who attacks a false and pernicious system must select his own weapons. By taking counsel from the enemy he does their work gratis. His best plan is to hear their advice, and do the very opposite. What they most object to is what he should persist in doing.

SUPPOSE the Germans were to say to the French—"Don't fire at us with that Lebel rifle. It doesn't do a bit of harm. You haven't shot a single man for three hours." Would the French listen? Would they not fire away with the greatest satisfaction?

THE *Press* gives the following view of the debaters.

"We are willing to confess that the recent discussion was conducted by Mr. Chapman with much ability, with great earnestness, and with some success. But Mr. Chapman is not a trained debater; he is, at the best, but an average platform speaker. Of words, he had always at command a most extensive assortment; but then words, whilst useful and necessary enough, are not all-sufficient in a debate. In the marshalling of facts, and in close reasoning, he made little attempt to cope with his formidable rival. A good pulpit orator is not necessarily a clever debater—indeed, he rarely fulfils the requirements of the latter. And during the proceedings, Mr. Chapman gave repeated evidence of the fact that the parson was paramount. He didn't take kindly to interruptions, whilst he chastised with severe looks and severer words laughter which he himself had provoked. It seemed

just a little hard on the audience to excite their risible faculties by a joke which was perfectly irresistible in its mirth-provoking power, and then to deal out summary punishment for the 'crime'; but Mr. Chapman was evidently under the impression that he was all the time in the pulpit, and not on the platform. With the exception of this trusting of the parson into the foreground, Mr. Chapman conducted his part of the business with great good taste, and with commendable tact. With respect to Mr. Foote, it is perhaps hardly necessary to state that he carried out his part of the programme with considerable ability and with commendable tact and temper. He had the whole 'business' at his fingers' end, for he is an old hand at this kind of public exhibition; in short, he is a trained—an exceedingly well-trained—debater, and so bore himself in manner and matter as to leave a very favorable impression upon the audience."

THE debate has suggested an article on "The Church and Secularists" in the *Spectator*. The facts are fairly reported, but the references to Mr. Foote are at least of questionable civility. One reference we charitably assume is a blunder. The whole article, indeed, is lumpy and equivocal. The writer—we know him—is virtuously severe on "paid lecturers," just as though there were no paid clergy. He evidently wishes Christian ministers to discuss with persons who have not cultivated the faculty of speech. No doubt this would make matters easier; but will it be satisfactory? The truth is opinions and sentiments must have spokesmen. Why else does this writer speak through the *Spectator*? And why else does he take his *douceur* for the article?

MR. FOOTE'S lecture in Hyde Park last Sunday morning drew a big crowd. There was some weak and malignant opposition, which was suitably replied to, and the lecturer left amid cheers and cries of "Come again!" A collection realised £2 on behalf of the London Secular Federation's fund for fighting the School Board elections in November.

ONE of the best known figures in the South of England is Toby King, of Hastings. He is a sturdy Radical and Freethinker, as some of his opponents have found to their cost. Toby speaks prose like the rest of us; and nobody would think, to look at him, that he ever wrote verses on the sly. But appearances are deceitful. Toby's genius has blossomed into song. He has published twelve pages of couplets, every one of which must have taken a great deal of hatching, on "Ireland's Woes and Ireland's Foes." Mr. Forder supplies copies at one penny, and we should like the pamphlet to have a large circulation. Toby King is a man, which is more than can be said of every fellow on two legs; and if the verses have not the polish of Pope, they are at least vigorous, thoughtful, and suggestive. We shall preserve our copy, and should it ever be lost we shall parody Shakespeare and exclaim "We could have better spared a better poet."

MR. FOOTE'S letter to the *Star*, on the School Board's treatment of Mr. A. B. Moss, has been reprinted in the South London journals. We hope this will tend to make it warm for Mr. Kelly.

L'Opinione Nazionale, of Florence, in its issue for June 21, gives a portrait of Giordano Bruno. The figure is in monkish garb and the portrait not so striking as either that in the *Life* by Bartholomew or in the *Life* by Berti. The paper speaks of a proposition to erect a memorial to Bruno, Mazzini and Garibaldi in the Pantheon, and states that the Municipal Council of Pisa has unanimously resolved to alter the name of the Place of the Dominicans into the Piazza Giordano Bruno.

CHRIST'S PARABLES.—XIV.

THE WICKED HUSBANDMEN (Matt. xxi., 33—45; Mark xii., 1-9; Luke xx., 9—16).

A CERTAIN householder having planted a vineyard and let it out to husbandmen goes away into a far country. When he sends his servants for the rent, or the fruits of the vineyard, the husbandmen beat them and send them away empty. According to the versions of the parable in Matthew and Mark the husbandmen also kill some of the servants. The lord of the vineyard then sends his son, but the husbandmen slay him in order to seize on his inheritance. Jesus asks what the lord of the vineyard will do to these wicked husbandmen. The answer (which is given by the people in Matthew but by Jesus in Mark and Luke) is that he will miserably destroy those husbandmen and let out his vineyard unto others who shall render him the fruits in their seasons.

Tales of robbery and murder on the one hand, to be followed by retaliation and execution on the other, are not particularly edifying. God, as the lord of the vineyard, is to execute vengeance and justice in one, on the men who have not rendered to him his dues and who have persecuted and slain his messengers, the prophets, and the Messiah, his son. The parable, though now applied by Christians in a general sense, was directed by Jesus against

the orthodox Jews who rejected him. The multitude thoroughly understood that the condemnation and the punishment were directed against their own nation, for when Jesus announced the fate of the wicked husbandmen they patriotically and piously exclaimed, "God forbid!" The priests and Pharisees were especially annoyed at this denunciation of themselves in particular as wicked husbandmen and as murderers of God's messengers. They, of course, reciprocated the preacher's compliments, and styled him a blasphemer and a child of the devil. Such expressions of violent hatred frequently pass between rival religionists, and Jesus and his foes were certainly no exception to the rule. The successful sect thinks its own accusations wonderfully true and valuable, and sets down the re-primations of the defeated sect as malicious libels. Thus religious abuse, whether by parable or otherwise, becomes sanctified by time and victory. Yet the Pharisees seem at least to have been as sincere in their piety as Jesus and his followers. It was in obedience to God—not in wilful defiance of him as Jesus assumes—that they resisted the claimant to divine honors, and finally procured his execution because he blasphemed against the only portions of the Word of God then in existence.

Taking the parable in its broader application, it seems evident that God should have selected, or made, better tenants for his vineyard, the earth. Also, knowing as he does the hereditary liability to go wrong with which he has endowed his children, he should not neglect them and go away into a far country. Being always everywhere he might call in person for the rent, or for whatever grapes he may need, and so save the miscreated and badly-chosen tenants from the crimes which he knows they will otherwise commit. When he lets them fall into temptation, he might, as a merciful being, put them in some kind of reformatory. He need not figure in the unpleasant and somewhat savage and debasing part of miserably destroying the tenants—repaying murder with murder, bloodshed with bloodshed, evil with evil. Man in his weakness may be obliged to resort to such means of putting down evil, but surely an omnipotent God could contrive some better system than one which makes himself a shedder of blood, a hangman, and a tormentor.

W. P. BALL.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

THE Ten Commandments are an interesting specimen of primitive legislation, but there are many reasons for modifying the excessive veneration in which that ancient code is popularly held on the score of its supposed "divine" origin.

In the Decalogue, as a code, I find two faults which tell seriously against its claim to superhuman authorship. It is deficient, and it is redundant. Out of the ten statutes four only appeal to my reason as being unexceptionable—viz., Commandments 6, 7, 8, and 9. At the same time, so far from there being anything superhumanly wise in these prohibitions, appealing to the judgment of all rational creatures, I ask whether any community, in the most rudimentary stage of its civil career, has ever existed, or could exist, for a single year without their enforcement.

With regard to statute 5, I would point out (1) the superfluous statement of a motive for its observance, a motive, moreover, which, even if it were based on fact, would scarcely be of the highest moral order—"that thy days may be long in the land"; and (2) the grave defect of dealing with only one side of a correlation: for nothing whatever is said about the duties of parents to children. This one-sided view of family obligations points to a conception distinctly primitive in its character, suggesting as it does a reference, for comparative purposes, to the Roman *patria potestas*. The divine legislator's wisdom had evidently failed to foresee the necessity of establishing, several thousand years after the promulgation of his edicts, a society for the prevention of cruelty to children.

The Tenth Commandment, from a scientific point of view, appears enough to spoil the Code, were it otherwise perfect. The other prohibitions deal with offences in action; this one passes into the domain of thought. In effect it says, "Do not desire to steal," and proceeds with a crude and inexhaustive inventory of the possible objects provoking cupidity, terminating in a kind of helpless summing-up, which might as well have come first as last. The superfluousness of this enactment is shown by the fact that there is no other of a similar character in the code. If it was necessary to forbid the "desire to steal," why not also enter a caveat against the inclination or tendency to commit murder and perjury? A theologian would of course tell me—what I used to hear when being prepared for confirmation—that these prohibitions were implied. Perhaps they are, or perhaps not; but why does the eighth commandment merit this privilege of an explicit corollary in the shape of a tenth

commandment? Surely there is some clumsiness in the draughting.

The first four of the Ten Commandments are wholly devoted to "Duty to God." Here, then, still treating the matter from the same legal point of view, I discover the same imperfections.

In the First Commandment, the words "I am the Lord thy God" are obviously redundant. The remaining words contain all that needs to be said.

The Second Commandment, like the Fourth, adds a motive. It is to be obeyed because "the Lord thy God is a jealous God."

In so far as it forbids the making of "images" and "likenesses" (no matter of what) this commandment differs specifically from the first, but all the rest is a mere amplification of the first.

The Third Commandment is specific and distinct, and therefore requires, on the present line of treatment, no further notice.

The Fourth Commandment is vitiated in a manner similar to the Second and Fifth; the fault here being, not, as in these, the statement of a motive for observance, but of a reason which is at once inadequate and irrelevant. Because the legislator rested from a great piece of work (presumably not requiring repetition and certainly never after to be equalled in magnitude) on a certain day, is this a reason (in the proper sense of the word) why those in whose interest he legislated should abstain from all manner of work on every seventh day for ever afterwards?

W. M. M. RORISON, B.A.

FURTHER DESPATCHES FROM OUR SPECIAL AERIAL CORRESPONDENT.

THE RESURRECTED SAINTS INTERVIEWED.

"ASTREA," May.

THE old saints who got out of their graves and walked into the city of Korjoosalem at the execution of the young man for plotting against the state, as mentioned in my last, I have interviewed, and the experiences gained may prove interesting to your readers. The old gentleman who gave me the best information about his charnel house had not got quite accustomed to his every-day clothes and evinced a desire to wear his coroments in public, but the State severely stopped him. On making myself known to him, he asked me to be seated, and began slowly to get into a sitting posture himself, but his bending to his chair acted on me like somebody sharpening a saw; his joints not having yet become quite pliable, he creaked like an old country garden gate. I then asked him what intimation he had to get up. He replied that after having lain an unknown time, just getting into his first sleep, and decay having been stopped by desiccation, he began to feel quite comfortable, although rather dry and empty, but still he composed himself in as easy a position as possible to wait for the last trumpet call, when a slight shooting pain of his champion corn advised him that something strange was about to occur, and his sensor organs beginning again to work he knocked his funny-bone and found a sensation of tickling pervading his system. So, solemnly winking, he raised himself into a sitting posture, his congealed blood commencing to work, producing that sensation commonly known as pins and needles. But the most entertaining episode was the active attempts made to catch his soul to put it back into his body, it being loose on probation. The old man smiled a stiff kind of smile, saying it reminded him of the catching of a very frisky pony by the allurements of a sieve of fictitious corn, "and then, when the soul was caught," remarked the old saint, "the trouble the angelic messenger had in compressing it again into its former body!" Here the old fellow appeared much pained, as he said "it was a very tight fit and so irritated me, I thought my old parchment-like skin would burst," but by great exertion he resumed "the God-like attitude of freedom and of man," his frisky soul giving his poor dry body great pain by hurrying him along at a speed that caused him to walk like a tin mechanical toy postman, not even letting him pause to wet his parched old throat at any of the numerous hostleries on the road.

He thinks, however, that with plenty of oil and gentle exercise he may again follow his lucrative occupation of prophet and saint. Still the thorough disappointment of the poor old man was very affecting when telling me how he had intimated to the angelic messenger who woke him up, that now having passed through the ordeal of death once he'd be secure against any further calls—"Oh! no," flippantly observed the angel, "you'll have to die again just the same." "So," said the creaking old man, "life's a hideous nightmare; and supposing I am again made comfortable in my narrow home, what guarantee have I that my long slumber may not again be broken;" and here the old man tried to squeeze a tear from out of his leather eyelid. "Besides I may be in a greater state of dilapidation, or some sacrilegious rascal may have stolen my arm and leg bones, and then I should have to get into Korjoosalem as a lively torso." Here the very dry old chap heaved a deep sigh, and his poor mildewed face looked like an ancient bronze, and so pitying him I left him to his sad thoughts. I shall leave this planet very soon, as a very embittered discussion is being carried on by the believers in the young man who was executed—they being divided so soon—one sect declaring he is the whole of himself, the other sect just as fervently asserting he is only the third part of himself and yet the whole. As this abstruse and highly necessary discussion will no doubt lead to the elimination of one side or the other, your humble correspondent's off to fresh fields and pastures new, at least to one of the millions of planets I can see from my point of observation on this little globe. I trust my despatches may be as fortunate as their predecessors in reaching their destination.

The Veil of the Temple is repaired, and looks very grand with its three coats of paint to hide the rent. The old mysterious nonsense is being again performed, and should darkness overspread this asteroid again at the execution of another malefactor, the local authorities are prepared for the occasion, having made all necessary arrangements with an Electric Light Company.

THE SACRED CITY.

A pious traveller has been describing his visit to the Holy Land in the columns of the *Christian Commonwealth*. The following are extracts from his account of the religious sights of Jerusalem:—

"The walls of the church are mostly covered with pictures of the martyrs, some represented as being in flames, and some as being torn by wild beasts. One picture, however, was, I am afraid, calculated to do very much harm, especially to unbelievers. Indeed, one of our party, whose faith is, I am afraid, not very strong, gave vent to some very sceptical remarks on looking at it. It represented the Last Judgment, and painted the demons dragging people away to a burning fiery lake, full of the most hideous monsters, while a lot of bishops looked down smilingly on them from above, as much as to say, 'Now you see what you've got by not becoming members of the true Church.'"

"But I took comparatively little notice of those places as I was anxious to see the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, for that I felt to be of more interest than all the others put together. I hardly know how to write about it, for as I attempt to pen what I saw a thousand conflicting thoughts come into my mind. I am almost sorry I saw it, it makes our Savior's death so unreal, so farcical, so fabulous. The whole thing seems got up for a show, a parade, while the spirit of Christ's death is forgotten. I know that it is not the fashion to write thus about this place, and I may not be very susceptible to hallowed spots, but I write as I feel. Neither the geography or the history of the place helped me to feel, to think as I wanted to do. . . . The scenes enacted within its walls are revolting. Fancy the various Christian sects, standing in a church where the Prince of Peace was said and believed to have been killed, and buried, fighting like so many dogs "over a bone," until the Mohammedan soldiers had to enter to keep the peace. Fancy infidels laughing at their vindictiveness and petty animosities, and the associations of the place do not remain very sacred."

"On entering the church, after passing the Turkish soldiers, who were stationed at the door to prevent the Christians from fighting, I saw the stone on which Christ was anointed for his burial."

"I was taken to the spot where St. Helena found the true cross of Christ, the crosses of the thieves, and the crown of thorns. The story goes that the place of the cross was revealed to St. Helena by a dream, and she immediately set men to work to find it, and sat at a window, which I saw, to watch them. After the three crosses were found, the question arose as to whom they respectively belonged. Which was Christ's cross, and which the thieves'? The priests, however, decided it, by taking them to a lady who was ill. On seeing the first she was made worse, on seeing the second she was thrown into convulsions, but on seeing the third she was entirely cured, and thus it was found out which was the cross of Christ. How wonderfully things are explained."

"I also saw the tombs of Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathea, dug out of the solid rock. Also the place where Christ met Mary Magdalene after his resurrection, and after that the spot on which the soldiers cast lots for Christ's garment. Everything is so convenient in this place. Everything in connection with Christ's death seems to have happened within a few feet of land, which must have been a great comfort to the founder of the Church. Here Adam was born—that is, on this spot the dust was taken from which he was made, here I supposed he evolved from a protoplasmic globular, here he cut his teeth, here he was deprived of a rib, here he first saw Eve, here he died, and here he was buried. Here, too, is his tomb, and thus we may conclude that, however far he may have travelled, he came home to die."

"Many other things were shown us just as unreasonable and laughable and yet there was some of our party who believed it all; no doubt entered their minds, and they were happy. They were Catholics, they were taught to believe, and they did so without a question. I am beginning to think that one of the fruits of education in our Protestant churches is doubt; if it is so, it is a pity, for if anything can make earth hell it is that."

"The Pillar of Flagellation was also pointed out. You cannot see it, but you can feel it with a stick, and I saw a man take a stick, feel the pillar with it, and then kiss most reverently the spot that had touched the spot where he believed Christ to have been scourged. . . . From this pillar we all went together to another part of the church where Christ was crucified, first where he was fastened to the Cross, and then to the spot where it stood. . . . Nevertheless, I can't believe it, everything seems so unreal, the hole in which the Cross is said to have sunk impressed one too much like the footprint of Mohammed, which I saw in Cairo. And then, too, all the glittering glass, all the burnished metal, all the mummery which I saw, seemed to destroy the little faith that I had, and I left the gloomy old pile with such a sensation as I never felt before."

PROFANE JOKES.

A clergyman, being told that some "new lights" had appeared in the religious world, replied emphatically, "I wish we could hear of some new *livers*."

"Good morning, Biddy, thou daughter of the evil one," said an Irish priest to a fair young member of his flock. "Good morning, father," the maiden meekly answered.

A priest is called in to see a poor old coachman who is on his death-bed. The priest (solemnly): "Have you been in the habit of going to church?" The coachman (faintly): "No; but (his face brightening) I've driven lots of people there."

A minister whose salary had not been paid for several months told the deacons of his church that he must have his money, as his family were suffering for want of the necessaries of life. "Money!" exclaimed one of the deacons noted for his stinginess, "money! Do you preach for money? I thought you preached for the good of souls." The minister replied: "So I do, but I can't eat souls. And if I could, it would take a thousand such as yours to make a meal."

NOW READY.

REPLY TO GLADSTONE

By COL. R. G. INGERSOLL.

Reprinted verbatim from the "North American Review," June, 1888.

With Publisher's Note, and

A BIOGRAPHY of the AUTHOR (by J. M. Wheeler).

PRICE FOURPENCE.

Progressive Publishing Company, 28 Stonecutter Street, Farringdon St., London, E.C.

DEFENCE OF FREETHOUGHT,

By Col. Robert G. Ingersoll.

BEING HIS FIVE HOURS' SPEECH TO THE JURY

AT THE TRIAL FOR BLASPHEMY OF C. B. REYNOLDS

6d.] At Morristown, New Jersey, May 19 and 20, 1887. [6d.

[Reprinted from the Author's Edition.]

Progressive Publishing Co.'s
LIST.

COLONEL R. G. INGERSOLL

Live Topics ...	0 1
Myth and Miracle ...	0 1
Real Blasphemy ...	0 1
Social Salvation ...	0 1
The Dying Creed ...	0 2
Faith and Fact ...	0 2

A Reply to the Rev. Dr. Field.

God and Man ... 0 2

Second Letter to Dr. Field.

Art and Morality ... 0 2

Defence of Freethought ... 0 6

Five Hours' Speech at the Trial of C. B. Reynolds for Blasphemy.

Mistakes of Moses ... 1 0

" " (in cloth) ... 1 6

The only complete edition published in England. Reprinted verbatim from the author's American edition. With an Introduction by G. W. Foote. 136 pp.

G. W. FOOTE & J. M. WHEELER

The Jewish Life of Christ... 0 6

An extraordinary work.

Ditto in Cloth ... 1 0

Crimes of Christianity. Vol. I.

Cloth, 224 pp. ... 2 6

An unanswerable historical indictment. Hundreds of authorities appealed to.

JAMES THOMSON (B.V.)

Satires and Profanities, cloth 2 6

DR. E. B. AVELING

Darwin Made Easy.

144pp. cloth ... 1 0

The best popular exposition of Darwinism ever published.

G. W. FOOTE & W. P. BALL

Bible Contradictions ... 0 4

Pt. I. of Bible Handbook for Freethinkers and Inquiring Christians. The Contradictions are printed in parallel columns

Bible Absurdities ... 0 4

Pt. II. All the chief Absurdities from Genesis to Revelation, conveniently and strikingly arranged, with appropriate headlines, giving the point of each Absurdity in a sentence

Bible Atrocities ... 0 4

Pt. III. Containing all the godly wickedness from Genesis to Revelation. Each infamy has a separate headline for easy reference.

Bible Immoralities, Indecencies, Obscenities, Broken Promises, and Unfulfilled Prophecies ... 0 4

Pt. IV. of Bible Handbook.

Bible Handbook (complete)

Four Parts in one volume. In paper covers ... 1 4

Better edition, in cloth ... 2 0

FREETHINKER TRACTS.

1. Salvation by Faith (Ingersoll)
2. Death of Adam (Nelson)
3. Bible Blunders (Foote)
4. Bible & Teetotalism (Wheeler)
5. Bible Harmony (Holy Ghost)
6. The Safe Side (Foote)
7. The Fanatical Monkeys (Southwell)
8. Parson's Creed and Real Trinity

6d. per Hundred, post free 7d.

These Tracts are numbered, but the old heading, "Freethinker Tracts," has been omitted, so as not to frighten people. Number 5 consists of a selection from *Bible Contradictions*. The circulation of such leaflets wholesale will be very beneficial to the Freethought Movement, as they are all specially designed for the common reader.

R. Forder, 28 Stonecutter St., London, E.C.

Now Ready.

Letters from Hell
AND
Letters from HeavenBY
J. M. WHEELER.

ONE PENNY EACH.

New Publication by "Humanitas."

CHRIST'S TEMPTATION.

Being an exhaustive examination of the story as given in the Gospels. Price 6d., post free 7d. Also

JACOB THE WRESTLER, or Catch as Catch Can.

Containing 196 pages and highly-finished frontispieces. Paper 2s., cloth 2s. 6d., post free.

Opinions of the Press.

"Humanitas' attacks with a keenly critical wit the main circumstances of Jacob's life, etc."—*Boston Guardian*."The whole story of Jacob as told in Genesis is carefully analysed by the author."—*National Reformer*"A Freethinker might lend it to a Christian friend with good results."—*Freethinker*."It would be encouraging if he succeeded in reaching a large section of the Christian public, who sorely need the instruction he is so well able to impart."—*Watts's Literary Guide*.

A FISH IN LABOR or Jonah and the Whale.

3d., post free 3½d.

"A vigorous criticism of the story of Jonah, tearing the absurd legend into tatters and scattering the fragments about in derision. The reader will have a most pachydermatous faith if it is not plucked ere he concludes this tract."—*National Reformer*.

Is God the First Cause? 6d., post free 7d. Bound in cloth with other Essays, 1s. 6d., post free.

Thoughts on Heaven. 6d., post free 7d.

Charles Bradlaugh and the Irish Nation. Addressed to Irishmen of all Creeds. 6d., post free 7d.

Charles Bradlaugh and the Oath Question. 2d., post free 2½d.

How Charles Bradlaugh was treated by the House of Commons. 2d., post free 2½d.

Socialism a Curse. 3d., post free 3½d.

NOW READY.

Christianity
and Progress

A REPLY TO

The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone

By G. W. FOOTE.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

G. W. FOOTE'S WORKS.

Prisoner for Blasphemy. Cloth 2 6

A Full History of His Three Trials and Twelve Months' Imprisonment

Copies in paper covers, soiled... 0 6

Christianity or Secularism. Four

Nights' Public Debate with the Rev. Dr. James McOann

Paper covers ... 1 0

Bound in Cloth ... 1 6

Infidel Death-Beds... 0 6

Being a Faithful History of the Deaths of the most eminent Freethinkers of all ages, and a triumphant answer to the lies and misrepresentations of Christian apologists

Bound in cloth . . . 1 0

Letters to Jesus Christ ... 0 4

Was Jesus Insane? (2nd Edition) 0 1

The Folly of Prayer ... 0 2

Third Edition, with Fresh Matter.

What Was Christ? ... 0 2

A Reply to John Staart Mill; 2nd Edition.

Royal Paupers ... 0 2

Showing what Royalty does for the People, and what the People do for Royalty. (3rd edition)

Is Socialism Sound? (cloth) ... 2 0

Four Nights' Debate with Annie Besant

Ditto in paper covers .. 1 0

The Shadow of the Sword. (2nd Edition) ... 0 2

An Essay on the Folly, Wickedness and Cost of War

W. J. RENDELL,

CHEMIST AND DRUGGIST,

26 GT. BATH ST., CLERKENWELL,

LONDON, E.C.

Drugs and Chemicals, Surgical Appliances,

Patent Medicines, etc.

Particulars of a Malthusian discovery sent on receipt

of stamped directed envelope.

Orders by Post promptly executed.

Printed and Published by G. W. Foote, at 23 Stonecutter Street, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.