

THE FREETHINKER

EDITED BY G. W. FOOE.

Sub-Editor—J. M. WHEELER.

Vol. VIII.—No. 35.]

AUGUST 26, 1888.

[PRICE ONE PENNY.

COMIC BIBLE SKETCH.—No. 258.



THE LORD DEFEATED.

And the Lord was with Judah; and he drove out the inhabitants of the mountain; but could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron.—JUDGES I, 19.

THE TRAIL OF THE SERPENT.

EVERY observer is aware that directly the Tories came into power the reactionaries of every species felt their drooping spirits cheered, and plucked up their courage for a fresh assault on the people's liberties. Among these exhilarated factions was the perennial enemy of all progress—the Church. Anyone who reads the Church Catechism will see that it breathes the very spirit of Feudalism. Children are taught to keep their hands from picking and stealing—especially what has been legally stolen from them before they were even born; and to order themselves lowly and reverently to all their betters. Who are their betters is not left to conjecture. Their betters are lords and ladies, persons in authority, and all who happen to be high in the social scale; in fact, the upper ten thousand, the lazy and luxurious scum of society, the ravenous and arrogant army of privilege. This Catechism, in the rural districts, enjoins subservience to the parson and the squire; and in the towns to the good old constitution of England, based on nobility, pillared and buttressed by the clergy, and crowned by royalty.

Such a Church, and such teaching, is foreign to the growing spirit of our age. It is evident, therefore, that

No. 369.]

the historic foe of the people must move cautiously. Stakes, thumbscrews, racks, and dungeons are out of date. Strategy must take the place of force, sapping and mining must be resorted to instead of open attack. Being no longer able to strut without fear of ridicule, the Church adopts the meaner but more prudent policy of creeping. Accordingly, a Commission was obtained on the Education System of the country. Its composition was reactionary, but a few Radical names were included to disarm popular suspicion. Men like Lord Cross, Cardinal Manning, the Earl of Harrowby, Earl Beauchamp, Bishop Temple, Baron Norton, Sir Richard Sandford, Canon Gregory, and Canon Smith, could be trusted to look after the interests of religion; and so long as the majority reported in favor of ecclesiasticism, the report of the minority, so far from doing any harm, would only lend the scheme an air of impartiality.

The trick was well conceived, for the Church has always been noted for cunning, just as thieves are always sharper (in some respects) than honest men. Two years and a half have elapsed, and the Report of the Commission is now published. It is a bulky volume of over five hundred folio pages, and its cost to the public is five and sixpence. Few people therefore, will obtain a copy; and fewer still will read it through. But it has a central point of interest, like the yokel's toad-in-the-hole, which is a

large body of plain pudding, with a small piece of fat bacon in the middle. The yokel chews industriously, but his mind's eye is fixed on the toothsome morsel that will crown his repast. Similarly, the lords and sky-pilots have worked industriously on this Commission, but their mind's eye was fixed all the while on the proposal for the further endowment of religion.

The gist of their proposals is that more aid and encouragement should be given to denominational schools, and that the religious instruction in Board Schools should be increased rather than diminished. They advance some pretty pretexts for this, which we shall analyse presently. But, meanwhile, let us consider their motives.

Priests, and their privileged friends, have in all ages sought to mould the plastic minds of children. They know that as the twig is bent the tree inclines; that the child is father of the man; and that whoever masters the young brain has the sovereignty of the world in his grasp. They also know that their dogmas—the foundation of their power—are an offence to the natural, unbiassed mind. They are perfectly aware that their spiritual nostrums stand no chance of patronage in a free and open market. They feel, therefore, the necessity of creating a demand for them. To this end they get hold of children before they are able to think, fill their minds with superstitious beliefs and artificial wants, and make them future customers. Thus the priestly trade flourishes century after century; and with this object the priests fight with every weapon, however dirty and disreputable, for the possession of little children.

Now for the pretty pretexts of the reactionary Commissioners. They insert the following little sermon in their report:

"We are persuaded that the only safe foundation on which to construct a theory of morals, or to secure high moral conduct, is the religion which our Lord Jesus Christ has taught the world. As we look to the Bible for instruction concerning morals, and take its words for the declaration of what is morality, so we look to the same inspired source for the sanctions by which men may be led to practise what is there taught, and for instruction concerning the helps by which they may be enabled to do what they have learned to be right."

First, let it be observed that several of the preachers of this little sermon, being in the clerical business, are simply crying up their own wares; secondly, that the other preachers are simply the mouthpieces of the professional gentlemen.

"High moral conduct" is impossible without the religion of Jesus Christ! Is it? Why, the commonest acquaintance with history disproves the lie. Half, if not three-fourths, of the greatest heroes and teachers of mankind lived before Jesus Christ was born or thought of, or lived after his birth and rejected his teaching. Even in our own age, are the Mills, the Buckles, the Cliffords, the Darwins, the Spencers, the Huxleys, the Bradlaughs, any whit inferior as moral beings to the products of Christianity? Colonel Hughes-Hallett is a Bible Christian; he objects to the Oaths' Bill, and denounces that irreligious Bradlaugh. But will any candid man assert that the Member for Rochester is worthy to dust the shoes of the Junior Member for Northampton?

The Commissioners go to the Bible "for instruction concerning morals." Yes, but where? Do they go to the story of Lot and his daughters, and derive moral lessons from their beastly incest in the cave? Do they find a sweet moral savor in the story of Tamar, Onan and Judah? Do they love to dwell on the ghastly narrative of the Levite and his concubine? Do they wish our children to watch Reuben climbing into his father's bed? Are they anxious that English boys should learn to treat women when they grow up as Abraham treated Hagar? Do they desire English girls to ponder how Leah bribed Rachel in order to sleep with her own husband? Do they desire their own daughters to imitate Ruth's adventures in the barn with Boaz? Do they really think society would be improved by emulating the example of the man after God's own heart? Do they suppose the sanctity of marriage is heightened by reading of "wise" Solomon, who had seven hundred wives and three hundred kept women? Do they fancy any benefit can be derived from the filth of the prophets? Do they imagine that a child's modesty would be enhanced by some of Ezekiel's descriptions of lust, which, bad as they are in the English version, are infinitely worse in the original

Hebrew? Or do they wish our boys and girls to pasture on the Song of Songs which is Solomon's, wherein every naked charm of two impassioned lovers is described with the most voluptuous license? The Commissioners may call this Bible morals; we call it Bible filth. They may desire to feed our children's minds with it; we desire to keep them from such damnable contamination. We do not deny the presence of good texts in the Bible, but as a divine book it must be taken in its entirety—the filth with the purity, the wickedness with the goodness, the ugliness with the beauty, the lies with the truth. As the pretended Word of God, therefore, we must reject it altogether; just as we should decline to eat fish if we had to swallow the bones.

What is "the religion which our Lord Jesus Christ has taught the world"? Even the Commissioners describe themselves as "differing widely" in their "views concerning religious truth." And this after eighteen centuries of the only true religion, countless volumes of exposition by learned doctors, and controversies that the strongest reader could hardly master in a lifetime! What an ignominious confession! The religion of Jesus Christ is the only safe foundation for morality; but what is the religion of Jesus Christ is a matter on which the Commissioners are at deadly variance. Yet this religion, which they themselves differ about, is to be taught by others, who may differ about it still more, as of greater certitude than the multiplication table and the only "safe foundation" for "a theory of morals." Was there ever a ghastlier mockery of reason? Was there ever a more wretched trifling with the interests of justice and veracity?

Some parts of the religion of Jesus Christ, however, are clear enough for the blindest eyes. His first principle was the blessedness of poverty. Yet the pious Commissioners shun this angel in disguise as the very Devil. "Blessed be ye poor," says Jesus Christ; but the Earls jingle their unearned guineas, the Cardinal hugs his income, and the Bishop of London laughs consumedly over his £10,000 a year. Woe unto you hypocrites! we might say in the very language of their "Master." Their object is the exploitation of humanity by the spiritual debauchery of children. First the devastated mind, and then the fettered flesh; first superstition, and then slavery. Such is the eternal aim and policy of priestcraft.

G. W. FOOTE.

WOMAN AND THE BIBLE.

MR. FOOTE, in his *Christianity and Progress*, has dealt to some extent with this topic. It is, however, of such extreme importance that further discussion may not be amiss. Christianity claims to have raised the status of woman. If the claim is a just one, it must be allowed that there is a large set-off to all the crimes that can be alleged against that religion. If the claim is unfounded, Christianity has the greater condemnation. Woman has been, and is, its chief supporter. If she sustains a creed which holds her in subjection; if she maintains a so-called sacred book which belittles and degrades her, the fact cannot be insisted upon too strongly. Emancipate woman from superstition, and the task of Freethought would be done.

What is there in the religion of the Bible to elevate woman? Nothing. There is much, on the contrary, to degrade her. She is distinctly placed, as an inferior creature, as far beneath man as he is beneath God. The husband is declared by St. Paul to be the head of the wife, even as Christ is head of the Church, and he is the Savior of the body. "Therefore as the Church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their own husbands *in everything*" (Eph. v., 23, 24). Let the woman, he says, "learn in silence with all subjection" (1 Tim. ii., 11). The reason is one that must be perfectly satisfactory to a creature of feeble intellect. It is—"For Adam was first formed, then Eve." Because creeping things were first formed, and then Adam, is of course a reason man should be in subjection to them. But we are further told that "Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." Eve was only an after-thought to supply a helpmeet for Adam. He was made for God only; she for God in him. Her fatal curiosity (which in man is laudable thirst for information) led to all our woes, and she was specially cursed accordingly.

The first family was surely meant by God as a model for imitation. Yet Cain and Seth must have married their own sisters. Abraham, the father of the faithful and the friend of God, who gossiped with him upon subjects usually left to Mrs. Gamp and her tribe, married his half-sister, Sarah, and acquired a fortune through an insult offered to his wife. This pattern to the faithful had slaves and concubines, and at the instigation of Sarah, backed up by God himself, sent his child and its mother, a bondswoman, out into the wilderness. Yet Abraham is one of the kingdom of Heaven. Indeed in that kingdom it would be hard to find a more respectable Saint. Abraham's nephew "just" Lot was another worthy example. He offers his daughters to be abused, and they in turn, their mother being changed into salt for the horrid offence of looking back at her late home, were guilty of acts unfit for publication. Let those women who regard the Bible as the great sanction of purity remember Lot's daughters. Jacob was no whit more respectable than his grandfather. He not only had two sisters to wife at the same time, but also their hand-maidens as concubines, and with one of these his son Reuben had an intrigue. To trace the doings of the whole ancestry of Jesus would be far from edifying. Nowhere do we find regard for woman's honor, still less for her mental elevation. Concubinage and polygamy, the assurance of woman's degradation, were not only practised by the Hebrew saints most distinguished for their personal piety and communion with God, who in no case censured or condemned these practices; they were recognised, sanctioned and provided for by the divine law. Even God himself is metaphorically described as having two wives. A Hebrew father might sell his daughter to be a wife, concubine, or maid-servant, and her master might put her away if she pleased him not. Women taken captives in war might be used as wives and dismissed at pleasure. In the case of the Midianites only virgins were preserved. Moses indignantly asked, Have ye saved all the women alive? "Now therefore kill every male among the little ones and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women children, that have not known man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves." And the Lord took shares in this maiden tribute.

Woman in the Bible is treated as merchandise. In Jacob's time she was bought by seven years' service, but in the time of the prophet Hosea she was valued only at fifteen pieces of silver and a homer and a half of barley. In the Decalogue it is prohibited to covet a man's wife on the same ground as his man slave, his maid slave, his ox, or his ass, or anything that is his. By God's law a man was permitted to dismiss a wife when she found "no favor in his eyes," by simply writing out a bill of divorce. There is no mention of the woman having any similar power of getting quit of her lord and master. If he suspected her fidelity he could compel her to go through an ordeal in which the priest administered to her the water of jealousy, which if guilty would cause her to rot, but which was harmless if she was innocent. No doubt this was a potent means in securing wifely devotion, and a ready remedy for any hated spouse. In the hands of a friendly priest the concoction would be little likely to fail, and even should it prove innocuous there was the expedient of writing a bill of divorce. Certainly God can claim that his system did not require the services of a Divorce Court. Jesus was more stringent, permitting divorce only for adultery, but he had no words against the concubinage, polygamy and oppression of women by which he was surrounded.

J. M. WHEELER.

ACID DROPS.

THE Convent of the Sacred Heart at New York has been destroyed by fire. The loss is estimated at half a million dollars. Jesus evidently doesn't look after his own as well as he should do.

THE Dean and Chapter of Christchurch, Oxford, is going to enforce distress warrants this week on all the farmers who refuse to pay him his tithes. At Meifod, in Montgomeryshire, twenty-one farmers are to be distrained upon immediately. Thus the Church shows her love for those of her flock who decline to be shorn.

THE Rev. E. E. Jenkins declares that he cannot find "one single force acting for the benefit of the human race that did not come from the Cross." The Rev. E. E. Jenkins is either a great

simpleton or a reckless hypocrite. Can he possibly be so ignorant that he does not know that philanthropy, patriotism, courage, honesty, truthfulness, and virtues of all kinds, were forces that acted for the benefit of the human race long before Christ came? Socrates, Plato, Leonidas, knew nothing of Jesus, and in every land virtues were known and practised, and were indispensable to the welfare and existence of even the most savage tribes, long before the Crucifixion. Reckless sky-pilots might just as well say that no physical strength or beauty existed before Christ came.

As one proof of his assertion Mr. Jenkins asks his credulous hearers, "Who are now lifting up their voices against war?" But did the pulpits ring with denunciations of our Burmese war, or our attacks on the Egyptians, Afghans, and Soudanese? Does the Christian press protest against our wars as the Infidel press does? Was it the Christians who held the peace meeting in Hyde Park, or was it Mr. Bradlaugh?

A "RECTOR," writing to the *Guardian*, says that "a celibate order among the clergy" is one of the imperative necessities of the times, because curates cannot support a wife and family on their ordinary incomes. He would prefer an unmarried curate to one who is in debt and has ten children. But why do teachers of the law of love and brotherhood pay such miserable stipends to those who do their work for them? And why are these poor teachers of duty to the multitude so reckless as to marry when they cannot support a wife and family? Why do they set their congregation the bad example of having ten children whom they can only keep by going into debt? This is not the imitation of Christ. Jesus never rushed into matrimony and had ten children—or if he did, the Gospels are perfectly silent on the matter.

At the third day's sitting of the New Church Conference at Accrington an animated debate, lasting eight hours, took place on the question of using fermented or unfermented wine at sacrament. Ultimately a resolution was carried expressing no opinion on the wine question, but providing for two communion services during conference week for both sections. Thus Christians cannot decide whether the Bible upholds teetotalism or not. Christ either did or did not drink intoxicating liquor, but he left no clear example except as a wine-bibber, and as one who said nothing to discourage the use of alcoholic beverages. Yet if teetotalism ever becomes universal among civilised nations, Christianity will take the credit for effecting the reform, just as it does for the abolition of polygamy and slavery. Probably, however, Christianity will be extinct as a dominant religion long before the teetotalers' millenium arrives.

THE Rev. George Moore and his sexton's son mutually summoned each other for assault at a burial in the churchyard at Cowley. The sexton's son swears that the vicar called him a scamp and a scoundrel, and then struck him three times, after which they had a stand-up fight, and there were three rounds. A witness gave corroborative evidence. The vicar swears he was attacked by Lee and thrown by him three times. He did not strike Lee except in endeavoring to get up from the ground. The magistrate dismissed both summonses. The Church militant thus engaged in brawling and fighting over an open grave is not a very edifying spectacle.

THE Duke of Argyll says he rather turns away from cremation, but he doesn't think it unscriptural. That is, we suppose, his Grace cannot find any verse in the Bible condemning it. There is, however, the broad historic fact that cremation was general before the spread of Christianity, and that the Christian Church substituted earth burial, doubtless because cremation was felt to be incompatible with the scriptural doctrine of the resurrection of the body. The Pope, who is a greater authority on Christian doctrine than the Duke of Argyll, except at Inverary, condemns and anathematizes the practice.

THE Bishop of Detroit was seized with an apoplectic fit while preaching at Westminster. He came over to attend the Pan-Anglican Synod, and it is considered doubtful if he will return.

HERR BINDER in his account of his capture by brigands in Bulgaria says: "The brigands who took us are pious. They cross themselves morning and night, and before each meal." Of course; religion everywhere forms an excellent substitute for morality. Jesus pays for all.

THOMAS NATTRASS, a well-known local preacher of Stockton, has been arrested for defalcations amounting to fully one thousand pounds.

THE Archbishop of York says he would not have a public house where drink was sold open on a Sunday if he could help it. No doubt his cellar is stocked with barrels and bottles of the choicest brands.

THEY want to enlarge St. Pancras Church. A friend looked in last Sunday morning at the adjacent church of St. Stephen's, Pratt Street, and counted twenty worshippers all told, including the parson and some children.

A CHRISTIAN correspondent writes to defend the alleged Bible prophecy of railways against our recent paragraphs. He says that "swift beasts" was a very proper expression as a prophecy of the locomotive, for Mr. Foote himself calls it "the Iron Horse." The "torches" are the fiery funnels, and the jostling is illustrated by the manner in which railway travelling shakes people and by the frequent collisions. "Broad ways" he associates with the "broad gauge," but he forgets that nearly all of our railways use the narrow gauge, to which of course the prophecy of collisions does not apply.

He also shows, very conclusively in his own opinion, that the Bible account of the six days' creation is perfectly accurate because Freethinkers and men of science occasionally refer to long ages of the past as "that far-off yesterday," or "the dawn of life," and so forth. We are quite content that Christians should amuse themselves in this harmless fashion rather than in combining to persecute unbelievers or in quarrelling among themselves. But the ridiculous excuses and misapprehensions of our very earnest and industrious correspondent are not likely to convert us to anything but a belief in the folly and simplicity and misplaced ingenuity of Christian prophecy-mongers.

The *Jewish Chronicle* mentions a circular which it has seen, appealing for £150 a year for a converted Jew, who thereby, it declares, will become "a valuable laborer in the work of the conversion of God's ancient people." We would wager our bottom dollar this valuable laborer never got £150 a year by any other species of employment.

SEVERAL members of the Eastbourne Town Council have expressed themselves strongly against preaching missions on the sea front as a public nuisance. The Council decided to give the police power to request the preachers to move away when complained of.

DURING the recent thunderstorm in Canada the lightning struck the parish church at Loriginal while it was full of worshippers. Death at such a moment should have been welcome, for every person in the building had a reasonable prospect of going to glory. But there was very little faith among the godly at that moment. They all rushed to the door in a panic of terror, the strong trampled the weak, and many were seriously injured. So much for the "consolations" of Christianity, and its divine power of lifting people above the fear of death!

THE Toronto *Secular Thought* reports that at Kingston, Ont., Mr. George Briggs was the defendant in a case brought before Police Magistrate McKim. It was decided upon the part of the prosecution that Mr. Briggs be sworn; accordingly the following colloquy ensued:—Mr. Shaw, prosecuting attorney: "Do you believe in the Bible?" Defendant: "What Bible—that Bible?" Attorney: "Do you believe in God?" Defendant: "What God—the God mentioned in the Bible?" Attorney: "Yes." Defendant: "No, sir." Attorney: "Do you believe in the scriptures and revelations?" Defendant: "No." Attorney: "What do you believe in?" Defendant: "I believe in doing what is right and good." The magistrate refused to hear the evidence after such a declaration, and thereupon decided the case against Mr. Briggs.

EVIDENTLY they have a good deal to learn in Canada. The notion that a man cannot tell the truth because he does not believe in a God who keeps liars in heaven, and occasionally sends them out to deceive people, is worthy of an idiot. Future ages will wonder at such imbecility.

ROME, the centre of Christendom, is the most religious place in the world. It is covered with churches. It has 1,469 priests, besides some thousands of candidates for the priesthood. It possesses 2,832 monks and friars, and 2,215 nuns. It has 35 bishops, 30 cardinals, and is sanctified by the presence of His Holiness the Pope. Yet it is distinguished for more crime and immorality than any other city of its size, and there are 100,000 of its inhabitants who are unable to read or write.

THE Mormons are wicked enough to follow the Bible and marry as often as they can afford. For this crime the other Bible worshippers of the United States have confiscated their Church property. Receiver Dyer reports that he has got hold of 790,666 dollars' worth. Moral—don't follow the Bible in a Christian country.

It looks as if the Catholics would like to preach a new crusade for the redemption of Rome from the dominion of Italy. The *Tablet* last week said—"To strike at Rome as the heart of Catholicity, to deal a blow to all religion by the desecration of the sacred city of the Christian world, is the avowed and vaunted object of the acknowledged masters of the official rulers of revolutionary Italy. The faith and zeal of Islam rebuke in this matter the coldness of Christendom, for who can doubt that a similar invasion of the sanctuary of Mohammedanism would call from its scabbard every sword in the Moslem world, from the Indus to the Atlas?" Mr. Gladstone knew what he was about when he said the Vatican would willingly strew Europe with the

whitening bones of slaughtered men in order to restore the temporal power of the Papacy.

A GREAT sensation was lately created amongst a congregation assembled at a chapel at Ocean Grove, New Jersey, by an insane man rushing in, his clothing saturated with water, and exclaiming, "I am God Almighty, and will preach to you." Usurping the place of the pastor, he implored the worshippers to believe his statement. Some women fainted, others screamed. The man was afterwards quieted, and removed. He was a wealthy furniture dealer, whose mind had been upset by overwork and study. The report says he had been previously trying to harmonise Ingersoll with orthodox Christianity so there can be little doubt of his insanity.

THE Knights of Labor form, we believe, a very useful organization in America. Their secretary and organiser, however, Mr. Powderly, is understood to be a Roman Catholic, and it seems they have yet to learn the elementary principles of toleration. Mr. Arthur C. Everett was editor of the *Labor Advocate*, and through his instrumentality five lodges of the Knights were formed in Wabash. Mr. Everett, it however transpired, was an Atheist. He did not conceal the fact, but it being prominently called attention to, he has been formally expelled from the lodge-room by Knights specially selected for their muscular development and vigorous piety. Not content with this, the Knights have subjected him to the boycott, so that he is not only deprived of emoluments formerly enjoyed as labor publisher, but is unable to secure employment. Mr. Everett will, however, submit his case to the State Assembly of Knights of Labor, to be held at Indianapolis in September, and it is to be hoped the Knights may yet wipe off the stains of bigotry, and reinstate the rejected and boycotted member.

GOD has damaged immense crops of corn in Austria by a thunderstorm, and has killed about fifteen people. This is one of the little ways in which he shows his infinite benevolence.

THE Chester-le-Street Branch has tried in vain to get up a debate between Mr. Foote and a Bible champion. The invitation has been declined all round. The Rev. J. Taylor, Primitive Methodist, says—"I am not a controversialist." The Rev. J. Charlesworth, Wesleyan, says his "engagements are so numerous." The Rev. R. Crookall, Congregationalist, says—"I believe such a discussion would do little good." It is the old story again. One has married a wife, one has bought oxen, and all say, "I cannot come."

WHAT will J. C. say when he meets these timid champions at the Day of Judgment? They had the chance of saving the souls of all the Infidels in Chester-le-Street, and they were afraid to seize it. How many bean-feasts they have prevented! There is more joy in heaven over one Infidel converted than over ninety and nine orthodox Christians who need no conversion. J. C. and the angels must be yearning for a festival, yet the ministers of Chester-le-Street will not give them the slightest opportunity.

WE have not seen the *Life of Billy Bray*, by the Rev. F. W. Bourne. Without the author's name, we should have taken it to be the life of a donkey called William, by a brother jackass. However, it must be a wonderful book, for, according to a paragraph in the *Guernsey Advertiser*, it has been the means of bringing at least six hundred persons to Christ, and among them "one of the most notorious infidels in New Cross." We should like to know the name and address of this notorious infidel. Very likely we shall be told that his identity is concealed for "prudential reasons." Very prudential.

TALMAGE says that "perdition was emptied of devils when they started for the pursuit of Christ, and He fell back and back, down lower, down lower, chasm below chasm, pit below pit, until He seemed to strike the bottom of oburgation and scorn and torture. Oh, the long, loud, jubilant shout of hell at the defeat of the Lord God Almighty!" Where does Talmage find his information? Is he on such familiar terms with the Devil that he is permitted free access to some private Chronicles of Hell which no one else ever saw or dreamt of?

TALMAGE believes that "the next twelve months will be the most stupendous year that heaven ever saw"—it is to be such a time of successes for the Christian cause and of defeat for its enemies. Well, we shall see. But if nothing particular happens, or if the Infidels prosper, what then? Why, the quack will simply postpone his dates, and the many who delight in quackery will go on believing in him just as fervently as ever.

OBITUARY.—We have to record the death of Martha Wilks, wife of Joseph Wilks, newsagent, Manchester Road, Bradford, in her 58th year. She died, as she had lived, a Secularist. She was interred at Undercliffe Cemetery on Aug. 20, the Secular Burial Service being read by a Unitarian friend.

MR. FOOTE'S LECTURES.

Sunday, August 26, Secular Hall, 61 New Church Road, Camberwell Road, at 7.30, "Did Christianity abolish Slavery?"

Sept. 2, Liverpool; 9 and 16, Hall of Science, London; 23, Manchester; 30, Camberwell.

Oct. 7 and 14, Milton Hall; 21, Newcastle; 28, Hall of Science.

Dec. 2 and 9, Hall of Science.

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. 7½d.

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.

EARNEST AGNOSTIC.—Paper forwarded. Orders should be sent to R. Forder, 28 Stonecutter Street. We note your opinion on the other matter, and certainly do not think you "presumptuous."

H. CRAWSHAW.—We note the change of address. Sorry to hear your neighbors are so bigoted. Mr. Foote is in excellent health.

J. BERMAN.—Gratified to hear from you as a recent convert, and pleased to learn that you have derived pleasure and profit from *Bible Heroes* and *Infidels' Death-Beds*. The origin of the world is a question which cannot be properly treated in this column. Any good manual of astronomy will furnish you with most of the information you seek. For the rest, read Spencer's Essay on the Nebular Hypothesis, which should be in your local free library. Certainly man does die "like a cat or a dog." No religionists dispute the fact. The only question is "Does man live again?"

This question is answered in a hundred different ways, but no one has a particle of trustworthy information on the subject.

C. A. GOLLE.—Your friend deals with a very big subject, which is foreign to the purpose of this journal.

T. GILCHRIST.—Jesus may be the captain of your salvation, but he certainly did say "Blessed be ye poor," and the context shows he meant it. We shall be very much surprised if you qualify yourself for the kingdom of heaven, unless you are qualified already—against your will.

W. T. LEEKY.—Thanks for the cuttings. We appreciate your indefatigable activity.

T. BIRTLEY reports that the Chester-le-Street Branch has placed the *Radical Leader* and the *National Reformer* on the Co-operative Society's reading-room table.

F. W. RICHARDS, N.W. London Branch, reports a successful meeting in Regent's Park last Sunday morning, addressed by Mr. F. Millar, and a 12s. collection for the *Freethinker's* Benevolent Fund.

HARRY RICHARDSON, 12 Rutland Street, South Kensington, S.W., will be happy to receive any *Freethought* literature for gratuitous distribution. H. R. wishes Mr. Foote "could give Hyde Park more of his time." He must remember that there are many branches in London, and Mr. Foote finds it hard to give them all a turn. Hyde Park has had one visit.

WM. SIMONS.—Cuttings are always welcome

CORRESPONDENCE should reach us not later than Tuesday if a reply is desired in the current issue. Otherwise he reply stands over till the following week.

SUGAR PLUMS.

A big audience assembled at Battersea Park gate last Sunday morning to hear Mr. Foote's lecture on "Salvation." The weather was warm, the speaking had to be loud, and there was no shade for the lecturer, who felt he could give some evidence before the Commission on the Sweating System. A Christian offered some feeble criticism, and another Christian got into a wrangle over a text, in which he was badly worsted. The audience was as attentive as it was large, and Mr. Foote's reception was enthusiastic.

MR. FOOTE lectured to a good audience in the evening at the Secular Hall, Camberwell. Mr. Ellis, who presided, drew attention to the coming School Board struggle, and pressed upon the audience's attention the London Secular Federation's meeting at the Hall of Science on Wednesday, August 29.

THAT meeting should be a crowded one. Mr. Foote will take the chair as President of the Federation, and among the speakers will be Mr. Charles Bradlaugh and Mrs. Annie Besant. Every member of the N.S.S. in London should feel it his duty to attend. Previous engagements, absence from town, late work, sickness, and other causes will prevent many from coming; but the rest are more than enough to cram the hall. The occasion is of the utmost importance. Note the day and the hour. Wednesday, August 29 (next Wednesday), at 8.15.

THE object of the meeting has already been stated. A plan of campaign will be submitted, resolutions will be proposed, and the *Freethought* party will be asked to pledge itself to a definite line of action. We must all be united if we wish to fight the parsons with any chance of success.

THE New York *Truthseeker* has a long article on the Oaths Bill, written before the third reading. The writer—we presume

the editor—is very careful, and obviously tries to be impartial. He quotes Mr. Foote's leaderette from the *Freethinker*, and gives a good summary of Mr. Bradlaugh's explanation. "There can be no doubt," he says, "that the amendment is a detriment to the Bill, for the mere mention of the fact in court that a witness or party in interest is an Atheist will prejudice a Christian judge or jury against him. Judges and lawyers will comment upon it, and cases might easily be decided on that alone, and not upon their legal or equitable merits." On the other hand, however, the *Truthseeker* says the question of half a loaf now, or a whole loaf at some unfixable future time, is "a question of practical politics, on which Mr. Bradlaugh is as well qualified to answer as anyone."

THE *Truthseeker* ends its article as follows:—"Mr. Foote's impatience with a compromise—'a bargain in which each party defrauds the other and himself'—is, however, natural. He is straight up and down for *Freethought*, first, last, and all the time. Mr. Bradlaugh has many other irons in the fire, and is a reformer on various lines. But as he told Parliament, in the discussion on the amendment, he has no objections to having the fact that he has no religious belief brought out. Holding the views he does, he said he never shrunk from accepting the consequences. Mr. Foote would undoubtedly say the same, and there can be no dispute as to the devotion to *Freethought* of either of our English friends. The dispute is simply over a question of policy, wherein both may be right and both may be wrong. But Mr. Bradlaugh may do well to remember that *Freethinkers* alone supported him in his long struggle for legislative honors; that without their zealous, unselfish aid not even his great ability would have opened to him the doors of Parliament. Their wishes should be respected, and if this 'bargain between a brazen falsehood and a timid truth' is going to defer for many years the complete legal habilitation of truth, it should not be consummated. It is better a thousand times to suffer and be strong, than to partially conquer and be forever weak."

FOR good or evil the Oaths Bill is now practically carried, and the Solicitor General regards it as closing the question, at any rate for a long time. Considering the large majority on the first reading, the overwhelming majority on the third reading, and the extremely narrow majority on the second reading, it is clearly arguable that the compromise was not absolutely necessary, or at least that a less objectionable one might have been carried. For it is not true—in our opinion—that the Bill enables *Freethinkers* to affirm "without question." They will have to state, in the express language of the Act, that they have "no religious belief," and it makes no difference that the public declaration is wrung from them by statute instead of by a judge. The point is, it has to be made. How the Act will otherwise work is a mere speculation. Time will show. Meanwhile we must make the best of it, and even those who, after the discussion on the second reading, thought the compromise somewhat mistaken, never for a moment question Mr. Bradlaugh's perfect honesty of intention, or withhold their admiration of the energy and perseverance he has all along displayed; nor can they help feeling that it will be a proud moment for him when he goes up to the table of the House of Commons and affirms instead of swearing his "allegiance."

THERE can be no doubt that Mr. Bradlaugh is a striking parliamentary success. *Freethinkers* are proud of it, and we believe they all wish "more power to his elbow."

FURTHER tributes to Courtlandt Palmer have appeared in the New York papers. The *Sun* says, "he met unflinchingly the fate from which no man can escape, and passed into the unknown saying: 'I suffer no fear in the presence of what Christians generally look upon as the king of terrors.'"

THE *Evening Sun* says: "The death of Courtlandt Palmer is another of the refutations of the assertions that the death-bed of the unbelievers is an agonising one. Mr. Palmer seems to have entered the dark valley with serenity and composure, fully equal to the many graphic pictures of the last hours of saints which are to be found in religious literature."

THE *Thinker*, of Madras, gives a report of the South Shields Conference, and inserts Mr. Foote's article on Gladstone and Ingersoll.

MR. WALLACE NELSON is circulating the *Freethought* gospel pretty well in Australia. We hope to have reports of his lectures at Gympie.

JAMES THOMSON'S mordant satire, "The Story of a Famous Old Jewish Firm," has been published by the *Liberator* Company, Melbourne. Through some error it is advertised as by Joseph Thomson.

MR. FORD, of Brighton, keeps the ball rolling by his letters on *Secularism* in the *Sussex Evening Times*. In a recent number he discusses the question of free agency and the punishment of criminals.

THE *Ironclad Age*, of Indianapolis, has changed its appearance and is now of more convenient size. The old heading is still

retained. On the one side is depicted "Theology at work," a scowling preacher pointing to hell and devils; and on the other "Humanity at work," a woman relieving distress, with the railway, telegraph and other signs of civilisation near; and in the centre "Our Trinity," a husband, wife, and child. Dr. Monroe appears to have dropped his wicked proclamation, but he still keeps the infidel flag flying bravely.

THE Rev. Hugh O. Pentecost, the American revivalist, who has turned Agnostic, now issues a journal entitled *The Twentieth Century*.

A LUDWIG FEUERBACH SOCIETY has been started by Professor Carl Schlegel, of New York, and the idea has been taken up in Germany by disciples of the distinguished Freethinker.

THE *Jewish World* has commenced a series of papers on the Jews and Jesus. No. 1 contents itself with mildly denying that the Jews are dispersed for their rejection of the carpenter's wife's son.

THE SEVEN LAST WORDS.

CHRISTIANS speak of the utterances of their dying God upon the cross as his "Seven Last Words" or sayings. Of these reported sayings of the crucified Jesus Luke records three, John records three others totally different, and Matthew and Mark record only one, and that one again totally different in words and in spirit from those narrated by Luke and John. Mark and Matthew probably give only one saying because they are the more archaic and presumably the earlier of the four gospels. Luke and John, as the more elaborated and sophisticated, omit the objectionable cry of despair and substitute their different versions of Christ's words according to the stories that developed or were invented later on.

The sayings mentioned by Luke are:—(1) "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do;" (2) Christ's unfulfilled promise to the crucified thief, "Verily I say unto thee, to-day shall thou be with me in Paradise;" (3) his final dying exclamation, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit."

The first and third of these sayings illustrate the incongruity of the different portions of the Christian mythus. God talks to God and prays to God, one portion of himself to another portion of his indivisible essence—a dramatic farce gone through apparently for the satisfaction and edification of Christian simpletons. God lowers his actions to the level of babes and sucklings, but forgets to remove the great stumbling-blocks presented by the logical impossibilities of the doctrine of the Trinity. If God the Father came down to die on some planet would he similarly commend his spirit into the hands of the Son? If Father and Son come down to die simultaneously as a still greater sacrifice for the remission of sins, would they commend their spirits into the hands of the Holy Ghost? If to make a clean sweep of sin the whole Trinity in Unity came down and died simultaneously, into whose hands would they commend their spirits?

Christ's morality, too, is as incongruous as his theology. The merciful prayer, "Forgive them"—which Christ has full power to do himself—accords badly with the doctrine of eternal torment.

Christ's promise to the penitent thief was not fulfilled, for he did not ascend to heaven for more than forty days after. Some Christians say that paradise only means Hades. Others point out that the word paradise literally means a garden or walled place, that is (in this particular case) a cemetery, so that Christ only promised the thief that they would both be in the cemetery that night. If so, the Gospel has deceived Christians most woefully all this while, and if it deceives them over one promise of paradise it may be equally treacherous in its other promises. Another difficulty concerning this alleged promise is that Matthew's account conflicts with Luke's, for he makes *both* the thieves mock Jesus, and, like Mark and John, he knows nothing of any promise or of any reason for it.

John's account of the last sayings of Jesus is similarly open to criticism as mythical rather than historical. He records how Mary the mother of Jesus, with other women and the beloved disciple (John himself), stood close by the cross, whereupon Jesus said to his mother, "Woman, behold thy son!" and to John, "Behold thy mother!" From that hour the disciple whom Jesus loved "took her unto his own home." The story is improbable. Luke says that

"all his acquaintance and the women that followed him from Galilee," of whom his mother must have been one if she was really present at the crucifixion, "stood afar off, beholding these things." Seeing that Mary had sons, and that no mention is made of her husband's death, it is hardly likely that she would spend her days with John.

John next proceeds to tell us that "After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished," exclaimed "I thirst." Vinegar—that is, the ordinary sour wine, or *vin aigre*—was put to his mouth, and when Jesus had received it he cried "It is finished," and "bowed his head and gave up the ghost." The story of the vinegar or wine varies greatly. Matthew mixes the drink with gall, Mark with myrrh, and John with hyssop, while Luke leaves it unflavored. Matthew and Mark present it immediately Christ is crucified, as well as unflavored vinegar just before his death, while John only administers vinegar and hyssop the moment before he dies. Matthew gives vinegar and gall as bitter mockery, Mark gives "wine mingled with myrrh" as if in sympathy, but says that "he received it not." Luke only offers vinegar in derision, while John gives vinegar and hyssop to relieve Christ's dying thirst. The omniscient Christ tasted Matthew's bitter draught as if he did not know that gall was mingled with it, and then, when thus enlightened as to its nature, would not drink it. He does not appear to have been allowed to taste Luke's draught, which was only exhibited to him by the jeering soldiers.

Mark and Matthew, as the more archaic of the four gospels, probably give the only accurate account of Christ's last words. They give one saying, and one only, as uttered by Jesus while on the cross. That utterance was a heart-rending cry of agony and despair—"Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?" according to Matthew, or "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?" according to Mark, were the words he used, and they represent the well-known passage in the Psalms, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" The despondent frame of mind indicated by this only exclamation recorded in the older gospels is perfectly natural and probable in a high spirited enthusiast whose ambitious hopes and religious and national delusions had signally broken down in the lingering agony and ignominy of a malefactor's death; but it is not easy to reconcile the signs of anguish and despair with the unnatural calmness and business-like words attributed to the didactic Christ crucified of Luke and John, who by some strange accident, or by special design, have failed to record a cry which they would feel to be derogatory to the character of their dying God.

This pathetic outburst of despair is probably the only authentic utterance of the crucified fanatic around whose petty personality as a basis the Christian myth subsequently crystallised. Christian commentators point out that only three of Christ's sayings are recorded in the Syriac dialect in which he spoke. Hence they regard the sayings, "*Talitha Cumi*," "*Ephphatha*" and "*Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?*" as being especially authentic and important remnants of Christ's actual and unfiltered words.

Independent of the utter contradiction in the spirit of the Gospel records, it is difficult if not impossible to reconcile the literal accounts of Christ's final words. According to Matthew and Mark his last words appear to have been "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" for "at the ninth hour," the time of his death, Jesus uttered this pitiful cry, whereupon a bystander gave him vinegar to drink, "and Jesus cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost" (Mark xv., 34—37). Luke says:

"And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said, Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: and having said thus, he gave up the ghost" (Luke xxiii., 46).

John says:

"When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, It is finished: and he bowed his head, and gave up the ghost" (John xix., 30).

How are these contradictions and discrepancies to be reconciled? And why should God inspire such simulation of falsehood in the all-important documents on which the eternal salvation of all his children depends?

According to John the vinegar was brought because Jesus said "I thirst"—an explanation which does not agree with the explanation given by Matthew and Mark. Considering the many and irreconcilable discrepancies both of

the letter and the spirit, and of record and of absence of record, we must conclude that the "Seven Last Words" are mainly mythical, and perhaps as entirely so as the deeds and words of William Tell or the Knights of the Round Table.

W. P. BALL.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

(Continued from p. 253.)

JUDGING the Decalogue by the pitiless light of Historical Science we pronounce scarcely too sweeping a verdict in asserting that it is accountable for the contribution of an enormous proportion of that peculiar brine, which in Shelley's too true words has made the "Ocean of Life" brackish with the salt of human tears."

1. Can anyone fairly maintain that Commandment I. had nothing to do with the Crusades of the Middle Ages, or with the persecution of that very race which it was surely the Divine Legislator's paramount duty to protect from the possible evil consequences of his own legislation?

2. Will it be denied that Commandment II. in any degree affected the relations, in a subsequent age, of Catholic and Protestant believers, or that it was conducive to the horrors incident to their long strife, or that it led to the persecution and slaughter of heathens and idolators?

3. But for Commandment III., such grotesquely abominable enactments as those dealing with the imaginary crime of Blasphemy might never have disgraced the statute-books of Europe as, even to this day, they do.

4. Commandment IV. has caused one day in every week to be (at all events for two hundred and forty years past in England, and in Scotland for a still longer period), to all enlightened and to many unenlightened men, a hebdomadal hell on earth; a day on which the wheels of knowledge and progress are for the time arrested, and the floods of ignorance, by civil enactment, let loose over all the land.

5. Even Commandment V. (despite its superficial attractiveness) must, from its defects, be held accountable for much irrational harshness and, among the brutalised masses, much revolting cruelty, vented by parents on their children.

6. By specialising murder, Commandment VI. ignores the attention due to that arch-crime *cruelty* in all but one of its ghastly varieties.

7. Lastly, seeing the notorious severity with which the English law visits offences against *property*—a severity out of all proportion to that with which it punishes even the grossest of offences against the *person* (wife-torture, for example)—can we be quite certain that this iniquitous tendency has not been fostered, or at least suggested, by that peculiarity in the Decalogue which, while ignoring several offences of the first magnitude, and allowing only one article apiece (and quite properly so) to the few crimes of which it *does* take account, emphasises its condemnation of theft by the virtual, if not explicit, assignment of two articles (Commandments VIII. and X.) to the prohibition of that single crime? For the English people, be it noted, possesses no tangible native code (if, indeed, it possesses a code in any sense), and is thus naturally enough disposed to appeal to the tangible Judaic one; and to base its conceptions of justice on a code consecrated by ecclesiastical recommendation and, especially, by Puritan tradition.

Enough and (but for the exigences of a task that has for its aim the complete demolition of an ancient, but most obstinate, superstition) more than enough of evidence has been adduced to prove my contention. The Ten Commandments constitute neither more nor less than an Archaic code, the product of a stage of civilisation which, as compared with that arrived at by even the backward European communities of to-day, may fairly be described as palaeozoic. But far more important than this determination of its nature and character is the fact of its phenomenally persistent and still pernicious survival as an object of reverence. The history of many a people, and many an age, bears witness to the havoc among human lives, and homes and hearts, occasioned by its faults, alike of excess and of defect, and leads me to the conclusion that, so far from its possessing a title to veneration on the score of its presumed "divine" origin, there is not a decently intelligent mother in Europe who would not be competent to provide her children, at an hour's notice, with a code immeasurably superior to the Decalogue.

W. M. M. ROBINSON, B.A.

MORE DISPATCHES FROM OUR SPECIAL AERIAL COMMISSIONER.

"Io," JUNE.

It has been reserved for me to clear up a difficulty that has been apparent to the minds of earth-men ever since thought took its present advanced form,—viz., that the same God would not do for all planets. There must be gods in different stages of culture for young worlds, adolescent worlds, and old worlds. For a full-fledged deity to appear on some earths would at once excite the cannibalistic tendencies of the inhabitants, and I feel proud as your Special Aerial Correspondent to be the first to publish the following intelligence, resulting from my visit to "Io," and thereby hand the name of your paper down to the ages when your earth perhaps has commenced to go back to chaos and old night.

After leaving "Astræa" I steered for the nearest, if not the largest, asteroid in sight, and my aerial machine occupying most of my attention, I failed to notice the appearance of "Io" until close to this small planet. My surprise was unbounded on looking up and finding almost the entire area covered with a vast building, something like your Buckingham Palace run to seed. On alighting I was greeted by a well-behaved young man who volunteered the information that this was the "Seminary of the gods," the Athenæum, in fact, where gods were coached for their duties in their different spheres of life, and he kindly offered to conduct me through the different class rooms, and show me the gods studying the different cults most suited for the peoples amongst whom they intended to appear.

Entering a room we found a class of student gods sitting cross legged, learning to sew garments of skins, deftly using an iron they facetiously called a goose, to press the seams. These deities, no doubt, were about launching into the hazardous and doubtful profession of world-making, and would have to clothe the first mud men they vivified by blowing up their nasal organs the breath of life. These students had all passed the standard for animal and parasite making. In another room I found a class practising warlike pursuits of a most horrible description. They were so savage that more advanced gods were set as guards over them to prevent extermination. A special class in another room were gradually habituating their olfactory organs to the smell of sizzled flesh, so that illness might not occur when their devotees offered up burnt animals on the altar. This same class were also being taught the use of human sacrifice. My conductor also showed me the crucifixion class, where deportment was inculcated, so that a proper dignity might be observed in approaching the cross, and not with the levity evinced by some of the younger gods, who capered and "leapt like troutlets in a pool." One juvenile deity looked upon the whole thing as an immense joke. The instruction of this class included the rising from the dead. This was great fun—the apparent corpse slowly waking up, scratching its head, and looking round for some suitable apparel to appear in in public. And then the attempts at ascension, reminding me of young birds learning to fly, caused great laughter, especially the numerous tumbles. Other classes this young man showed me where gods were in all stages of tuition—learning to be bushes of fire, pillars of cloud, etc., learning to turn grains of sand into small tooth comb insects, also how to turn water into wine (those in this section were compulsory abstainers). Another set were being taught the making of mud and saliva ointment for the cure of blindness. There was also the swearing class for cursing fig trees. This last experience was truly awful.

From these classes I was taken to a room where nothing could be detected but a kind of faint echo constantly whispering the one word "God." This was an instruction room, my guide told me, for those airy deities that will only do on certain old planets where a semblance of belief is kept up in a shadowy conception of a faint murmur of the name of God. "And now," said the young man, "for the last class-room." He threw open the door, and a most beautiful sight met my vision. Nature seemed exerting herself to produce the greatest beauty—birds and flowers and all things bright were here. It reminded me "of a melody that's sweetly sung in tune,"—happiness reigned supreme. "And where's the class?" I asked. "There is no class," replied my guide, "this represents Atheism and is only symbolical of the state of those planets of the highest cult, that have learnt to do without gods of any kind." This young man, then continuing, said, "I cannot understand why you earth-men do not see that as intellect progresses, so does the civilisation of the gods. The different deities of different sects ought to show you this, for instance, the Salvation Army God—a barbarous deity, fond of noise and drums and caterwauling generally—would not be tolerated on a planet where a primate like your poor and penniless Benson reigned supreme; but there, I didn't mean to treat you to a homily. If you stay on this asteroid you will be able to interview some of the student gods if you like, but I must caution you against those of the younger 'larrikin' species. If you intend leaving, remember me kindly to the staff of the *Freethinker*." And with these final words this courteous young man left me to my reflections.

PROFANE JOKES.

Minister (to little boy with a basket of fish)—"Little boy, aren't you ashamed to go fishing on the Sabbath day?" Little Boy (lifting the cover of the basket with conscious pride)—"Ashamed? Look at them."

Old Aunt (who has been reading to Bobby from the Bible)—"What yer thinkin' on, Bobby?" Bobby—"I was wondering if Solomon had seven hundred wives why he went and slept with his fathers."

Some irreverent travellers recently sang "Here's a How D'ye Do" before the great bronze image of Buddha at Kamakura. The natives thought it was a sacred hymn in praise of Buddha, and they imagined that the image showed distinct signs of pleasure.

"Did I understand you to say that you had had considerable experience with the Indians in the west?" inquired a man on the eastern train of a tall stranger. "Yes, I suppose I have." "What do you consider the outlook for their civilisation?" "Poor, very poor; they don't seem to learn anything. Why sir, only last week I traded with one of the most intelligent of them an old horse, blind in both eyes, all crippled up generally and good for nothing, for two fine ponies, and the poor devil never knew he was cheated." "Yes, that does look bad for them, true enough. I suppose you have a ranch near one of our reservations?" "O no, I'm no rancher; I am a missionary," replied the stranger as he threw his big leg over the arm of the seat. "I was sent out by the William Society of Philadelphia and have been laboring among the red brethren for the last twenty years."—*New York Tribune*.

THE
RADICAL LEADER

EIGHT LARGE NEWSPAPER PAGES.
ONE PENNY.

CURRENT NUMBER CONTAINS—

POLITICAL LEADERS IV.—**CHARLES BRADLAUGH.**

“A stirring exponent of militant Radicalism—well conceived, well written, and well printed.”—STAR.

28 STONECUTTER STREET, E.C.

BIBLE HEROES

By **G. W. FOOTE.**

FIRST SERIES—(1) Mr. Adam, (2) Captain Noah, (3) Father Abraham, (4) Juggling Jacob, (5) Master Joseph, (6) Joseph's Brethren, (7) Holy Moses, I., (8) Holy Moses, II., (9) Parson Aaron, (10) General Joshua, (11) Jephthah & Co., (12) Professor Samson.

One Penny Each.

Bound in Elegant Wrapper, One Shilling.

SECOND SERIES—(13) Prophet Samuel, (14) King Saul, (15) Saint David, I., (16) Saint David, II., (17) Sultan Solomon, (18) Poor Job, (19) Hairy Elijah, (20) Bald Elisha.

“Wittily written.”—*Truthseeker* (New York).

PROGRESSIVE PUBLISHING COMPANY, 28 Stonecutter Street, London, E.C.

THE
BIBLE HANDBOOK

For Freethinkers and Inquiring Christians.

EDITED BY G. W. FOOTE AND W. P. BALL.

Part I.—BIBLE CONTRADICTIONS.

Part II.—BIBLE ABSURDITIES.

Part III.—BIBLE ATROCITIES.

Part IV.—BIBLE IMMORALITIES, INDECENCIES, OBSCENITIES, BROKEN PROMISES, AND UNFULFILLED PROPHECIES.

This work is simply invaluable to Freethinkers. The Bible is thoroughly analysed, and its objectionable features are given in its own language. The Word of God speaks for itself and tells its own tale. Every Rationalist should keep this volume always by him.

164 pp. In paper covers, 1s. 4d. Superior edition, in cloth 2s. 164 pp.

REPLY TO GLADSTONE.

4d. By **COL. R. G. INGERSOLL.** 4d.

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.

Two New Works by Dr. EDWARD AVELING
(Alec Nelson)
LABOR MOVEMENT IN AMERICA.
By Edward and Eleanor Marx Aveling. 1s.
AN AMERICAN JOURNEY. 1s. 6d.

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

CHRISTIANITY AND PROGRESS

A REPLY TO
The Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone
By G. W. FOOTE.

“Vigorously penned.”—*National Reformer.*
“Mr. Foote always writes interestingly and convincingly, backs himself up with facts and quotations, and generally makes out his case—as he has most assuredly done in this pamphlet.”—*Truthseeker* (New York).

“One of the best productions of Mr. Foote's fertile brain. Its diction is faultless, and its array of facts invaluable.”—*Secular Thought* (Toronto).

PRICE TWOPENCE.

**LETTERS FROM HELL AND
LETTERS FROM HEAVEN**

By J. M. WHEELER.

ONE PENNY EACH.

A YOUNG BUSINESS MAN desires to meet with an Educated Freethinker who would advise, guide and assist him in his evening studies (subjects include Freethought, Theology, Science, etc.) at advertiser's own home in London. Write in first instance, stating terms, to “Student,” c/o Mr. Rowley, 157 Gloucester Road, South Kensington.

Printed and Published by G. W. Foote, at 28 Stonecutter Street, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.