

# The Free Thinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.]

[Sub-Editor, J. M. WHEELER.

VOL. XV.—No. 9.

SUNDAY, MARCH 3, 1895.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

## THE WOMAN WHO DID.

*The Woman Who Did.* By Grant Allen. London: John Lane.

MR. GRANT ALLEN is one of the brightest of the champions of Evolution. His arm is not so strong as Professor Huxley's, nor is his sword of the same weight and trenchancy. But there are very few Huxleys. We never find more than one in a single generation. It is therefore no disparagement of Mr. Grant Allen to place him below our great protagonist of Evolution. Yet in one respect he has a decided advantage. He has not hesitated to speak out plainly on the subject of religion—far more plainly than Huxley, whose Agnosticism seems at times a mere excuse for reticence.

Mr. Grant Allen has also written with the utmost plainness upon the social and ethical aspects of Evolution. He may be right or wrong, but at least he is honest. At one time we could only have said this with a reservation. But that was Mr. Grant Allen's own fault. He told the world that he had written a masterpiece, which he had not published, but destroyed, because he could not run the risk of committing the unpardonable sin against Mrs. Grundy. This was an act of cowardice, though there was some courage in the confession. But we take it that the masterpiece was only destroyed in a Pickwickian sense. It is presumably the book which has just been issued from the Bodley Head.

Mr. Grant Allen has waited until the air is thoroughly saturated with the odor of the Woman question, and he is sure of a hearing. He has also put his revolutionary argument before the world in a handsome attire. Mr. John Lane issues dainty volumes from his press in Vigo-street, and a dainty volume helps to disarm prejudice. There is nothing furtive about it. It seems to say that we may dislike it, but we must admit it is good-looking; and so it moves about, challenging a certain inevitable admiration.

It is a pity, however, that the title on the cover was not punctuated. "The Woman Who Did Grant Allen" is a very awkward joke. Of course it is a small matter; but the worst thing a revolutionist can do is to start a laugh at his own expense.

*The Woman Who Did* is a brightly written story; in some parts it is written beautifully. But it is not a mere story. It is really a fierce impeachment of marriage. Now this is a dangerous line for a writer to take, though less dangerous than it was ten or twenty years ago, and far less dangerous than it was in the days of Shelley. Mr. Grant Allen displays a discreet instinct, therefore, in dedicating the book to his wife—"to whom I have dedicated my twenty happiest years." After this he informs us that the book was written at Perugia, in the spring of 1893—"for the first time in my life wholly and solely to satisfy my own taste and my own conscience." By this time the reader is put, if possible, in the frame of mind to judge the book upon its merits.

No. 710.]

Before we proceed to judge the book upon its merits, we have a word to say on the subject of novels with a purpose. We conceive them to be an utter mistake, unless the purpose is latent, as it is in the tragic masterpieces of Shakespeare. The method of art is indirection. Shelley learnt this long after he wrote *Queen Mab*, and forcibly expressed it in the sentence, "Didactic poetry is my abhorrence." You may write a novel with a purpose ever so powerfully, but you will never make it convincing. The reader who dissents from your conclusions can always say, "This proves nothing; it never happened; it is all imaginary." Besides, as Flaubert said, somebody else may write a story as powerfully to illustrate the opposite thesis. And where are you then? Art—if it is art—has counterbalanced art; and the result is a futile equilibrium. If you have a thesis to maintain, do it in the proper way. Challenge the intellect directly. Appeal to fact and logic. Put your case so that it may be proved or disproved. To do otherwise is to evade your logical responsibilities.

The only good a novel with a purpose can really do is to draw attention to a principle or a grievance. It is very doubtful, however, if the persons whose attention can only be excited in that way are capable of any profitable thinking. The chances are, therefore, that you have appealed to the wrong audience; which is a serious waste of time and energy.

These are general considerations, and we now come to a more particular criticism. Mr. Grant Allen has made a tremendous blunder in logic, even as a novelist. He sets out to illustrate the argument that marriage is a relic of ancient slavery, and that men and women should unite their lives, or separate them, not only without the sanction of religion, but also without the sanction of the law. Accordingly, he introduces a beautiful, cultivated, and high-spirited girl, who refuses on principle to marry the man who loves her, and argues him into becoming her husband in the merely natural sense of the word. So far so good. But it is only, after all, the beginning; the first act, so to speak, of the drama. Mr. Grant Allen should then have worked out the after-life of this couple; he should have shown us how they bore themselves towards the world, and how the world bore itself towards them; he should have developed their relationship to each other when passion had settled into affection; he should have told us how the experiment answered for them, in the course of many years, and in the existing social environment. Instead of doing this, he kills off the hero (if we may call him so) in seven months with typhoid fever; giving him no time to echo Shelley's apostrophe to the skylark, "Thou lovest, but ne'er knew love's sad satiety." Mr. Grant Allen says that it is the fools who always put that question, "What of the children?" and think it a crushing one. All the more, then, was he bound to work out the problem from the point of view of the unmarried husband and wife. Killing the husband off—and it is the novelist, not nature, who perpetrates the assassination—is a weak evasion of the real difficulty. The problem that remains is not the

primary one, but the secondary one, which Mr. Grant Allen rather hastily declares to be no problem at all, or only a problem for fools.

The second half of Mr. Grant Allen's book answers his first half, and proves (if it proves anything) that "What of the children?" is not merely a question for fools. Herminia Barton is cut by most of her old acquaintances, and even by her father, the Dean of Dunwich. She is also cut by the family of her child's father. Her child grows up a Philistine. It was a case of atavism. Dolores Barton's beauty brings her a good offer of marriage. She learns of what she regards as her mother's "shame," rounds upon her in vehement Philistine language, goes to her paternal grandfather for "protection," and leaves Herminia no alternative but to take poison and leave a free stage for her daughter's career.

Mr. Grant Allen winds up with a funeral dirge, in which is a certain note of triumph. "Herminia Barton's stainless soul had ceased to exist for ever," but—"Not for nothing does blind fate vouchsafe such martyrs to humanity. From their graves shall spring glorious the church of the future." The sentiment is worthy of reverence; yet the cool intellect bids us ask what can possibly spring from imaginary graves, and whether the blood of imaginary martyrs can ever again be the seed of a church.

Dolores Barton was a beautiful young Philistine. She could not rise to the level of her mother's principles. But was it *her* fault? Mr. Grant Allen brands as "a silly error" the idea that parents can "influence to any appreciable extent the moral ideas and impulses of their children." Character, he maintains, is congenital, and cannot be "altered or affected after birth by the foolishness of preaching." Very well, then; if the law of atavism, which is only a *deeper* heredity, so often makes children unlike their parents, is it safe, is it fair, to involve children, whose character you cannot foresee, in the consequences of your own social experiments? Herminia Barton meant to give her daughter the glorious blessing of being "the first free-born woman ever begotten in England." But the blessing proved a curse, and it is idle to say that the daughter "made a curse of it." It *was* a curse to her. "All my life has been sacrificed to you and your principles!" exclaims Dolly. "You had no right," she cries, "to bring me into the world at all; if you did, you should have put me on an equality with other people." Herminia is unable to reply effectively; in other words, Mr. Grant Allen is unable to lay the spectre he has raised. We put it to him, in all seriousness, whether the fate of offspring is really a problem for fools. If it is, he should have been logical; he should have made Herminia resolute to the end, and have raised the "glorious church of the future" on the martyrdom of Dolores as well as the martyrdom of her mother.

In every civilised society the principle is gaining recognition that the rights of children are supreme. However marriage originated—and all good things had vulgar beginnings—it has held its own, just as monogamy has triumphed over polygamy, by virtue of the protection it affords to offspring. Family life may be purified; it can never be abolished without the ruin of civilisation. Children cannot grow up as they should without a home, and how is a home possible without marriage? This is the very kernel of the question, and not to see it is to be blind to the very essence of human evolution.

Mr. Grant Allen has strong views on the subject of marriage, and we shall deal with them in our next article. We shall also note some of his outspoken observations on other points in ethics and religion. He has put his heart into the work, and is entitled to a fair hearing and a candid criticism.

G. W. FOOTE.

(To be concluded.)

## CHURCH MEMBERSHIP AND CHURCH PROPERTY.

THE Parish Councils Act has been generally recognised as an excellent piece of legislation, developing the possibilities of public life in the villages, and helping to remove the village parishioners from the thralldom of parson and squire. The Act was opposed by these interested classes, and the bishops were consistent with the whole course of their legislative career in their antagonism to the measure. It is an open secret that their opposition was not extreme, both because it was seen to be unavailing, and because the new measure was not without some benefit to the Church. The old vestries having had their church functions swallowed up by their civil business, it became a distinct advantage to the Church to make the new civil council go to the schoolroom, or other building, instead of to the church vestries, thus dissevering the old and true idea that the church belonged to the parish, and could itself be used, as in old time it was used, for parish business. Still more, to retain parish charities as ecclesiastical charities, without the control of the parish councils, was, as it were, to obtain the advantages of disestablishment without the disadvantages of disendowment. Within narrower limits the Church may have more real power than ever. The Act restored to the vestry and the churchwardens their ecclesiastical character, and now Churchmen in Convocation have been discussing the question whether the election of the parish vestry, formerly the right of parishioners, cannot be confined exclusively to Churchmen. At first sight the question may appear to have no more importance than the ordinary discussions of Convocation (which, by the way, once had the right of examining all Bills brought before Parliament that in any way related to religion, but which can now only pass resolutions that nobody heeds); but on examination it will be found to be wide-reaching. If the church affairs of the parish are to be decided by Churchmen only, and not by the majority of the parishioners, it is evident that the Church of England, which has long ceased to be really co-terminous with the nation, will also cease to be entitled to the designation of the National Church. The Bishops in the Upper House of Convocation saw this, and adhered to the old precedents, which, as laid down by Hooker, declared "there is not any man a member of the Commonwealth who is not also of the Church of England." The Bishops of London and Rochester distinctly admitted that every citizen, as such, has a right to a voice in the affairs of the Church. The Bishop of Ely dissented; but he appears to have been the only member of the Upper House of Convocation who ventured to antagonise the existing law. For, by the law, all members of the nation are, *ipso facto*, members of the National Church, entitled to all the privileges of such membership. Though I have ceased to be a Christian, and consequently do not claim these privileges, I am in law a nonconforming member of the Church of England, and have as much legal right to a voice in Church matters as any of my fellow-parishioners.\* I may, moreover, if able, invest money in the purchase of advowsons, and present livings to any ordained clergymen I may select. The Lower House of Convocation appeared to be in a hopelessly muddle-headed condition on the question. Evidently they wished to limit the right of voting for the vestries to Churchmen; but as evidently they feared the State would never permit such a limitation of the rights of other parishioners. That mysterious body, the new House of Laymen, which has been, under the leadership of Lord Selborne, more sacerdotalist than the sacerdotalists, rejected the propositions of the Upper House. They would limit the voters for vestries to persons baptised in the Church of England; and since it is notorious that many who have been so baptised have become "nonconforming members of the Church of England," some would limit the voters to confirmed and communicating members. As, however, less than ten per cent. of baptised persons, and those mostly females, go through the ceremony of confirmation, any such rule would at once restrict the membership of the Church of England to within much narrower bounds than that of the Wesleyans, and render more glaring the

\* Even if excommunicated, my excommunication might not be recognised by the State. The Church was compelled, in the case of Mr. Jenkins, who was refused the sacrament because he did not believe in the Devil, to admit an acknowledged heretic into the fold.

iniquity of its holding for its exclusive behalf vast sums of national wealth. The Church is in a strait "between the Devil and the deep sea." If all parishioners vote, it must face the possibility of a nonconforming majority some day altering the very constitution of the Church, and possibly re-applying its buildings, lands, and endowments, or it must, by narrowing the term of its membership, confess it is no longer the Church of the nation, and consequently no longer entitled to those endowments. It hopes to sail between Scylla and Charybdis, and use the Liberal Parish Councils Act to dish the Liberationists. The very proposals show that the Church has lost its ancient, national basis, and that it has no more title to national property than any other of the various sects that teach in the name of religion. For it must never be forgotten that the churches, cathedrals, glebe lands, tithes, rents, and other funds in the administration of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, are national property. The clergy have no more right to consider the churches as their property than the Admiralty have to consider the dockyards and the ships of the navy as their property. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners and the various Church corporations are trustees for the entire nation. Nor is this affected by the fact that private persons have endowed the Church. As a matter of fact, of the aggregate annual income of six millions, only the comparatively small sum of £284,380 is derived from "private benefactions since 1703." The Churchman who gives his property to a church of which every member of Parliament is a ruler, and of which every citizen is a member, can no more question legislation concerning it than had he given property for a road or for a public park. The nation cannot take gifts on the condition that it shall never afterwards legislate concerning them. Mr. Gladstone made this clear in the debate on the Irish Church Bill in 1869, and the late Lord Chief Justice Coleridge remarked that, "if men give property to the Church, and the Church takes it, the property is given and taken subject to State control, on State terms: upon conditions laid down from time to time by the State, and liable to be altered by the power which has laid them down."

The Church is shrieking against its disestablishment in Wales as spoliation and robbery, though it has long robbed and despoiled a people who want none of it. Its talk of sacrilege and robbery will be regarded by no wise statesmen. A nation can do more rob itself than a man can rob himself. Should the nation deem it wise and expedient to devote the whole or any portion of ecclesiastical property to secular purposes, whether for the promotion of education, the encouragement of science, the endowment of research, the establishment of pensions for old age, or for the relief of the poor, it has exactly the same right as any individual has to buy books or give alms, instead of paying for fire insurance. When the nation is convinced of the unsoundness of theological *post-mortem* fire insurance it will certainly reconsider the wisdom of investing six millions and more per annum in that dubious business.

J. M. WHEELER.

### CHRISTIAN HISTORY NOT TRUSTWORTHY.

WHATEVER value the Christian religion may possess in itself, there can be no reasonable doubt that its early history was associated with fraud, falsehood, and barefaced forgery. For centuries the followers of Christ were not only guilty of interpolating different writings, with such alterations and additions as were deemed necessary to suit the purpose of Christian propaganda, but they actually forged entire passages that were favorable to their dogmas, attributing them to authors who had nothing to do with their production. Bishop Faustus says: "It is certain that the New Testament was not written by Christ himself, nor by his Apostles, but a long while after them, by some unknown persons, who, lest they should not be credited when they wrote of affairs they were little acquainted with, affixed to their works the names of Apostles, or of such as were supposed to have been their companions, asserting that what they had written themselves was written according to those persons to whom they ascribed it." (Lardner's *Gospel History*, vol. vi., part 2, chap. 63, p. 559). Probably these writers were influenced by the words of St. Paul: "If the truth of God hath more

abounded through my lie unto his glory, why yet am I also judged as a sinner?" (Romans iii. 7).

Mosheim, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, writes: "Thus it happened . . . that they who were desirous [in the third century] of surpassing all others in piety looked upon it as lawful, and even laudable, to advance the cause of piety by artifice and fraud" (p. 77). "The interests of virtue and true religion suffered yet more grievously by two monstrous errors which were almost universally adopted in this [the fourth] century, and became a source of innumerable calamities and mischief in the succeeding ages. The first of these maxims was, 'that it was an act of virtue to deceive and lie, when by that means the interests of the Church might be promoted'" (p. 102). "Nor did the heralds of the Gospel think it at all unlawful to terrify, or to allure to the profession of Christianity by fictitious prodigies, those obdurate hearts which they could not subdue by reason and argument" (p. 171). Such falsehood and deceit were not confined to mere *professed* Christians, for Mosheim says: "It cannot be affirmed that even true Christians were entirely innocent and irreproachable in this matter" (p. 55).

One of the most audacious instances of the endeavors of the Christians to palm off upon the world forged writings as real is that of ascribing to the Jewish historian, Josephus, a direct reference to Jesus as "the Christ." There are two passages that refer to Jesus in the *Antiquities*, which Josephus is supposed to have written A.D. 93; but the more important of the two is that found in chapter iii., book xviii., which reads thus: "Now, there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works—a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ; and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him, for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him; and the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day." Now, there is a general consensus of opinion among able writers (including eminent Christians) that this entire passage is a forgery.

C. B. Waite, who published his *History of the Christian Religion* in Chicago during the year 1884, says: "It is the general verdict of scholars that the paragraph in the third chapter of the eighteenth book of the *Antiquities*, wherein it is stated that Jesus was the Christ, etc., is an interpolated forgery" (pp. 16, 17). Eusebius is the Christian charged by several writers with the forgery, as it is well known that this pious writer was not over particular in keeping to the truth, if, by the use of falsehood, he could promote the interests of the Church.

Dr. Lardner, in the third volume of his works, says: "Probably some learned Christian, who had read the works of Josephus, thinking it strange that this Jewish historian should say nothing of Jesus Christ, wrote this paragraph on the margin of his copy; and thence it came to be afterwards inserted into many copies of Josephus." In the preface to his fourth volume Lardner writes more definitely, for therein he observes: "Indeed, it is not Josephus, but Eusebius, or some other Christian, about this time, who composed this paragraph."

Judge Strange, in his *Sources and Development of Christianity*, speaks of the passage as "a recognised forgery," and remarks: "The language is plainly that of a Christian, and not such as would be held by a Jew. Nor can it have proceeded from one so near the alleged events of Christianity as Josephus, who, sixty years after the atonement said to have been made by the Messiah, would not have had to point to the fact that he still had a following at this day as a noteworthy circumstance" (p. 21).

The Rev. Dr. Giles, in his *Apostolic Records* (p. 285), observes that the forged paragraph "is not noticed by any earlier writer than Eusebius, and plainly shows that the writer of it was a Christian. It has been rejected by all critics as a forgery, introduced into the text of Josephus to supply what was thought to be a serious want of evidence in favor of the Christian history." A host of other authorities could be cited, all being decidedly against the theory that the passage under consideration was written by Josephus. Even Professor Graetz writes, in his *History of the Jews* (vol. vii., p. 166), in referring to the circumstances

that are said to have occurred in connection with the life of Christ: "Strange that events fraught with so vast an import should have created so little effect at the time of their occurrence at Jerusalem that the Judæan historians, Justus of Tiberias and Josephus, who related, to the very smallest minutiae, everything which took place under Pilate, never mentioned the life and death of Jesus."

In my opinion, the paragraph, as it appears in the *Antiquities*, bears the strongest possible evidence of its being a forgery, and it requires no scholarship to detect its lack of genuineness. If anyone were to read a speech delivered by an archbishop of the Church of England in favor of the Establishment, and found that it was interpolated with opinions of the Liberation Society, the difference of the language and its import would be speedily detected. All that is required to discover the forgery in the book of Josephus is to remember who he was, and what religious views he held, and then to note the nature and position of the interpolation. Josephus was an orthodox Jew, and would not, therefore, use language that would indicate he believed in the divinity of Christ. There would be nothing extraordinary in a Jew mentioning the name Jesus, for that was an ordinary name, whereas Christ was not; it was a title, the "Anointed One," the Messiah. But the passage says that Josephus wrote, "He was the Christ," which is absurd, inasmuch as, had he done so, the early Christian Fathers would surely have alluded to the fact in their discussions with the Jews. "Origen," says Judge Strange, "could not have failed to have made use of it in his argument with Celsus, when occupied in bringing before him the testimony of Josephus. On the contrary, he has to admit the absence of any sufficient notice of Jesus by Josephus, and to endeavor to account for his silence."

Let us note the position of the passage as it appears in the *Antiquities*. The edition of 1737 gives in the margin the dates of the events recorded. It mentions three things as having happened A.D. 28—the first being a riot, in which Pilate's soldiers killed many of the populace, while others ran away. The account then says: "Thus an end was put to this sedition." Following in the order of this date, the historian adds: "About the same time, also, another sad calamity put the Jews into disorder." But between these two accounts appears the forged passage, which has no relation whatever to what preceded and what followed. In fact, it entirely destroys the continuity of the two narratives of the national disasters. Besides, the whole affair of the birth, miracles, death, and resurrection of Christ is disposed of in a few sentences, which is a most improbable thing for Josephus to have done, considering he gave full details upon local riots, which had no comparison in importance with the wonderful incidents mentioned about Christ. The concluding sentence of the paragraph ought to settle the matter once and for all. It reads thus: "And the tribe of Christians, so named from him [Christ], are not extinct at this day." Does not this point to the fact that the passage was written long after A.D. 93?

The allegation that the paragraph is after the "style" of Josephus is not true. His usual plan was to enlarge even upon trivial matters; yet in this case he is made to dismiss events of unparalleled magnitude in a few words. The fact is, all trustworthy evidence that has any reference to this "testimony of Christ" shows it to be one of the many glaring forgeries for which the early Christians were noted. As the author of *Supernatural Religion*, speaking of the early Christian Fathers, says: "No fable could be too gross, no invention too transparent, for their unsuspecting acceptance, if it assumed a pious form, or tended to edification. No period in the history of the world ever produced so many spurious works as the first two or three centuries of our era. The name of every apostle or Christian teacher, not excepting the great Master himself, was freely attached to every description of religious forgery." Such were the men who controlled the infancy of the Christian faith; and such were some of the elements that comprised its history.

CHARLES WATTS.

We look before and after,  
And pine for what is not;  
Our sincerest laughter with some pain is fraught,  
Our sweetest songs are those that tell of saddest thought.  
—Shelley.

## ACID DROPS.

THE recent severe weather is not much of a testimony to the wisdom and benignity of "Providence." It has inflicted the most frightful hardships upon the poorest classes. Inquests have been held in London upon men and women who died of sheer cold and starvation. In one very sad case the Coroner was very pathetic in his lamentations, and gave some coal and food tickets to the surviving family. After the inquest it was discovered that several of the jurymen were themselves suffering from lack of sustenance, and the coroner distributed tickets amongst them as well. All this is a curious commentary upon our boasted "Christian civilisation." It is very doubtful whether any ancient pagan state, or any modern heathen country, could show such poverty, destitution, and misery as obtain where the Bible is read and Christ is worshipped.

Mr. Barnes, a Sheffield publican, determined to give away soup and loaves to the destitute poor in his neighborhood. Some tickets were sent to the Rev. C. F. Knight, of St. Simon's Vicarage, to distribute, but the man of God would not have anything to do with such tainted charity. He would not have people go to a public-house, even to save themselves from starvation. Of course this is a very noble attitude, but a correspondent of a local newspaper wants to know whether the reverend gentleman, who took a tour on the continent lately, stayed at hotels or not. We have not seen his answer to this pertinent question. Probably we never shall.

A story is being circulated about Mr. Gladstone at Cannes, where the venerable statesman is escaping the rigors of our English winter. Going to church one day, the G.O.M. was accorded a seat near the pulpit; but his deafness still prevented him from catching the sermon. "I can't hear," he said, turning to his helpmeet. "Never mind, my dear," said Mrs. Gladstone, "never mind; go to sleep. It will do you much more good." We should think so.

The Gifford lectures are becoming quite jocular. Professor Wallace, the latest Gifford lecturer at Glasgow, has just defined the soul as follows: "Our soul was that not in which we were separated from others, but that in which we were most one with others; that which was not a part of our structure, but something that was higher than physical structure, something which used physical structure for its ends, something which, so far as we knew, did not live, did not exist, except where two or three are gathered together." If this sort of thing continues, the *Freethinker* will have to look to its laurels.

The old man Moyes, recently murdered at Liverpool, earned a living by selling Bibles. He couldn't have been less under the protection of Providence if he had earned a living by selling the *Freethinker*.

John Jones, sub-postmaster at Trealar, in the Rhondda Valley, has been arrested on a charge of embezzlement to the extent of £1,000. The prisoner, who has been a Nonconformist deacon, thanked God that he had been a Christian for thirty years. He trusted God would have mercy upon him, and incline the hearts of the officials to pardon him. Nice man, John Jones!

The goody-goody paper which boasts the title of *Great Thoughts* gives, in its issue for March 2, a portrait of Pierre Joseph Proudhon. But there is no hint that the Father of Anarchism was a Freethinker, though his saying, *Dieu est le mal*, was almost as famous as *La propriété est le vol*. This is the more notable as the writer of the paper upon him is the Rev. S. E. Keeble, who says: "Proudhon's life was strictly moral and upright. He appears to have been singularly free from personal immorality, an affectionate husband, a true friend, an upright man, free from feelings of personal hatred against any man." After this it might have astonished the Christian readers to be told he was an Atheist.

Mr. E. Thornton has been stating in the *Church Times* that in London shops and factories, out of 2,000, 1,000,

and 700 men, only two or three are found to go to church or chapel. The statement has provoked a revival of the oft-discussed question why working men do not go to church, to which so many answers have been given without bringing them any nearer to the house of God. Perhaps the causes mentioned by the Rev. F. L. Donaldson are as amusing as any. They are "carnality, conceit, and Calvinism."

It appears from the second annual report of the Liberator Relief Fund that there are on the books of the Fund 2,472 victims of that sanctimonious fraud, their losses amounting to £700,000. Most of them were people of small means, who, misled by the pious aspect of the scheme, thought to have treasure above and increase their possessions here at the same time. After much has been done for their relief, hundreds of the sufferers still have the workhouse staring them in the face.

Christians, conveniently forgetting the past of their faith, which has been found compatible with the most atrocious forms of persecution, war, and slavery, put it forward as synonymous with all that is humane. They should read the series of articles in the *Law Times* on the history of punishment, and they would discover that in the palmy days of Christianity its professors were as inhumane and remorseless as North American Indians or South Sea Islanders. No Christian expressed pity when, in the reign of Henry VIII., Richard Mekins, a boy of fifteen, was publicly burned for "heresy," or even when a woman was boiled to death in Smithfield, in the middle of the sixteenth century.

As late as 1812 Daniel Isaac Eaton, then aged sixty, was placed in the public pillory, a punishment which often meant the violence of the mob, as well as the torture of the instrument, for having published Paine's *Age of Reason*. Fortunately, the populace was sympathetic, and a ballad in his honor was sold round the pillory. The sentence, however, excited the indignation of Shelley, and evoked his spirited *Letter to Lord Ellenborough*.

We have already referred to the shameful boycott of Mr. Foote's lecture for the Humanitarian League on "The Shadow of the Sword." We now invite our readers to look at an opposite picture. On Sunday afternoon St. James's Hall was crowded. The *Daily News* says 8,000 people were present, but that is nonsense. Still, it was a large meeting, and it was held under the auspices of the West London Mission. The speakers included Sir John Hutton, chairman of the London County Council, the Rev. Alderman Fleming Williams, and the Rev. Dr. Clifford. The boss of the show was the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes. It does not matter that he is a convicted liar. He is in the swim; he is respectable. Nor does it matter that Mr. Foote exposed the lie. He is out of the swim; he is a naughty Freethinker; and he must be boycotted.

According to the report in the *Daily Chronicle*, the Rev. Fleming Williams expressed himself in a fashion which he professed to disdain when he had that friendly discussion with Mr. Foote at the Hall of Science. Speaking of the project of breaking London up into twelve municipalities, he said that this "involved consequences as black with Atheism and as foul with iniquity as anything outside hell."

We acquit Mr. Williams of meaning anything particular by this, except that, as a Progressive alderman, he hated the policy of the Moderates. Logic is not his strong point, and we do not expect it of him. At the same time, it would be well for him to be a little less wild in his utterances. He knows that he had no sort of right to bring in "Atheism" in this connection. The Atheists in London are almost to a man Progressives, and the party of reaction is almost entirely composed of rather ostentatious Christians. Mr. Williams should give this fact his careful attention, instead of dragging in "Atheism" to please the bigotry of the Methodist groundlings at St. James's Hall.

"Outside hell" is a good mouthful, and Mr. Williams loves big phrases. But, as the Yankees say, what the hell did he mean by it? The sentence implies that there is fouler Atheism in hell than outside it. Perhaps there is.

Mr. Williams may be a better authority on hell than we are. But is he a better authority than the Bible? And does not the Bible say that "the devils also believe and tremble"? The natural inference from this is that there is *no* Atheism in hell. Mr. Williams, however, asserts otherwise; and we leave him to settle the matter with the Holy Ghost.

Dr. Clifford made a very unfortunate historical reference. He said that the Progressives should go forward in the spirit of the Crusaders, who cried "God wills it." Yes, that was indeed their cry; and what did they do on the strength of it? They went forward plundering, torturing, ravishing, and massacring—like the vilest set of ruffians ever let loose upon the world. It is to be hoped that the Progressives will not fall under the same spiritual influences. The fact is, Dr. Clifford was like Alderman Williams; he did not think beyond the exigency of the moment; otherwise he would have let the Crusaders rest in their unhallowed graves.

"That ridiculous *Daily News*" was an expression in our first leading article last week. Of all the London newspapers, this highly respectable organ of official Liberalism was the only one that gave no report whatever of the Hall of Science libel case. The *Daily News* has always pursued these ostrich tactics. It treats as non-existent what it does not like to recognise. For a long while it affected not to know that there was such a person as Charles Bradlaugh. It kept up the affectation until its own public laughed at its absurdity. When the whole country "stunk of Bradlaugh," as the Tories put it, the *Daily News* readers opened its pages and could never see his name. In the same way, Mr. Foote's name has been systematically excluded from the reports of meetings, even when he was one of the principal speakers. The *Daily News* has an unconquerable aversion to anything and everybody connected with Freethought.

A week or two ago the *Daily News* gave a very appreciative review of M. Fouillée's biography of M. Guyau, in which it lavishly praised the latter's power of thought, fine imagination, and grace of style. But not a word suggested that he was a Freethinker, and the author of a striking book on *The Irreligion of the Future*. Of course the silence was not due to ignorance. The writer knew his subject well enough. He was obliged to be reticent. Freethought is tabooed by the editor. He cannot "abide" it. Like Macbeth, he exclaims, "Come in any other form but that!"

"A Stupid Boy," who is really very different, writes a jocular letter in the *Eastern Daily Press* on the Bible teaching he suffered in his youth at a Church school. The chief thing he recollects is the schoolmaster, who was very muscular, and who wielded the cane most effectually. After the schoolmaster comes the parson:—

His coat so sleek and buttony,  
His checks so smug and muttoney.

The authorities up in Springfield have intercepted a package sent thither from China. It was ostensibly a book, but on being opened it was found that the leaves had been cut out and a gorgeous silk handkerchief, of dutiable value, was smuggled therein. The sad thing about it is that it was sent by a converted Oriental to a Springfield missionary.—*Boston Herald*.

The *Tablet* notices Mr. Balfour's book so favorably that it evidently thinks that in denouncing Rationalism he is preparing others for the road to Rome, even if he is not sufficiently logical to take that road himself.

A bishop with £8,000 a year can hardly be expected to be in favor of Disestablishment, but it is a notable sign of the times that the Bishop of Durham should address a letter to his diocese on the subject, in which, among much other questionable matter, he states that, if the Church be disendowed, the heaviest losses will fall on the poor. Nonsense, bishop. The fact is, that the poor might then resume their right to the tithes, and the national property now devoted to the Church might provide the whole of the aged poor with pensions.

Representatives of Burial Boards, in different parts of the country, have waited on the Home Secretary and represented to him that the clergy in many cases made excessive charges on account of graves, monuments, tombstones, etc., in the consecrated portions of cemeteries and burial grounds provided out of the public rates. The public were at the expense of providing those places, and the clergy rendered no service for the charges made.

Mr. T. E. Page writes to the *Times* that, in consequence of the head-masterships of public schools being given to clericals, those posts are occupied by persons who, at the university, would not be considered worthy of a college lectureship. He says: "That this should be so is a scandal to education; but it is men like the Bishop of London who are mainly responsible. They know that teaching is not a necessary appanage of the clerical profession; but they prefer to keep it so, no matter at what cost of public detriment."

A big Missionary meeting was recently held at Dr. Parker's City Temple. Mr. H. M. Bompas, Q.C., who presided, tried to stir up young men and women to take part in missionary work, and to push the Gospel of Christ with the energy displayed in pushing English commerce all over the world. While this gentleman was exhorting his hearers to go and convert the heathen, thousands of people were living in poverty, squalor, and degradation within a mile of the place where he was speaking. Christianity, thy name is (or should be)—Hypocrisy!

The next speaker was the Rev. R. P. Ashe, of the Church Missionary Society. This gentleman was very eloquent over the change that Christianity has produced in Uganda. He admitted the melancholy business of the fighting, says the *Daily News* report, but he appeared to find some subtle consolation in the fact that the machine guns were made by European Christians. Guns or no guns, the Bible was being read in Uganda, and there was liberty of conscience—at least for the missionaries. Mr. Ashe forgot to say, however, how soon, in his opinion, the natives of Uganda would be exterminated. The guns, the rum, and peculiar Christian diseases, will probably send them to kingdom-come, and leave their soil free for the occupation of the missionaries' friends.

Fred Douglass, the runaway slave, and afterwards the eloquent champion of the black race in America, is just dead, and the Christian newspapers are gushing over his grave. It would be more honorable, and perhaps more profitable, if they reflected on the old attitude of Christians in general to slavery, before it was condemned by the conscience of civilisation. Fred Douglass once delivered a lecture in the town where Colonel Ingersoll resided, and after the lecture he walked the streets because no hotel would afford him accommodation. When this outrage came to the ears of the "infidel," he sallied out into the streets and took the "nigger" to his own house. No wonder that Douglass spoke of Ingersoll on public platforms as the eloquent friend of the downtrodden blacks.

The Rev. Conrad Hancy has too much of the man after God's own heart in his composition. In 1879, while pastor of a Methodist flock in Sherman, Texas, his admiration of other men's wives made him conspicuous, and he was obliged to seek fresh woods and pastures new. Recently he has had to skedaddle from Chicago, where he saved souls in the Lake Avenue Evangelical Church. He has gone off with a Mrs. Brandt, leaving his own wife and children destitute. No doubt he will turn up in another part of the Lord's vineyard, and find there another Bathsheba.

What knowest thou, man, of life? and yet, for ever twixt the womb, the grave,  
Thou pratest of the coming life, of heaven and hell thou faint must rave.

The world is old, and thou art young; the world is large, and thou art small;

Cease, atom of a moment's span, to hold thyself an all-in-all.

—Haji Abdul El-Yezli.

## THE HALL OF SCIENCE LIBEL CASE.

(Continued from p. 125.)

MR. JOHN SNOW, one of the defendants, was then examined by Mr. Rawlinson. He said he was a publisher and bookseller, carrying on business in Ivy Lane, London. His name appeared on the pamphlet.

As a matter of fact, what connection had you with the production of the pamphlet?—I am merely agent for the sale of the pamphlet.

That is a common practice in your trade, I think?—It is. You receive so many copies from the printers, and sell them and account to the proprietors?—Yes.

On what terms do you receive them?—I sell them at a commission of 5 per cent.

That is all the connection you had with the production of these pamphlets?—Yes.

Before this action was brought had you ever heard of Mr. Smith?—Never heard of his name before.

I need hardly ask you whether you had any feeling of any sort against him?—None.

You knew that this pamphlet was a reproduction of what had already been published in some other paper?—Yes.

It also appears that it is a verbatim report of what occurred at Leeds?—Yes, certainly.

So far as you were concerned, had you any knowledge at all even of the existence of this paragraph in the middle of the pamphlet?—Not until I received a letter from the plaintiffs' solicitor.

The JUDGE: What is the date of that?

MR. RAWLINSON: 6th April, 1894. (To witness) In that letter there was no indication to you as to what part of the pamphlet was complained of?—None whatever.

And no suggestion that Mr. Smith was in any way connected with the Hall of Science, which it now appears he is connected with?—No.

And at that time had you any idea of what was complained of in the pamphlet?—None.

Now since this action was brought have you, through your solicitor, collected a large number of different papers, Secular or otherwise, having reference to the conduct of Secular halls at Leeds?—Yes.

Amongst others have you received a copy of a review called the *Secular Review*?

MR. WALTON: How is this evidence, passages which may have appeared in other contemporaneous papers?

MR. RAWLINSON: In this way. The question here is whether or not the audience who heard this remark would apply it to the Leeds or London hall. I venture to submit it is evidence of a discussion which appeared in the Secular papers published by people who held the same line of thought, to show, as a matter of common notoriety, it was a subject which had been under discussion between Christian and Secular debaters shortly before the time of the speech complained of. I propose to bring a large number of papers to show the Leeds question had been discussed, and it was a matter of public interest at the time, and therefore to ask the jury to hold that when the speaker referred to a hall, speaking at Leeds, he referred to a hall in Leeds, and not in London.

MR. WALTON: It is a very simple issue. The question is whether Mr. Powell said this having reference to a building in Leeds. That could be proved by calling persons who heard it and the person who spoke it, and proved by giving a description of the building in Leeds, which would answer the description given in this article. It is not proved by throwing in a large armful of newspapers and saying, If you look at them you will see the speech discussed.

MR. RAWLINSON: I propose to show that the speech on conduct at Leeds was the subject of public discussion.

The JUDGE: You don't find in the pamphlet that it was a subject of discussion.

MR. RAWLINSON: Up to that time it was an important subject of discussion; and in the pamphlet itself it was also the subject of discussion.

MR. WALTON: Your lordship has already ruled upon that point.

The JUDGE: You cannot put papers forward as evidence of what took place in Leeds. There is surely another way of getting it.

MR. RAWLINSON: I don't care what took place at Leeds. The JUDGE: You have got a faint denial from the plaintiff of having heard that some scandal had taken place at Leeds. Had not you better be content?

MR. RAWLINSON: I am showing that this subject was under discussion between the parties during all these years, and that it was referred to by these gentlemen on that occasion. That is the line of my argument. Of course it is a very loose description on page 29 of the pamphlet. In other parts of the pamphlet the matter is put more accurately. I don't know that I can put it any further than that.

The JUDGE: You have got the pamphlet there, and if you can find a case in that, so much the better.

Mr. RAWLINSON: Then I will deal with the pamphlet, and I shall hope to alter your lordship's mind, to a certain extent, so as to show what I mean. I submit I am entitled to prove what he was referring to.

Mr. WALTON: He describes it, not as having happened at a Hall of Science, but at the North-street Hall, Leeds; but that was in his first speech.

Mr. RAWLINSON: I submit it is the same subject.

The JUDGE: Then you are met with the same difficulty. If you can call somebody who is able to tell us what happened, all very well; but at present it is like asking to put in a copy of the *Times*, and saying you are not going to call any witnesses, asking me to believe everything in it.

Mr. RAWLINSON: If it was a subject of ordinary interest, I should be entitled to read articles in publications which appear to show that it was an article of public interest. Here I am asking your lordship to allow me to read a matter which must have been known to the Secularists at the time.

The JUDGE: Already you have got proved by the plaintiff that something had taken place at Leeds, and that the matter had been discussed in his presence. You have got that. Mr. Smith says himself he was present when the report of the trial was discussed.

Mr. RAWLINSON: I was wishing to tell your lordship what the nature of the scandal was.

Witness was then cross-examined by Mr. Walton.

I understand, Mr. Snow, you publish numerous publications of this class?—Yes.

Do you publish a paper called the *Anti-Infidels*?—I do.

With your name upon the face of it?—Yes.

And I think you were the first in the pages of the *Anti-Infidels* to give this discussion to the world?—The proprietor, Mr. Bradlaugh, was.

I am speaking of you as publisher. You published it under your name; is that so?—The discussion was published in the *Anti-Infidels*.

Do I understand you to tell the jury you published that discussion in the newspaper, without troubling yourself to read it?—I did not read it.

The JUDGE: What had Mr. Bradlaugh to do with it?—He is the editor and proprietor.

Mr. WALTON: What is the circulation of the *Anti-Infidels*?—I sell about 2,000.

I did not ask you what you sold.—I only receive it from Mr. Bradlaugh on sale.

How many copies pass through the press?—I don't know. I am not the printer.

You have no idea?—No.

Not the remotest?—No.

The JUDGE: You did not print the pamphlet, I understand?—No.

The JUDGE: It was sent to you to sell, the same as the *Anti-Infidels* was?—Yes, on the same terms.

Mr. WALTON: It appeared in pamphlet form, with your name on frontispiece?—Yes.

Do you regard yourself as responsible for what appears under your name as publisher?—No.

Mr. RAWLINSON: That is a legal question which your lordship may have to decide later.

The JUDGE: If he does regard himself as liable, and he is not legally so, it won't hurt him to say he is.

Mr. WALTON: You tell that to the jury. You issue a pamphlet with your name on the front, and you do not consider yourself responsible for having given it to the world?—I am responsible for the copies I sell, of course.

Are you responsible for allowing your name as publisher to appear on the document for its contents?—Responsible for the name appearing.

Before you allowed your name to appear on this, do I understand you did not trouble to read it?—I did not see it before it was put on.

Your attention was called to it by the solicitor later?—It was.

That was a serious letter?—It was.

Did it complain that this pamphlet contained a serious libel both upon Mr. Smith as the manager of the Hall of Science, and upon the National Secular Hall Society, Limited?—I don't think the letter did.

Let me read it; perhaps you did not read it?—I did read it.

Mr. WALTON (reading): "I have received instructions from the National Secular Hall Society, Limited, and from Mr. Owen Smith, the late manager of the Hall of Science, to commence an action against you and the printer for certain defamatory libels." Did you, after you got the letter, take the trouble to read the document?—I did.

Did you come across the passage in question?—I did not notice it particularly when I received the letter.

When did you first notice it?—On the receipt of the writ.

Did you answer the letter?—No, because I thought I had better see the proprietor of the pamphlet first.

When you did read the passage, did you think it a very shocking libel on somebody?—I thought it was a libel on the Hall of Science.

In London?—Well, I did not know where it was.

Do you really tell the jury that?—I do.

You are the publisher of the *Anti-Infidels* and similar literature, and did not know where it was?—No; I had never seen it.

Did you know it was in London?—I knew there was one in London.

Did you know it was the one in London that was suing you?—I did not suppose anything about it.

Did you say you did not form any opinion?—No.

Did you think it was any other Hall of Science in London?—I did not know.

You did not know which it was?—No.

And you did not trouble to inquire?—I went to see Mr. Bradlaugh.

Did you ascertain from him that it was any other hall than the one in London that was referred to?—No.

You thought, then, it was the Hall of Science in London?—I thought it might be.

And was no other?—Well, I knew of the hall in Leeds.

Did you think that the one referred to?—I thought it quite possible?

You swear that?—I do.

Then you thought it did not refer to the plaintiffs?—I thought not.

When you were served with a writ?—Yes.

That you swear?—Yes.

Then, having come to the conclusion that this did not refer to the plaintiffs at all, did you write and tell them so?—No.

Why not?—Because I saw Mr. Bradlaugh.

I am not speaking of what you said to Mr. Bradlaugh, but of what you said to these gentlemen complaining of the libel?—I said nothing.

Why not?—Because I did not know him. (Laughter.)

You think that is a serious answer?—I do.

And you tell the jury you thought it did not refer to him?—I put the matter in the hands of my solicitor.

I see. Did you continue to publish the *Anti-Infidels* after the action had begun?—Certainly.

Did you happen to have been publishing it in May and June, 1894?—Yes.

In May and June, 1894, you were strongly of opinion that this did not refer to the plaintiffs who were suing you?—I cannot say what happened in May and June. This was in April.

Did you change your opinion before May, 1894, as to whom the libel referred to?—No.

Then you thought it did not refer to the plaintiffs?—I thought so.

Will you tell the jury, if you did not think the action referred to the plaintiffs, how you came, in May, 1894, to publish a letter containing this passage: "The fact that Mr. G. W. Foote can only bring forward one solitary paragraph on which he thinks it even possible to base an action is a tacit admission on his part that every other charge concerning the filthy and immoral literature issued from the Secular press, and the vile conduct and practices of Secularists themselves, has been proved up to the hilt. When the case comes before the court the evidence lacking in the involved paragraph will be forthcoming, and then the charges will be proved up to the hilt?" How came you, if you thought in May, 1894, that this paragraph did not refer to the plaintiffs at all, to publish a statement that you were going to prove the charges up to the hilt?—Mr. Bradlaugh wrote that; I did not.

You published it. Do you mean to say you did not read that?—No; I don't mean to say so.

And do you mean to tell the jury you allowed these gentlemen to come into court under the impression that the libel referred to them, without having in any way sought to correct that opinion? You know now, perfectly well, it refers to them?—It was only my opinion.

Have you any doubt about it?—Oh yes.

Do you suggest there is no Hall of Science in London?—No, there was one.

In 1879?—I cannot say what year.

Did you ever hear of a Hall of Science in Leeds, so-called?—Yes.

The National Secular Hall is referred to in this libel. Is there any Hall of Science in Leeds the headquarters of the Society?—I don't know.

Can you suggest any Hall of Science in the United Kingdom which can be described as the headquarters of the Secularists, except that managed by Mr. Smith?—I cannot suggest any.

Or any situated, as that is, near a lunatic asylum?—I don't know where it is situated.

Inasmuch as this Hall of Science is a Hall of Science in London, and inasmuch, therefore, as Mr. Smith manages it and conducts it, you now understand that the passage refers to him?—He says it does.

Have you any doubt?—Oh yes.

If what he says is true, it must?—Yes.

Have you offered any retraction or apology yourself?—No, I have not.

Are you indemnified in respect of damages and costs?—Yes.

Re-examined by Mr. RAWLINSON: My learned friend has asked you about the Hall of Science in Leeds in 1878. Did you know when it was shut up?—I can't say from my own knowledge.

Only from what you have read?—Yes.

The JUDGE: Is it shut up?—It is, I believe.

Mr. WALTON: There is no such building, and never was.

Mr. RAWLINSON: There was a Secular Hall.

Mr. WALTON: There is this hall in North-street, Leeds; but it has not this description. It was not called the Hall of Science. I am instructed that that is a malicious and malignant fabrication.

Mr. RAWLINSON: The Secular Hall was the one I asked about. You can, if desired, tell what has become of the hall in Leeds?

Mr. WALTON: My friend is not entitled to that.

The JUDGE: You are both knocking your heads against a brick wall. One of you refers to the Secular Hall, and the other to the Hall of Science.

Mr. RAWLINSON: I was only going to ask the date.

The JUDGE: Mr. Walton says there is no Hall of Science at Leeds.

Mr. Cook, the second defendant, was then called, and said he was the printer of this pamphlet.

Were you instructed to print it in the ordinary course of your business?—Yes.

At the time you printed it did you know of this paragraph, the subject-matter of this action, being in at all?—I did not.

It was printed as a reprint of what had been in the *Anti-Infidel*?—Yes.

And that was a copy of a report of a meeting held at Leeds?—Yes.

You never heard of Mr. Smith before this action?—No.

Cross-examined by Mr. WALTON: Are you indemnified too, are you in that happy position?—Yes.

Damages and costs?—I don't know.

Which?—I don't know.

Both?—I don't know.

Which do you think? (Laughter.)

The JUDGE: Have not you got what you want, Mr. Walton?

Mr. WALTON: I think so.

Mr. RAWLINSON then addressed the jury for the defence.

He said: I shall detain you a very short time in summing up the evidence laid before you. The point which my learned leader, Mr. Murphy, made when he addressed you is one which I think is certainly worthy of your consideration. The main question for you is, Was this remark, which was made by Mr. Powell, reasonably to be understood as referring to the London Hall of Science, or was it referring to a Secular hall in Leeds, about which scandals had arisen. And a prosecution had taken place shortly before the date referred to in the pamphlet? I do call your attention most carefully to this. As appears from the pamphlet, these two disputants, Mr. Powell and Mr. Fisher, made alternate speeches. Mr. Powell first made a speech, and Mr. Fisher replies at some length. Mr. Powell again replies on him, and so the combat is carried on. In his first speech Mr. Powell opened the case against Secularism in great detail, and in that opening, one very short part of which I shall read to you, he deals in detail with the charges of disgusting conduct against the National Secular Hall at Leeds. There is not the slightest doubt as to what he is referring. When he refers to the "rotten proceedings" at the National Secular Hall, he is obviously referring to the scandal which was well known to his audience, because he does not go into detail. Mr. Fisher then makes a speech of some length, and then Mr. Powell has the reply upon him, and it is in the second speech that this paragraph occurs. If it was meant to have referred to the London hall, you would have found it set out in his first speech. As it is, you find it in the second speech, which is a continuance merely of his first speech. He puts his case in his first speech, and details very shortly the proceedings which occurred before the Leeds magistrates, and then goes on to the *Elements of Social Science*. In his second speech he again refers, as I submit, to the Leeds Hall in the paragraph complained of, then reverts to the *Elements of Social Science*. My friend very properly objects when I want to put in the Leeds *Daily News*, because it is not the *Daily Standard*, so I cannot show you to what this libel refers. It is spoken by a man who is summing up his case replying to Fisher. He has identified the hall before in detail, and he sums it up, saying: "If you doubt me, look at the *Daily Standard* of August 11, '79." There is no such paper, and so you are asked to take the words verbatim, and say, if you take the man as having spoken exactly what he knew, you cannot have the slightest doubt it applied to the National Secular Hall in London, and it was impossible to apply them to the hall in Leeds. The point I wish to make here is this: Mr. Fisher, one of the disputants, was a member of the Council of the National Secular Society. He went down to speak as representing the Secular Society to that extent. He was a member of the committee, fighting their side of the case. After this remark had been made he had a reply, and he made full use of his opportunity and entered fully into the reply. If he had thought it applied to the London hall, would not he have replied at once and said: "What a

scandalous lie you have told? There has never been a suggestion against the London Hall of Science. There has never been a suggestion that the Hall of Science allowed unnatural offences to take place in their hall?" He was in Leeds; he was present there carrying on the dispute. If he thought it meant London and not Leeds, would he not have answered it? Of course he would; but he does not, because he knows perfectly well it has been referred to properly in the first speech, and he knew what was being referred to—the hall at Leeds. If he had, the answer would have been: "We know the class of thing that went on there; we know what came out before the magistrates." I am entitled to use that as a fair argument here. My learned friend has suggested that I ought to call Mr. Powell. As a matter of fact, we cannot call him to help us in this matter. He is not helping us; but why does not my learned friend call Greaves Fisher, the member of the National Secular Society who took part in the debate, and who did not answer the charge. He must have known perfectly well to what hall it referred, and the whole facts of the case. Why is he not called? My friend comes down here and defends, with the ardor which is perfectly right, the idea that anything could be meant about Leeds instead of London. Why does he not call Mr. Fisher to come and say, "I knew he meant the Leeds hall?" Remember that my friend has opened the case saying they had no idea of the case they had to meet. The defence, in this matter, was put in on June 4, 1894, and that defence was this: "They admit that the words set out in the complaint were printed and published by them; but they deny that the said words had any reference to the plaintiff, either in reference to the position as alleged, or at all." Could you expect a clearer denial than that? We have said from the beginning that this does not refer to the plaintiff at all. Greaves Fisher must have known it never referred to them, and he did not reply on it. It was not until it was printed by Cook and published by Mr. Snow that the action was brought against us. My friend has made a very strong point about why we did not answer that solicitor's letter more fully before the action was brought. Can he suggest any sort of answer we could have made? We know that Mr. Powell had not been attacked in the matter; that no action had been brought against him. He had spoken the words complained of, and could have been attacked. They knew we had done it at the request of Mr. Bradlaugh, the proprietor of the *Anti-Infidel*. We are the first to get the solicitor's letter. What possible answer could have been sent to that? A great point has been made that no answer was made to it; but what sort of reply was there to a solicitor's letter of that kind? Does it request an apology or withdrawal? Does it tell us what part of the pamphlet of forty pages was complained of? Never a word suggested as to what the libel complained of was. Never a suggestion it was that passage subsequently taken out and put in the statement of claim. Never a suggestion that it applied to Mr. Smith as manager of the hall. The answer is obvious: we cannot, because we don't know what part we are attacked about. The letter does not ask for an apology or withdrawal, but simply says: "I wish to have the address of solicitors to accept service on your behalf, and if you do not send it I will serve you personally with a writ." I can only say that my friend must be consciously hard driven when he had to come to such a complaint against the defendant in this case. Directly he puts in his defence he says: "I admit I published the words, but they do not refer to you, either in your position as manager of the hall or refer to you in any way." What more can my friend wish for than that? Have we had a chance from beginning to end of more clearly expressing our case than we have to-day, and in our defence? Now, I have put the simple facts before you. I don't think anything the plaintiff has done here will make you think he is entitled to large damages in this matter. Do you think his character has been seriously affected? They all knew the attack was made in Leeds, and the whole subject of the controversy was in Leeds; and do they mean to say the plaintiff was damaged at all, looking at all the circumstances? Further than that, are there any matters in the conduct of the defendants which make you think they ought to pay larger damages than they ought to if they are wrong? Both the defendants knew nothing at all about the libel before it was put in print. They were very negligent, and possibly they ought to have read it before they put it in. But I say there is nothing which defendants have done which should lead you in any way to unduly press the case against them. The last topic of prejudice is this: They have been indemnified; and, it is suggested, by Mr. Bradlaugh, on whose behalf they were published. If you think that is a topic which you ought to take into account, by all means do so. But the main question is: Did the audience who heard the statements, and the persons who read them, not know perfectly well from the context, and from the fact that Fisher did not reply in any way to the charge—must they not have known that the real sting of the libel was against the Leeds hall, and had no reference to the London hall, still less to Mr. Smith, whom nobody ever heard of?

(Continued on page 138.)



**Mr. Foote's Engagements.**

Sunday, March 3, Secular Hall, New Church-road, Camberwell-road, S.E.:—7.30, "God is Dead."

March 9, Ryhope; 10, Sunderland; 17, Nottingham; 24, Bristol.

**TO CORRESPONDENTS.**

MR. CHARLES WATTS'S ENGAGEMENTS.—March 3, Manchester; 17 and 24, Hall of Science, London; 31, Newcastle-on-Tyne. April 7, Sheffield.—All communications for Mr. Watts should be sent to him (if a reply is required, a stamped and addressed envelope must be enclosed) at 81 Effra-road, Brixton, London, S.W.

LECTURE NOTICES must reach 28 Stonecutter-street by first post Tuesday, or they will not be inserted.

J. G. FISHER.—You are quite right. The libellous pamphlet referred to the North-street Hall, Leeds, on p. 8, and the utterance on p. 29 about "headquarters" is, as you say, in every respect additional and distinct. This is dwelt upon in Mr. Walton's speech, which we give this week in the second half of our verbatim report of the trial.

J. K. MAAGAARD.—Thanks for your interesting letter. You are quite right in exercising a certain discretion. But a leader's position is necessarily different. If he knows a moment's fear, he is unfit to lead at all. In fighting bigots, liars, persecutors, and libellers, he must take Danton's motto: "De l'audace, et encore de l'audace, et toujours de l'audace."

C. HARWOOD, 4 Wingmore-road, Church-road, Tottenham, is the new secretary of the Edmonton Branch. Mr. Patten has been obliged, for domestic reasons, to resign the office.

T. E. M.—Pleased to receive your congratulations on the result of the libel action.

H. GILLET.—The amount claimed as damages in a libel suit is little else than a formality. It is usually fixed by the lawyers.

W. SIMONS.—Thanks for cutting. See paragraphs.

MR. JOHN PAYNE, 6 Heavily-grove, Horwich, Lancs, will send, to any Branch willing to pay carriage, twenty-four dozen of mixed *Freethinkers* and *National Reformers*, for distribution.

INQUIRER.—Mr. Foote caught a nasty cold, but he nursed himself carefully, and got better. Mr. Watts caught a bad cold too, but he too is nearly himself again. Mr. Parris has been unwell for some weeks. Mr. Moss had a bad fortnight's bronchitis, but is now able to follow his vocation, though he has to be careful. Secularists are just like Christians—liable to the ills that flesh is heir to—especially in bitter weather.

N.S.S. BENEVOLENT FUND.—Miss E. M. Vance acknowledges:—C. J. Pottage, 10s.

NEW READER.—If you read the report in our last number carefully, you will see that all our witnesses in the Hall of Science libel case affirmed, instead of swearing.

A. B. MOSS.—Glad to hear of your recovery. Be careful for some time.

H. JONES.—Pleased to have your congratulations. There is too much truth in your remark that "All the rascality of the churches seems to filter down into the slime of Christian Evidences."

P. SABINE.—See paragraph. Many thanks.

W. OWEN.—Success atones for a lot of trouble. We hope to teach some other rascals a lesson before we have finished.

E. D. H. DALY.—Thanks for cuttings.

J. T. IVES.—We cannot print a list of all the apocryphal books in this column. You can obtain a copy of the New Testament Apocrypha for half-a-crown, and the Old Testament Apocrypha for less.

LONDON SECULAR FEDERATION.—Miss Annie Brown acknowledges:—Mr. and Mrs. A. G. Lupton, 5s.; H. A. Lupton, 5s.

IMPLACABLE.—Any persons who now circulate the libel on the Hall of Science, either by sale or gratuitously, can be prosecuted under the criminal law, and sent to prison if found guilty. We beg our readers to send us immediate information if they learn of any continued circulation of the libel.

MR. FOOTE'S FIGHTING FUND.—W. Owen, 2s.

PAPERS RECEIVED.—Manchester City News—Eastern Daily Press—Der Arme Teufel—Secular Thought—Ironclad Age—Progress—Toronto Globe—Boston Investigator—Newcastle Daily Leader—Pack—Travel—Open Court—Liberator—South Wales Echo—Freethinkers' Magazine—Two Worlds—Newcastle Chronicle—Cambria Leader—Twentieth Century—Echo—Brisbane Telegraph—Nottingham Evening Express—Sheffield and Rotherham Independent—Liberty—Melbourne Age—Cape Times—Progressive Thinker—Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.

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

LETTERS for the Editor of the *Freethinker* should be addressed to 28 Stonecutter-street, London, E.C.

The *Freethinker* will be forwarded, direct from the publishing office, post free, at the following rates, prepaid:—One Year, 10s. 6d.; Half Year, 5s. 3d.; Three Months, 2s. 8d.

SCALE OF ADVERTISEMENTS.—Thirty words, 1s. 6d.; every succeeding ten words, 6d. *Displayed Advertisements*:—(Narrow Column) one inch, 3s.; half column, 15s.; column, £1 10s. Broad Column—one inch, 4s. 6d.; half column, £1 2s. 6d.; column, £2 5s. Special terms for repetitions.

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

It being contrary to Post-office regulations to announce on the wrapper when the subscription is due, subscribers will receive the number in a colored wrapper when their subscription expires.

ORDERS for literature should be sent to Mr. R. Forder, 28 Stonecutter-street, E.C.

**SUGAR PLUMS.**

THE verbatim report of the Hall of Science libel case is concluded in this week's issue of the *Freethinker*. It is our intention to keep the case on permanent record. The report will be put into pamphlet form, with an introduction and notes, and a statement as to the Leeds affair which was so lied about in the trial. The pamphlet should be circulated by Secularists wherever they hear any slander against our movement.

Mr. Foote lectures this evening (March 3) in the Secular Hall, New Church-road, Camberwell, his subject being "God is Dead." On the following Saturday evening (March 9) he will lecture at Ryhope, and the next day (Sunday) at Sunderland, which he has not visited for a considerable time. The local Branch has engaged a large hall capable of holding three thousand people, for two lectures in the afternoon and evening. No doubt friends will come to Sunderland from the surrounding district, and help to fill the big building.

The Bristol Branch congratulates Mr. Foote on the success of the Hall of Science libel action, and hopes he will live long to continue his leadership of the Freethought party.

Last Sunday Mr. Charles Watts had excellent audiences at Newcastle, where he lectured three times. The opposition by local Christians was considerable. In the evening Mr. Lynn, the vice-president of the Christian Evidence Society in Newcastle, spoke for half-an-hour in an able and most gentlemanly manner. The audiences thoroughly enjoyed the discussion after each lecture. There was a great demand for the *Freethinker*, on account of the report of the trial.

To-day, Sunday, March 3, Mr. Watts lectures three times in Manchester, where we hope to hear that he has had good audiences.

This Saturday (March 2) the Failsforth Sunday School holds a tea party at 5, the proceeds of which will go towards defraying the expenses of the Whit-Friday procession. On Sunday Mr. Evans, of Burnley, lectures at 6.30.

Last year the *National Secular Society's Almanack* arrived when Mr. Symes was in New Zealand, and no notice of it appeared in the *Liberator*. This year the *Almanack*, edited by G. W. Foote and J. M. Wheeler, appears in a new and improved form, and is full of the most interesting matter. We have never been so pleased with it as in the present number. The price is 6d., but it is honestly worth double the money, and would be a capital shilling's worth. We wish it every success.—*Liberator*.

Professor H. D. Müller, of Vienna, has called attention, in his *Studies in Ezekiel*, to some suggestive parallels between the phrases of scripture and those found in cuneiform inscriptions. For instance, Assurbanipal records that certain persons were punished "according to the curses as many as were written in the writing of agreement" (see Deut. xxix. 21). Professor Müller thinks his many instances prove Hebrew indebtedness to Assyrian sources.

Hugh Price Hughes was the principal speaker at the anniversary meeting of the South London Mission on Monday evening, and the Camberwell Secularists thought they would go and hear him. A dozen members of the Branch committee armed themselves with three hundred copies of our "Atheist Shoemaker" pamphlet, which they

distributed outside the chapel. One copy was carefully handed to H. P. H. as he went in. When the Secularists took their seats they were amused at seeing the audience busily reading the great man's exposure. After the great man's speech Mr. Sabine rose and asked if he might put a question; whereupon the great man, looking very chalky, nudged the chairman, who said, "No, no." Mr. Sabine, however, got out the explanation that his proposed question had reference to the great man's book about a converted Atheist. H. P. H. then left the meeting, leaving both the County Council candidates behind him.

The *Freethinkers' Magazine* gives as frontispiece a capital portrait of George Everitt Macdonald, brother and assistant to the editor of the *Truthseeker*. In the sketch accompanying the portrait George is described as the Prince of Good Fellows. Having read with interest his "Observations" in *Freethought* and the *Truthseeker* for many years, this is a statement we can well believe. His character shows in his portrait.

Mr. Maurice Russell, of the West Ham School Board, is standing for re-election. He is running, as before, on the "secular education" ticket, and it will be a misfortune if he does not retain his seat. We hope the local Freethinkers will work for his return as well as vote for him at the poll. Mr. Russell's committee rooms are at 33, High-street, Plaistow, and 61, West Ham-lane, Stratford.

Kingsland and district Freethinkers are requested to meet to-day (March 3) at 12 noon, at Mr. Davey's, 21, Castle-street, to make arrangements for carrying on the open-air propaganda at Ridley-road. Lecturers have already been engaged for almost every Sunday during the summer.

The East London Branch has just held its annual meeting. Mr. G. J. Warren, ever faithful and zealous, was reappointed honorary Secretary and Treasurer; a strong committee of seventeen was appointed, with Messrs. Lofer and Thorrington as auditors. It was decided to carry on the open-air work at Mile-end-waste from April to September. A resolution was passed expressing pleasure that the Hall of Science Club was to terminate on its present basis. It was also resolved to nominate London for the Conference in view of Mr. Putnam's intended visit.

## THE HALL OF SCIENCE LIBEL CASE.

(Concluded from page 136.)

MR. RAWLINSON (to the Judge): I do not know whether I ought to have taken the point as regards the question whether the publisher is liable. As Mr. Snow was merely a conduit pipe for the selling of the book, under a case which I will hand up, he would not therefore be liable, as he was in the position of a mere news-vendor. Where a publisher publishes, it is another thing; but here the evidence is that he simply received copies from the printer, to sell on commission.

THE JUDGE: His name is put on them as publisher.

MR. RAWLINSON: But that is only a custom of the trade. He certainly sold them on commission. If necessary, I will put the point before your lordship later.

MR. WALTON then addressed the jury on behalf of the plaintiff. He said: I am not surprised that my learned friend has not more than once in the course of his speech referred to three persons who are before you in this litigation; and, before I advert to one or two material observations which, it occurs to me, I ought, on behalf of the plaintiff, to make, I think it would not be inadvisable to ask ourselves for a moment, Who is Mr. Smith? who are these two gentlemen in the position of defendants? Mr. Smith and his connection with the Hall of Science, referred to in this libel, has been made abundantly clear. My learned friend has had the opportunity of cross-examining Mr. Smith; and, with that opportunity, with the large license which the law gives him—with the little scruple which has characterised my learned friend's method in using that license, which you have witnessed—he has completely failed to discredit and disparage Mr. Smith; but my learned friend has had no instructions to suggest that Mr. Smith has not been a man of eminent respectability and of unimpeachable character, and who has borne himself honestly and honorably in all relations of life. It is perfectly true that Mr. Smith

has what some of us would regard as a misfortune—not those religious opinions which many of us hold. But, except the fact that his religious opinions differ from those of the majority of us, there is no kind of suggestion that Mr. Smith is not moral and trustworthy in every relation of life. Mr. Smith has been connected with this building called the Hall of Science in a very intimate way. He helped to found it; and within those walls men of the most eminent character, men who lectured in the cause of Freethought, have lectured; men who, although they have suffered for their opinions, won the respect of the British people. These men here have had the opportunity—which I trust every man may be afforded—in the light of day of expressing freely, to the people who thought them worth hearing, the views which they entertained. And it turns out further that Mr. Smith, through a long course of years, endeavored to make the Hall of Science a centre of education and instruction. He connected it with the Art and Science Classes of South Kensington. He had associated with him a clergyman of very free opinions, but of the very highest character—the Rev. Stewart Headlam, who was a member of the committee, and co-operated with him. He had, in addition, entertainments for the amusement of the young people who were members of his Society, and whose parents were connected with the movement; and in this way it is obvious that, in the actual conduct of these very classes, the foundation of the dancing academy, admission to which was by ticket, the regulation of these proceedings, the supervision, and the mode in which it was conducted, Mr. Smith is regarded by his own people—by the Secularists throughout the country—as a respectable person. Mr. Watts only told us what is obvious. He said: "I regard Mr. Smith as responsible in this matter." Mr. Smith of himself says: "I am responsible. I was actually present at these instructions, and actually superintended these very classes. A state of things such as that indicated would have been impossible without my knowledge, and could not have occurred without my authority"; and therefore Mr. Smith, with the long years of respectable character which he is bearing, comes face to face with these honorable and moral and honest men, who hold Freethought in relation to religion. Mr. Smith is compelled to come into court, and to challenge from them some sort of substantiation for this monstrous attack levelled against him. It is essential that Mr. Smith leaves this court to-day with your verdict, with damages marking your sense of the attack made against him, and his right to invite an expression of opinion against him. Who are the defendants? They have been put into the box, and, if they had to pay these damages and costs, I could understand why my learned friend should call them, and make an appeal *ad misericordiam* that you should take into consideration their own negligence and own general respectability in awarding that sum; but why they should be put forward when they are not the real defendants, and when the verdict will not involve them in any damages, when they are merely show defendants for the spirits that are stabbing in the dark, wreaking their malignity in the dark, and were not put into the box, gentlemen, it is very difficult to understand. Of course Mr. Cook is only the printer, and of course Mr. Snow is only the publisher, and your verdict will be a verdict against them. But through Mr. Cook and Snow you are hitting those men who, for aught I know, have been sitting here within sound of my voice, and who have put in motion the printing press which gave currency to this malignant attack, and who dare not answer for it and submit themselves to cross-examination. After Snow and Cook have told us they will not be affected by your verdict, you need give very little consideration to the sort of appeal which my learned friend has addressed to you. Even though they are the defendants, I fail to see how they can ask for any consideration in the matter of this action. Mr. Powell, the obscure person who goes from Liverpool and vanishes into the obscurity from which he emanated, might have been made a defendant in this action. What would have been said then? They would have said that what Mr. Powell stated he said in the heat of the moment, and it was an excess of zeal; and, therefore, he made a statement which, in calm moments, he would regret. It is these defendants who have given prominence to the libel. They have put it into the hands of every person interested in the matter throughout the kingdom, and they have professed to refer to a paper called the *Daily Standard*, which most men would understand referred to one of the most influential London papers. The defendants, who carelessly printed and carelessly published a document such as this, are not in a position to ask for any consideration from the jury when they have to do justice to the unfortunate man who may have been injured by the publication for which they are responsible. Now, let me consider for a moment how my learned friend, on behalf of the defendants, has sought to meet the case. I do not wonder at the line he has taken. I think I proved a true prophet in my opening. I ventured to predict what the real defence to the action was, and what the real tactics were which Mr. Murphy was instructed, on behalf of these persons, to pursue; and I do not wonder he tried to induce you to disregard the motive of justice,

which is, perhaps, as sacred as any other motive in human nature, to disregard the motive of justice, because you disapprove of the opinions of the man who asks you for the justice of your verdict. My learned friend produces this book called *The Elements of Social Science*, and reads pages from it, and from the work of another Freethought writer; and he said to Mr. Smith, Are these the opinions of Freethought writers? are they your opinions? My learned friend knew perfectly well they are not the opinions of Mr. Smith, and he said so at once. He said: I am a Freethinker, and belong to the school which says that every man is entitled to speak and think freely on those subjects, and these are the opinions of honest men published in the light of day. It challenges the interference of society and the interference of the police, and neither society nor the police have interposed in any way to stop the dissemination of these books. We may dispute them and think them in error; but every person thinks differently. Here is a book which for forty years has been on public sale, being sold up and down the kingdom, dealing with matters of great importance, and it has never been challenged by any public authority, charged with the administration of the law in the matter. Mr. Smith says it is perfectly true it is sold on a bookstall which is licensed to a bookseller by the person who owns the Hall of Science in Old-street; but he is entitled to sell any books he likes. If they ought not to be sold, the police can interfere; but we simply let the man the bookstall, and he sells what books he likes, and Mr. Smith says it would be an impertinence to come forward and attempt to revise his list and proceed to make out an index of certain books which I, Mr. Smith, in the exercise of my superior wisdom, will not allow him to sell. That is an affair between the owner of the book shop and the police. And this book has laid on this bookstall for thirty or forty years without any sort of challenge. It is the kind of line by which my learned friend hopes to disparage Mr. Smith in your estimation. I think all of us draw a strong line between opinion and moral conduct. My learned friend would be the last man to say this was a country in which opinion ought not to be as free as air. There was a time when those who professed different religious opinions had no tolerance, even in courts of law, or in society; but, fortunately, the time has come when every man is entitled to express his views freely; and just as we give freedom to other men for religious opinion, so we allow freedom to other opinions, conscious that the forces of orthodoxy are stronger than the forces of error; and therefore we need have no fear of error. Against Mr. Smith's moral conduct, and the character of all the men associated with him, there is not a suggestion in this case; and yet this libel is not a libel of his opinions, but of his conduct, because it alleges a condition of things which makes the best feelings of one's nature rise in revolt. It is not that he taught these laids Freethought; that he taught them to disregard the Divine Being; that he gave them his views about the future state; that he expounded the tenets of Secularism; but it is that he taught practices which can only be mentioned in order to be scouted in every society of human beings. It is not a matter of religion, depending on orthodoxy or heterodoxy of religious opinions; but it is a matter of ordinary common decency, in connection with which this libel has been published. What is the sort of defence which has been put forward? First we have what I may describe as the illegitimate defence; then we have the legitimate defence. The illegitimate defence I described, while my learned friend was cross-examining, as drawing a herring across the scent; and it has been admirably illustrated by the tactics in this case. We have had to deal with what occurred, in the year 1879, in connection with the Hall of Science in London; but my learned friend has sought to divert the whole of our attention to what occurred at a different place and at a different time; to what occurred, not in London, but in Leeds; not at the Hall of Science, but at the North-street Hall in Leeds; and my learned friend has suggested, in what is the most dangerous and the most illegitimate mode conceivable in a court of justice—he has suggested that these proceedings were in relation to obscene and improper conduct. The suggestion is absolutely false. There is not a tittle of evidence to support it. The only evidence is that given by Mr. Smith himself. He said he heard that certain proceedings had been taken against a place in North-street, Leeds; but what those proceedings were Mr. Smith had never heard. He never heard until this moment that they spoke of obscene conduct, or that the nature of the conduct was obscene; and, so far as Mr. Smith is aware, that prosecution was withdrawn. He never heard of a conviction as in fact having taken place, and Mr. Murphy would have been the first one to prove it.

Mr. RAWLINSON: You ought not to say there was no conviction.

Mr. WALTON: I say it was a charge of disorderly conduct. My learned friend is a lawyer, and knows that if a publican allows dancing to take place in his house, he can be charged with keeping a disorderly house; and the prosecution against the Jockey Club at this moment is for disorderly conduct. My learned friend ought to be the last to make

cheap capital out of the facts, because he knows perfectly well that, if you allow proceedings to take place on premises and you are not properly licensed, you are charged with allowing disorderly conduct to take place if you allow the public to take part.

Mr. RAWLINSON: The proceedings were not against a licensed house.

Mr. WALTON: I quite understand my learned friend's restlessness—(laughter)—and his anxiety to make up a case which cannot be proved by evidence of what took place. Where is the conviction—where is it? In the imagination of those who instruct my learned friend, in whom they have succeeded in infusing some of the spirit which seems to have characterised the proceedings on their part. Nothing would have been easier than to have called the police who laid the prosecution. Nothing could have been easier than to have put in the conviction; but we are told, and that is the whole evidence you are told by Mr. Smith, that the prosecution took place; but, so far as he knows, no conviction occurred, and if it occurred he would have been the first to hear of it. I say this effort to draw this question into a trial of what happened at Leeds, in another place, and for which other persons are responsible, is done in order to confuse your minds as to the real issue. That is the illegitimate defence, and, like all illegitimate defences, tries to establish itself by illegitimate means; and my learned friend, instead of bringing witnesses from Leeds to prove the facts, comes here with an armful of newspapers. A more irrelevant and and fruitless inquiry I cannot imagine. These papers, some of which have been raked up from the cellars of the British Museum, he wants to scatter around, and create a confusion as to what we have to try. I am perfectly certain if any witnesses came up from Leeds we should have listened to them with the greatest respect; but, as there is no substance in this sort of suggestion, they have endeavored to infuse into these proceedings an animus which can only have been introduced to confuse your minds. What is the real defence? It is that this was not spoken of the Hall of Science in London at all, but spoken of the Hall of Science in Leeds. In the first place, that defence would have been established by calling two or three witnesses. It would have been established by calling the speaker of this at the discussion, who would have told us what hall he was referring to, and by calling the people to whom he was speaking; but, instead of calling them, they leave you to imagine that this description applies to a hall in Leeds. If you look at it, there is no Hall of Science in Leeds at all. The only Hall of Science out of London is the one at Sheffield. It is true the Secularists have a hall at Leeds, but they don't call it the Hall of Science. But this is referred to as the headquarters of the Secularists, which is in Old-street. Then you have a reference to a newspaper called the *Daily Standard*, which is not produced, but the *Leeds Daily News* is attempted to be set up as the one meant. Such efforts are only the sort of devices which we expect from persons having a hopeless case. Now how is this case met, because that is the real question for your consideration? It is obvious they knew perfectly well (both Snow and Cook) the very serious nature of this libel. The solicitor's letter has been read, and when that letter was received I should have thought that one course—and only one course—could be pursued by honorable men anxious not to do injustice to anyone. Honorable men in a matter of this kind would be most anxious not to do an injustice to people against whom a prejudice was entertained, because there are some men of whom if you say a foul thing it does not matter, because no one believes it; but if a man happens to be a Secularist, there are a great many evil-minded men who will believe it. And the defendants knew this was being said of persons who were Secularists. If they were anxious to act honorably, they would have been the first to repudiate the libel and make reparation. Mr. Snow said he thought it did not refer to the plaintiff. Why did not he write so at once and say they were mistaken, withdraw it, and offer an apology? Because he had those behind him, those who had indemnified him, and were putting him forward to bring this into court to satisfy their fanatical prejudice. Instead of that, Mr. Snow published a letter, signed under the name of the man he represented, and those who were supporting him in the matter, which contains this passage: "When the case comes into court we will not say, 'It is not true what it was I said about you'; we will not say, 'It is a mistake,' and ask the jury to give as little damages as they can, because we are poor printers and publishers. Not that sort of defence at all. But, when it comes before the court, the evidence lacking will be forthcoming, and that charge, like others, will be proved up to the hilt." So that we get, until the last moment, when they are anxious to save their skins—we get the language of bluster. "It is true. Take us into court, and we will prove it. You did give this instruction. You (the plaintiff) are responsible for the Hall of Science, where it took place. We shall prove it, and publish it to the world; and kind friends will come forward with their subscriptions, and we will fight under the flag of truth." Now, instead of fighting under the flag of truth, they are skulking and crawling away, and making piteous

appeals to the jury. I should have had some respect if they had stuck to their guns, and, having got the public money, had tried to prove their case, and failed. But, having got it under this brave profession, the courage oozes and the bravery vanishes, and they now say: "We are poor publishers and printers. Let us off, because we are only agents." I ask you to give Mr. Smith such a verdict as will enable him to still hold up his head, so that those who may be connected with this matter will have no ground for saying there was one tittle of evidence of the monstrous and barbarous charge made against him. (Subdued applause.)

Mr. JUSTICE LAWRENCE, who was very indistinctly heard, in summing up, said: Gentlemen of the jury, the question you will have to consider is, how far the defendants have made out that which they say is an answer to the case—viz., that this matter had no reference to the plaintiff's place at all; that it was not known to the man who uttered the slander first—Mr. Powell. Smith was not known to him, and he was not known to Mr. Cook or to Mr. Snow, the other defendant, the publisher and printer of the libel; and it is said that the transactions had no reference to the Hall of Science in London at all. A great many considerations have been imported into this case, necessarily from the very nature of the case. All I can suggest is, that you should do the best you can in the matter, and not allow whatever feelings you may have on one side or the other to interfere with you in the discharge of your duty. Look at it just as you would at an ordinary case. The matter is a very simple one. Smith, the plaintiff, is the manager and treasurer and organiser of lectures, etc., at the Hall of Science in London, and he held that position till, I think, 1892, when it was turned into a Limited Company. (To Mr. Walton) What position does he hold now?

Mr. WALTON, Q.C.: He is a director of the Company, and that is why the action by the Company was discontinued, because the Company were not the proprietors of the hall at the date referred to. The action was originally brought by the Company, but when it was seen that the Company were not the proprietors of the hall in 1879, the action was discontinued.

Mr. JUSTICE LAWRENCE: Now, Mr. Smith says it was his duty to carry on the business of this Company, and to do so he had lectures and science classes, and was generally responsible for the management of the hall. The debate took place in October, 1893, and the plaintiff says he heard of it soon afterwards, and made no complaint against Mr. Powell, who said there had been a great scandal at Leeds. He also said he had heard of the trial in 1878, but he did not read it, and did not know what the evidence was. He says he knew Mr. Foote, but never heard the matter discussed in his presence, and he had not seen the report of the debate. He says he did not know who owned the Secular Hall at Leeds; but he seemed to say he had heard the report of the trial discussed. Now, gentlemen, Mr. Murphy has asked you to say that Mr. Smith's answers were not satisfactory on that point, and that he was not clear in giving a distinct denial to the statement; but that the fact was he knew exactly what had taken place at Leeds. On that point you must judge by your own conclusions from the evidence given before you. With regard to the suggestion that the defendant has been indemnified of the costs of this action, the plaintiff also seems to have been getting up money for the costs of the trial; so there is not much to be said on either side, because "what is sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander." (Laughter.) It appears that both of them were getting up public funds for the trial. No point has been made that plaintiff was not responsible for the management of the Hall; and Mr. Charles Watts said he was on the Committee, and always looked upon Mr. Smith as the responsible person of the Company. Then a copy of the *Anti-Infidel* was put in, in which portions of the letter from Mr. W. R. Bradlaugh were printed, and on this it is said, on behalf of the plaintiff, that the points taken by Mr. Bradlaugh there were that, if this case went on, the charges made in the libel would be proved. Well, that was said to depend on what was the defence in the action; and I may have a word more to say about Mr. Bradlaugh's position, and the letters written by him in the case, because he is the person responsible for them and the person making profit out of it as the owner of the *Anti-Infidel*. Therefore, he is one of the persons who would be primarily responsible and liable for any injury the plaintiff might have sustained. Well, Mr. Murphy's case is shortly this: That the observations made by Mr. Powell at Leeds had reference to what had taken place at Leeds, and that Mr. Powell, like a great many other public speakers, not only in matters of religion, but in other matters which we read of every day—say politics, for instance—(a laugh)—Mr. Powell was like a good many more people who used extremely strong language, and had gone a great deal further than they were entitled to go, or would have gone in their calmer moments. There can be no doubt at all about that; and it is said here that what Mr. Powell had done was to mix up two or three things, and what he really intended to convey was that what he was saying had reference to the scandal that took place in Leeds in 1878.

That there had been a scandal at that time there can be no doubt from the evidence of the plaintiff himself. Mr. Walton is quite right in saying he won't permit anybody to say that it was so of the Hall of Science, because there is no evidence about that. There had been something in the shape of a prosecution in Leeds, which may have been for only keeping a disorderly house—we are left in doubt; but there had been something—a prosecution which was of interest to Secularists generally, because the plaintiff said the matter had been talked about before him, and Mr. Watts remembers the Leeds trial. But I suppose we shall never know the real truth about the Leeds trial. That being the state of things, let me read you the parts of the pamphlet relied on by the plaintiff. It is said the Hall of Science was not the proper name, and that it should have been the Secular Hall, and therefore it could not refer to the London hall. It was said by the plaintiff: "The dancing academy must refer to me because there is no proof that there was a dancing academy at Leeds"; and then he relies on the fact of its being near a lunatic asylum, thus completing the identification. These things are said by the plaintiff to point—and can only point—to the Hall of Science in London. It is said by the defendant that the date 1879 was wrong, and was intended for 1878; that it was wrong to call it the Hall of Science; it should have been the Secular Hall in North-street, Leeds, and that the *Daily Standard* should be the *Daily News*. All that is said to be a mistake made by the speaker in the heat of debate, and what he really meant was the hall in Leeds; and the reference to 1879 was a reference to what had already taken place in 1878 in regard to the hall at Leeds, and not to the London hall. It is to be noticed that Mr. Powell was a Liverpool man; he was said to be an obscure Liverpool man, who had emerged from there, had spoken, and had retired again. Mr. Fisher was a Leeds man; and Mr. Powell, I observe, talks about certain books sold by Kingfisher of Leeds, and in one discussion Fisher acknowledges he is the person who sold the books referred to. Then he goes on to make the charge complained of. The question you have got to decide is whether that really had reference to the place in London, or whether it had reference—badly expressed by a man in the heat of debate—to the proceedings which had taken place in Leeds, and was intended and taken to be understood by those who heard him to have reference to the Leeds hall only.

Mr. WALTON: May I say, so far as the libel is concerned, would not the question be whether persons reading this pamphlet would not take it to refer to the London hall?

The JUDGE: Quite true. It is not what was spoken at Leeds. The question is this: Without knowing anything further, would anybody taking up this book, and reading what was said there—and you have heard the most that can be said, and the best way it can be put for the defendants—the question is whether a person taking that up would apply it to the Hall of Science in London, and so apply it to the person—namely, the plaintiff—who was responsible for the manner in which that business was carried on. Mr. Murphy produced a paper which is not the *Daily Standard*, but is the *Leeds Daily News*; but of course he cannot go any further than that. Mr. Snow then comes, and it turns out that the contents of the pamphlet had been published week by week, so far as I can gather, in the *Anti-Infidel*; and therefore it must have been going on for some time between October and January. It is dated January, 1894.

Mr. RAWLINSON: The pamphlet was not published until March, I am told.

The JUDGE: There is the whole of the evidence upon the one side and the other. There are only one or two other considerations. We have heard a great deal why Mr. Powell has not been called on one side, and Mr. Fisher on the other. You always have, in cases of this kind, complaints by learned counsel on each side. They have each got complaints, and I suppose the answer to them really is—Mr. Walton does not hesitate to say: "I have nothing to do with Mr. Powell. He is not worth powder and shot, and I am not going against him." I do not know what your view is; but, when you are considering the position, one would have thought there was some reason why Mr. Bradlaugh should not have been made a party to the case. It may be that they think he is not worth going for. I don't know. He is the owner of the pamphlet and of the *Anti-Infidel*, and he was the person who was going to take any profits, and when you cannot get the man who is going to profit by the libel then you generally go for the printer and publisher. There may be some reason, but no reason has been forthcoming, as to why Mr. Bradlaugh should not be made a party to this suit. Mr. Bradlaugh was the person who, if any profit was to be made, would be entitled to it. But the writ reached the printer, who, I do not suppose, ever takes the trouble to see what he is printing; and the publisher, who only had a certain number of copies sent to him, having no control over the matter at all. But for some reason, best known to the plaintiff, Mr. Bradlaugh was not included. He seems to have been one of the principal parties concerned. There are the whole facts. The question is, Did these words refer, or would they reasonably be taken by anybody reading the pamphlet to refer, to the plaintiff, or do you think that the

defendants' case is made out that they referred, and ought only to be taken to refer to, the case at Leeds and the Leeds hall? If you find they refer to the plaintiff, then comes the question of damages. That is a matter for you entirely to deal with. The libel, no doubt, is a serious one. The action is brought against two men, who are, as far as they are concerned—if there is any injury to the plaintiff—are not nearly so much concerned with the matter as the parties who get a profit by it, and who have been let go—viz., the man who spoke the words and the man who was the owner of the pamphlet. That may make a difference to you when you come to consider the amount of damages to which the plaintiff is entitled. It is for you to say whether you find for the plaintiff or defendant. If for the plaintiff, what damages do you think he is entitled to?

The jury retired at 4.30, and, after a deliberation of three-quarters of an hour, came into court and gave a verdict for the plaintiff, with £30 damages.

On Tuesday, February 19, Mr. Lawrence Walton, Q.C., who appeared for the plaintiff, said, in the case of the National Secular Society and another *versus* Snow and another, in which the jury, the day previously, found for the plaintiff, he had now to apply that judgment be entered in accordance with the finding of the jury.

Mr. JUSTICE LAWRENCE assented, and judgment was entered accordingly.

### Obituary.

On Saturday, February 9, the remains of the late Mr. William Morton, of Failsworth, were interred in the Failsworth Cemetery. Mr. Morton's family were connected with the Secular School at Failsworth, and have been workers for, and supporters of, the school all their lives. The deceased was fifty-nine years of age. Mr. S. Standing, of Rochdale, conducted the Secular funeral service in a very sympathetic and impressive manner.

On Monday, February 11, the remains of the late Mr. Jonathan Taylor, of Failsworth, were interred in the Failsworth Cemetery. All the members of the District Council, the guardians and officers for the district, the sanitary inspector, the medical officer of health, the School Board officer, a deputation from the Failsworth Liberal Club, of which deceased was a member, and a large number of the teachers and members of the Secular School, of which body he has been a member for a large number of years, besides many of his friends and acquaintances, attended, along with the members of his family. The funeral service, which was of a Secular character, was conducted by Mr. S. Standing, of Rochdale, who, in the course of his remarks, said Mr. Taylor had never been afraid of death. He died as he had lived. Mr. Taylor's life might be divided into two parts: the public and the private life. His public life had been well known to all. He was one of the originators of the co-operative movement in Failsworth, and that alone gave a halo to his name. For long before the formation of the Local Board he was connected with the Ratepayers' Association, and for over twenty-seven years had been clerk of the Failsworth Local Board. He was one of the originators, and on the first board of directors, of the Failsworth Liberal Club. In his private life he was a member of the Secular Society; first as a scholar, then as a teacher. Thirty years ago he was conductor of the singing, and later he taught a grammar class, and in various other ways was a worker and supporter of the school, to which his loss will be irreparable. The Secular lecturers visiting Failsworth always found in Mr. and Mrs. Taylor a kindly and obliging host and hostess. General sympathy and respect were manifested by the hundreds present at the graveside for the members of the family in their sad bereavement.

Accuracy of language is one of the bulwarks of truth.—*Mrs. Jameson.*

No indwelling deity now regulates the burning of the life sun, no guardian angels drive the stars across the arching firmament; the divine Ganges is water flowing down into the sea, to evaporate into cloud, and descend again in rain. No deity simmers in the boiling pot, no presiding spirits dwell in the volcanoes, no imprisoned demon shrieks from the mouth of the howling lunatic. There was a period of human thought when the whole universe seemed actuated by spiritual life. For our knowledge of our own history, it is deeply interesting that there should remain rude races yet living under the philosophy which we have so far passed from since physics, chemistry, biology, have seized whole provinces of ancient Animism, setting force for life, and law for will.—*Dr. E. B. Tylor.*

### LONDON SECULAR FEDERATION.

THE adjourned General Meeting was held at the Hall of Science on February 7; the President in the chair. Present: Messrs. J. M. Wheeler, G. Standing, G. J. Warren, C. Thomas, J. Wood, A. Wheeler, J. Neate, A. F. Taylor, W. Williams, M. Loafer, Edith Vance, and the secretary. Minutes of previous meeting read and confirmed. The old list of officers was proposed for re-election, and carried. Mr. Charles Watts was invited to become a vice-president. The undersigned was re-elected as hon. secretary, and Mr. Robert Forder as treasurer. It was decided to arrange a course of lectures for the North-West London Branch; and the secretary received instructions to make inquiries concerning a second course, either for Battersea or West London Branch. Proposed by Mr. Warren, seconded by Mr. Wood: "That a dramatic performance, etc., take the place of the usual Federation Ball, and a sub-committee be appointed to arrange details." £5 was voted to the printer, and the meeting closed. *ANNIE G. BROWN, Hon. Sec.*

Branch secretaries are reminded that delegates' fees for 1895 are now due, and an early remittance will assist the work in hand.

### PROFANE JOKES.

It was an Ardrossan schoolboy who the other day, when asked by the school inspector which was "the longest day," struck bottom facts by the reply, "Sawbath."

"How, brethren," shrieked the Salvationist, "how shall we save souls?" "Walk on your uppers like me," remarked the blear-eyed man who had come in to get warm. And then the doorkeeper showed him out.

The Rev. Rosy Babbleton (detecting Johnny stealing an orange from a sleeping apple-woman)—"Ah, Johnny, Johnny, this is a little matter, but where will it end?" Johnny (in an injured tone, but dividing the orange)—"That's just it; there's always somebody wants to stand in. There yer are; but if you are a square cove, you will nick some nuts and divide."

Watson—"What was the largest trout you ever caught, James?"

James—"Let's see; what day of the week is this, Watson?"

"Monday, I believe. What in the world has that to do with my question?"

"Oh, nothing; only I think you'd better wait until Wednesday. I always like to get as far as possible from Sunday when I tell my fishing experiences."

Some ridiculous mistakes are made by missionaries, who have but an imperfect acquaintance with the language in which they teach. Everyone knows how the Chinese call Christianity the pig religion, through missionary mispronunciation of the word for Lord, as if it were pig. In Japanese the word for "rat" is similar to that for "fountain," and missionaries have been known to tell the natives to fly for refuge to the rat; and, the word for hell being similar to that for post-office, unbelievers have been threatened that they would all be sent to the post-office.

Professor Sayce fancies he has discovered Nimrod in the cuneiform inscriptions. He says: "His full name was Nazi Muruda the Kassu, and he was the Babylonian contemporary of the father of the Assyrian king who restored Nineveh and founded Calah about fifty years before the Exodus." This looks pretty much like a guess in the dark, like Professor Sayce's identification of Melchisedek with Eben Tob. Probably some one will come after him and discover that Nazi Muruda was not a bit like Nimrod, and not even a mighty hunter before the Lord.

The infidels of one age have been the aureole saints of the next.—*Ingersoll.*

The altar and throne have leaned against and supported each other.—*Ingersoll.*

Humility is the first of the virtues—for other people.—*O. W. Holmes.*

A Church should put no fetters on the man; it should have unity of purpose, but with the most entire freedom for the individual. When you sacrifice the man to the mass, in Church or State, it becomes an offence, a stumbling-block in the way of progress, and must end or mend.—*Theodore Parker.*

## SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, ETC.

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

### LONDON.

HALL OF SCIENCE (142 Old-street, E.C.): 11.30, a lecture. (Free.) 6.30, musical selections; 7, A. B. Moss, "What Do Christians Believe?" (Admission free; reserved seats 3d. and 6d.) Wednesday, at 8.30, a lecture.

BATTERSEA SECULAR HALL (back of Battersea Park Station): 7.45, a lecture. (Free.) Tuesday, at 8, dancing for N.S.S. members and friends. Wednesday, at 8, dramatic club.

CAMBERWELL (North Camberwell Hall, 61 New Church-road): 7.30, G. W. Foote, "God is Dead."

FINSBURY BRANCH: 12, important members' meeting at 120 St. John-street, Clerkenwell.

ISLINGTON (Liberal and Radical Association Committee Rooms, Upper-street, near the Vestry Hall): Thursday, at 8.30, J. Rowney, "What Think Ye of Christ?" (Free.)

ISLINGTON BRANCH: 3.30, important members' meeting at 10 Waterloo-terrace, Upper-street.

MILTON HALL (Hawley-crescent, 89 Kentish Town-road): 7.30, A. Westcott, "Pasteur: His Life and Works"—with dissolving views by limelight. (Free.)

WEST LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Princes' Hall, Piccadilly): 11.15, J. A. Hobson, "Victor Hugo and the Proletariat."

WEST LONDON BRANCH ("Duke of York," Kensington-place, Silver-street, Notting-hill-gate): Monday, at 8.30, business meeting.

WOOD GREEN (Star Coffee House, High-street): 6.45, monthly meeting; 7.30, W. J. Heath, "What Caused the French Revolution?"

### OPEN-AIR PROPAGANDA.

BATTERSEA PARK GATES: 11.30, F. Haslam will lecture.

HYDE PARK (near Marble Arch): 11.30, St. John will lecture.

WOOD GREEN (Jolly Butchers' Hill): 11.30, W. J. Ramsey, "What Christ Said of Himself—a Reply to the Rev. Mr. Pedley."

### COUNTRY.

BIRMINGHAM (Coffee House, corner of Broad-street): Thursdays, at 8, papers, discussions, etc.

BRISTOL (Shepherds' Hall, Old Market-street): 7, musical program by Miss Humphries.

BLACKBURN: 3, members' meeting at secretary's house.

CHATHAM SECULAR HALL (Queen's-road, New Brompton): 7, A. E. Rowcroft, "Personal Experiences of Spiritualism."

FAIRSWORTH SECULAR SUNDAY-SCHOOL (Pole-lane): Saturday, at 5, tea party. Sunday, at 6.30, Ernest Evans, "Animals and Plants: a Lesson from Nature."

HULL (St. George's Hall, Storey-street): 11, Stanley Jones, "The Problem of Unsectarian Moral Teaching"; 2.30, "Radicalism and Socialism"; 7, "Woman: Past, Present, and Future."

LIVERPOOL (Oddfellows' Hall, St. Anne-street): 3, philosophy class—Ernest Newman, "Kant"; 7, Mr. Miller, "Energy in Nature."

MANCHESTER SECULAR HALL (Rusholme-road, All Saints): 11, Charles Watts, "Mohammed and Christ"; 3, "Trust in God a Delusion"; 6.30, "Religion with and without Theology." (3d. and 6d.)

PLYMOUTH (Democratic Club, Whimpey-street): 7, a meeting.

PORTSMOUTH (Wellington Hall, Wellington-street, Southsea): 6.30, committee meeting; 7, lantern entertainment.

ROCHDALE (Working Men's College, 4 Acker-street): 6, singing practice; 6.30, Sam Standing, "The Rise and Fall of Nations."

SHEFFIELD SECULAR SOCIETY (Hall of Science, Rockingham-street): 7, Mr. Gorril, "Japan and the Japanese"—with lantern illustrations.

SOUTH SHIELDS (Thornton's Variety Hall, Union-lane): 11, C. Cohen, "Buddha and Buddhism"; 7, "The Rev. A. J. Harrison as Christian Apologist—A Reply."

SUNDERLAND (Lecture Room, Bridge End Vaults, opposite Echo office): 7, the Secretary, "Christianity and Medical Science."

### OPEN-AIR PROPAGANDA.

ROCHDALE (Town Hall Square): 11, Sam Standing, "God's Frost."

### Lecturers' Engagements.

C. COHEN, 12 Merchant-street, Bow-road, London, E.—All Sundays until April, South Shields.

STANLEY JONES, 53 Marlborough-road, Holloway, London.—March 3, Hull; 10, Sheffield; 17, Hanley; 24, Derby.

ARTHUR B. MOSS, 41 Credon-road, Rotherhithe, London.—March 24, Camberwell.

SAM STANDING, 6 Bury-road, Rochdale.—Mar. 26 and 27, Sheffield.

Vol. I., cloth gilt, 216 pp., 2s. 6d., post free,

## CRIMES OF CHRISTIANITY

BY

G. W. FOOTE AND J. M. WHEELER.

Hundreds of exact References to Standard Authorities. No pains spared to make it a complete, trustworthy, final, unanswerable Indictment of Christianity.

CHAPTERS:—1, Christ to Constantine; 2, Constantine to Hypatia; 3, Monks; 4, Pious Forgeries; 5, Pious Frauds; 6, Rise of the Papacy; 7, Crimes of the Popes; 8, Persecution of the Jews; 9, The Crusades.

"The book is very carefully compiled, the references are given with exactitude, and the work is calculated to be of the greatest use to the opponents of Christianity."—C. BRADLAUGH, in *National Reformer*.

"The book is worth reading. It is fair, and, on the whole, correct."—*Weekly Times*.

"The book has a purpose, and is entitled to a fair hearing."—*Huddersfield Examiner*.

"The work should be scattered like autumn leaves."—*Fronclad Age* (U.S.A.).

London: R. Forder, 28 Stonecutter-street, E.C.

## ALLINSON FOR HEALTH.

HOME CONSULTATIONS—10 a.m. to 1 p.m., 10s. 6d.;  
6 p.m. to 8 p.m., 5s. Patients Visited.

### MEDICAL ESSAYS. Vol. I. For Postal Order for 1s. 2d.

Contains Articles on Management of Infancy, Health, Longevity, The Teeth, Tobacco, The Drink Question. Also the Cause and Cure of Disease, Constipation, Biliousness, Eczema, Blackheads and Pimples, Nervousness, Coughs and Colds, Chest Complaints, Deafness, Thread Worms, Long Worms, Tape Worms, The Itch, etc.

### MEDICAL ESSAYS. Vol. II. For Postal Order for 1s. 2d.

Contains Articles on The Healing Power of Nature, Urine, Saline Starvation, the Hair and its Management, Sleep and Sleeplessness, Want of Energy, etc. Advice for the Thin, for the Stout; Simple Fever, Measles, Scarlet Fever, Whooping Cough, Ringworm, Hypochondria, Bloodlessness, Diarrhoea, Ulcerated Legs, Tumours, etc.

### MEDICAL ESSAYS. Vol. III. For Postal Order for 1s. 2d.

Contains Articles on No More Death, Management of Young Children, Un-suspected Domestic Poisons, How to Grow Tall, to Keep Warm, to Live One Hundred Years, to Improve the Memory, and to become Beautiful and Attractive. On the Cause and Cure of Stomach Troubles, Flatulence, Sleepiness, Varicose Veins, Boils and Carbuncles, Sebaceous Tumors and Wens, Hay Fever, Winter Cough, Chilblains, Epilepsy, and on the Diseases Produced by Taking Mercury.

### MEDICAL ESSAYS. Vol. IV. For Postal Order for 1s. 2d.

Contains Articles on Hardening, Work and Overwork, Sugar and its Abuse, Milk as Food, the Tomato, Poulitices, Quinine, Against the Knife, Arsenical Poisoning, Tonics, Against Stimulants in Disease, about Swallowing Pins and other Articles. Also Cure of Sunstroke, Dog Bites, Pains in the Back, Pediculi or Lice, Chicken-Pox, Synovitis or Inflammation of the Joints, Tonsillitis or Quinsy, Herpes (Tetter or Shingles), Erysipelas, Ulcer of the Stomach, Epidemic Influenza, Sciatica, Psoriasis or English Leprosy, etc.

### MEDICAL ESSAYS. Vol. V. For Postal Order for 1s. 2d.

Contains Articles on Pure Water, The Mouth, Its Use and Abuse; Rules for the Aged, Training, Blood Letting, Nose Bleeding, Felon or Whitlow, Ingrowing Toenail, Gum Boil, Cold in the Head, a Red Nose, Flushing and Blushing, Toothache, Sore Mouth, St. Vitus' Dance, Goitre, Mumps, Inflamed Eyes and Eyelids, Fits, Fainting, Apoplexy, Spitting and Vomiting of Blood, Vomiting, Wounds, Burns, Scalds, Bruises, etc.

*The Five Volumes, strongly and neatly bound, price 6s. 9d., post free.*

HYGIENIC MEDICINE. For Postal Order for 1s. 1d.—An Eye Opener to Drug Takers.

RHEUMATISM: ITS CAUSE AND CURE. Post free for 7d.

DIET AND DIGESTION. Post free for 7d.

CONSUMPTION: ITS NATURAL CURE. Post free 7d.

All these Books, bound in One Vol., post free, 9s. 6d. Send Postal Order.

THREE PAMPHLETS FOR YOUNG MEN. For Postal Order for 1s. 1d.

A BOOK FOR MARRIED WOMEN. For Postal Order for 1s. 2d.

All communications to be addressed to—

DR. T. R. ALLINSON,

4 Spanish-place, Manchester-square, London, W.

## Freethought Publications.

**Bible Handbook for Freethinkers and Inquiring Christians.** Edited by G. W. Foote and W. P. Ball. Complete, paper covers, 1s. 4d.; superior edition, on superfine paper, bound in cloth, 2s.

**The Jewish Life of Christ.** Being the *Sepher Tobloth Jeschu*, or Book of the Generation of Jesus. With an Historical Preface and Voluminous Notes by G. W. Foote and J. M. Wheeler. Paper covers, 6d.; superior edition, superfine paper, cloth, 1s.

**Bible Studies.** Essays on Phallic Worship and other Curious Rites and Customs. By J. M. Wheeler. Illustrated, superior paper, 2s. 6d.

**Biographical Dictionary of Freethinkers of All Ages and Nations.** By J. M. Wheeler. Handsomely bound in cloth, 7s. 6d.

**Darwin Made Easy.** By Dr. Edward B. Aveling, Fellow of the London University. This is the best popular exposition of Darwinism extant. Cloth, 1s.

**Essays in Rationalism.** By Charles Robert Nowman (Atheist Brother of the late Cardinal Newman). With a Preface by George Jacob Holyoake, and a Biographical Sketch by J. M. Wheeler. 1s. 6d.

London: R. Forder, 28 Stonecutter-street, E.C.

## W. J. Rendell's "Wife's Friend"

Recommended by Mrs. Besant in *Laws of Population*, p. 32, and Dr. Allbutt in *Wife's Handbook*, p. 51. Made solely by J. PULLER, 15 Chadwell-street, Clerkenwell; 2s. per doz., post free (reduction in larger quantities). For particulars send stamped envelope.

### IMPORTANT CAUTION.

BEWARE of useless imitations substituted by some dealers and chemists, the words "Rendell & Co." and "J. W. Rendell" being speciously and plausibly introduced to deceive the public.

LOOK FOR AUTOGRAPH REGISTERED TRADE MARK

*W. J. Rendell*  
No. 182,688.

IN RED INK ON EACH BOX, WITHOUT WHICH NONE ARE GENUINE.  
Higginson's Syringe, with Vertical and Reverse Current, 3s. 6d., 4s. 6d., and 5s. 6d. Dr. Palfrey's Powder, 1s. 2d. Quinine Compound, 1s. 2d. Dr. Allbutt's Quinine Powders, 3s. per doz. All prices post free.  
W. J. RENDELL, 15 Chadwell-st., Clerkenwell, E.C.

IN PREPARATION, PRICE  
ONE SHILLING

# THE LEGITIMATION LEAGUE'S

## SECOND VOLUME OF PROCEEDINGS

**CONTENTS**

BALANCE SHEET.  
ANNUAL REPORT.  
CORRESPONDENCE.  
DISCUSSION  
AT THE  
DIALECTICAL  
SOCIETY.  
PRESIDENTIAL  
ADDRESS.  
ETC.

**The BAR SINISTER  
AND  
LICIT LOVE**

LONDON: W. REEVES, 135, Fleet Street.  
LEEDS: G. CORNWELL, 8, Upper Mill Hill.

**PERSONAL RIGHTS & SEXUAL WRONGS,**  
by **OSWALD DAWSON,**  
will be published simultaneously with the Second Volume  
of the proceedings of the Legitimation League.  
**PRICE SIXPENCE.**

**THE BEST BOOK**  
ON NEO-MALTHUSIANISM IS, I BELIEVE,  
**TRUE MORALITY, or THE THEORY AND  
PRACTICE OF NEO-MALTHUSIANISM.**  
By J. R. HOLMES, M.M.L., M.V.S., M.N.S.S.  
*160 pages, with portrait and autograph, bound in cloth, gilt lettered.  
Price 1s., post free.*

*\*\* In order to bring the information within the reach of the poor, the most important parts of the book are issued in a pamphlet of 112 pages at ONE PENNY, post free 2d. Copies of the pamphlet for distribution 1s. a dozen post free.*

*The National Reformer of 4th September, 1892, says: "Mr Holmes' pamphlet . . . is an almost, unexceptionable statement of the Neo-Malthusian theory and practice . . . and throughout appeals to moral feeling. . . . The special value of Mr. Holmes' service to the Neo-Malthusian cause and to human well-being generally is just his combination in his pamphlet of a plain statement of the physical and moral need for family limitation with a plain account of the means by which it can be secured, and an offer to all concerned of the requisites at the lowest possible prices."*

*The Council of the Malthusian League, Dr. Drysdale, Dr. Allbutt, and others have also spoken of it in very high terms.*

*The Trade supplied by R. FORDER, 28 Stonecutter-street, London, E.C. Other orders should be sent to the author.*

**J. R. HOLMES, HANNEY, WANTAGE, BERKS.**

Now Ready, price 6d., by post 7d.  
**The Path I Took, and Where it Led Me.**  
*AN AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND ARGUMENT.*  
BY A MONMOUTHSHIRE FARMER.  
REVISED BY G. J. HOLYOAKE.  
London: Watts & Co., 17 Johnson's-court, Fleet-street, E.C.

Colonel Ingersoll's  
Great New Lecture  
**ABOUT  
THE HOLY BIBLE**  
Price Sixpence.  
London: R. Forder, 28 Stonecutter-street, E.C.

*From the "Bradford Weekly Telegraph," Saturday, February 16, 1895.*

**GREAT FIRE IN BRADFORD.  
EXTENSIVE DAMAGE.**

Early on Saturday a big fire took place in the warehouse, No. 2 Union-street, Bradford, occupied by Mr. R. Higgins, who occupies a large part of the ground floor, and numbers the following tenants occupying the other offices and rooms: Mr. Ernest Hahnel, Messrs. Schmidt & Co., Mr. J. W. Gott, Messrs. G. D. Wright & Co., and Mr. J. Pepper. The damage done is very extensive, and is roughly estimated at a figure between £8,000 to £10,000. It certainly cannot be less than £8,000, as many of the firms occupying the building had large and valuable stocks stored in the various rooms. Mr. R. Higgins had a big stock of woollens, stuffs, and yarns, and estimates his loss at over £4,000. He is insured up to £4,000. Messrs. Wright & Co., stuff merchants, have had fully £1,000 damage done to their stock and premises, but it is completely covered by insurance. Mr. J. W. Gott, cloth and stuff merchant, had a stock valued at £1,500, and it is partially destroyed, chiefly by water. The other firms, with the exception of Mr. J. Pepper, have suffered in like manner, a lot of stock being destroyed by water. The cause of the fire is unknown, but, judging by appearances, it broke out in the packing-room of Mr. R. Higgins.

**To the Readers of "The Freethinker."**

WE had just got the New Spring Goods ready for Sale when this unfortunate fire took place, and, although we have sustained no damage by the fire itself, most of our goods have been soaked in water. We have taken immediate steps to have all the goods dried, and for all practical purposes they are not worth one penny less than before the fire took place. The finish which is put upon new goods has, of course, been disturbed, but that always takes place in making garments up. So that if you get a length of this cloth, or stuff, and have it made up, there is not the slightest difference between that and any other new goods you might buy, when made into garments.

**We have got a Big Allowance from the Insurance Company,**  
and to make room for New Goods, which we have already ordered, and which will be ready for sale in one month,

**We now offer all our Present Stock at HALF PRICE.**

We are making the goods up into the following lots:—

<p><b>Parcel for 21s. carriage paid.</b> A Lot of GOODS for GENTLEMEN'S WEAR, worth at warehouse prices 42s. ✍ State what will be most useful. ✍</p>	<p><b>Parcel for 21s. carriage paid.</b> A Lot of GOODS for LADIES' WEAR, worth at warehouse prices 42s. ✍ State what will be most useful. ✍</p>
<p><b>Parcel for 21s. carriage paid.</b> MIXED LOT OF GOODS, Worth 42s. For Ladies' and Gentlemen's wear.</p>	<p><b>Parcel for 21s. carriage paid.</b> Mixed Lot of Goods, such as BLANKETS, SHEETS, QUILTS, TABLE-CLOTH, APRON, BELT, PURSE, ETC.</p>

We have engaged 25 additional Tailors to make up Trousers. Price during Salvage Sale, 7s. 6d. per Pair to Measure. Fill up form and state Color preferred.

- Round waist .....
- Round seat.....
- Inside leg seam.....
- Outside leg seam .....
- Thigh .....
- Knee .....
- Bottom .....
- Lined or Unlined .....
- (Lined 6d. extra.)
- Color .....

**SEND AT ONCE.**

**J. W. GOTT, 2 & 4 UNION-STREET, BRADFORD.**