

# The Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.]

[Sub-Editor, J. M. WHEELER.

VOL. XV.—No. 21.

SUNDAY, MAY 26, 1895.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

## CHRISTIAN CHARITY.

IN another part of this week's *Freethinker* our readers will find a long letter from the Rev. C. L. Engström, secretary of the Christian Evidence Society. Very few Christian journals, if any, would have inserted such a letter from a secularist; and in this respect, at any rate, we think we have an advantage over orthodox parties. We even go to the length of asking our readers to break off at this point. Let them peruse Mr. Engström's letter carefully, and then return to our reply.

Our first intention was to let Mr. Putnam reply to Mr. Engström, and to leave the matter with the two disputants. But many of the points raised are such as Mr. Putnam cannot deal with, as they relate especially to Secularism in England. We shall therefore answer Mr. Engström at once, as far as seems necessary; leaving Mr. Putnam to supplement our reply from his own standpoint.

The secretary of the Christian Evidence Society rather parades his generosity towards Freethinkers, but we do not feel particularly grateful. He does not sin himself against the laws of good-breeding, but his underlings in London—whom he hires and pays—are notorious for their ghastly ill-manners, and their addiction to the worst vices of controversy, including reckless lying and unscrupulous slander. Mr. Engström has often denied this impeachment; but as he has never restrained his underlings, nor even taken the trouble to ascertain what they *do* say in public, it is impossible to hold him guiltless.

We have another complaint against Mr. Engström. He is constitutionally inaccurate. It is not true that we "discouraged" discussion after Mr. Putnam's lecture. We distinctly said that our American visitor was "yearning" for debate. It is true that we rebuked an auditor who called out Mr. Engström's name, but it was on the express ground that gentlemen should be able to visit the Hall of Science without being "spotted." There was absolutely no reason, so far as we are concerned, why Mr. Engström should not have mounted the platform and battled for his faith.

What we may call the American part of Mr. Engström's letter will be answered by Mr. Putnam. But we must say, in passing, that the lecturer did *not* affirm bluntly that "faith was, for Christians, everything, and conduct and character nothing." He admitted that plenty of Christians were good men, and said he rejoiced to find the Churches engaging in secular work. What he asserted was, that Christianity, as such, was a creed, and not an ethical system; that morality was only "tacked on to it" because no creed could get along without something of that kind; and that, under the disguise of morality, Christianity carried on an infamous war against the rights of reason, beginning at the cradle and ending at the deathbed.

Mr. Putnam is well able to answer Mr. Engström with respect to Christianity in America. With regard to England, it is beyond dispute that the leading divines and the Church standards have, with the rarest exceptions, taught the very doctrines which Mr. Putnam called the essence of Christianity. No doubt they are growing ashamed of those doctrines, but it is too transparent a trick to repudiate them and then to reaffirm them in different language. For instance, the difference between "total depravity" and a "universal Fall" is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. Mr. Engström admits the vicarious atonement, and he admits eternal

damnation, subject to his interpretation of "what the New Testament says."

What the New Testament says on hell and damnation was never much in dispute among Christians until they felt the necessity of making their creed presentable to the enlightened morality of the present age. Even now they cling to "eternal punishment," only they contend that it is not so long as we are apt to imagine. This is the contention of Dean Farrar, but it was *not* the contention of Dr. Pusey. Mr. Engström must surely know that Dr. Pusey's book, to which he refers, was written expressly in reply to Dean Farrar. It was only with respect to whether the fire of hell is literal or metaphorical that Dr. Pusey allowed any latitude of opinion. He concluded his preface by declaring that "if we know anything at all, we know that the doctrine of Everlasting Punishment was taught by Him Who died to save us from it."

Mr. Engström turns good Atheists into Christians in spite of themselves. It is kind of him, no doubt; but the good Atheists will prefer to wear their own ticket. And, after all, Mr. Engström does not hold the keys of heaven.

We put this question to the secretary of the Christian Evidence Society: If an honest unbeliever may go to heaven, what is the use of taking the trouble to be a Christian? It will not do to reply that there is *no* trouble. Christians must believe mysteries, and reconcile contradictions; and that is a lot of trouble to a man of common sense.

Mr. Engström is but superficially charitable in his observations on the Hall of Science. He is well aware—or, if he is not, his ignorance is inexcusable—that the Christian law of England is dead against the natural rights of Freethinkers. They may dodge the law to some extent, but this is not very satisfactory. The time comes, sooner or later, when the dodge fails. Money can be devoted to Christian purposes without any fear of alienation. It cannot be so devoted to Secular purposes. And this is a tremendous hindrance to our movement, which has lost thousands of pounds in this way during the last four or five years.

It is not true that the Churches subsist on the funds they raise annually. They flourish largely on endowments. They have their roots in graves. They live on dead men's money. But they deny us the same advantages, and after robbing us by their own law, which they refuse to alter, they sneeringly ask us why we do not spend as handsomely as themselves.

Architecture and decoration are simply questions of money. Christianity does not produce genius. Nature does that. Christianity merely employs it. How many fine churches could Christianity boast in the first two hundred and fifty years of its existence? When it became respectable and wealthy, mainly through the patronage of the State, it was able to employ architects, sculptors, and painters. Brahmanism, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism did the same thing. And when Secularism is respectable and wealthy—or at least when it no longer suffers from legal stigma and robbery—it will be able to erect large, noble, and splendid buildings.

Mr. Engström flaunts the ten to fifteen thousand places of worship of the Church of England. How rational! How considerate! Is not the Church of England established and endowed? Does it not subsist on the revenues of national property? Are not the very Freethinkers taxed to support it? Even the Nonconformist places of worship are recipients of a State subvention. Secular halls have to pay rates and taxes; churches and chapels pay none.

It will be time enough for Christians to boast of their "charities" when they relinquish all their privileges and accept an equality of opportunity with Secularists. Let them give up State endowments; let them forego State subventions; let them enjoy no more right than the Secularists to legacies and trusts; and then let us see what they will have to spare for their much-trumpeted work amongst "the poor."

Mr. Engström plays the Pharisee in asking to how many mourners we speak words of comfort. We do not keep a register of these little kindnesses. Our own poor we relieve; we do not send them to Mr. Engström. We do not build hospitals, but probably we subscribe to them, without bawling it from the housetops. Certainly we do not try, as the Christians do, to make the hospitals sectarian institutions. We have no special agencies for reclaiming drunkards and prostitutes. We are laboring to bring about a state of society in which drunkenness and prostitution will die a natural death.

Mr. Engström winds up with an inaccuracy. He speaks of "the Secular Cromwell Club" at Plaistow. The Cromwell Club was not "Secular." It was a political Club. The Secularists engaged its lecture-room occasionally for a meeting. But suppose it had been a "Secular" Club. What is proved by stating that the building is now used by the Christian Evidence Society? Two chapels, at Manchester and Portsmouth, have been turned into Secular halls.

G. W. FOOTE.

### VANINI'S MARTYRDOM.

(Concluded from p. 306.)

THE story of Vanini in England ends with his escape from the tender mercies of Archbishop Abbot. His subsequent short career and tragic fate must be briefly sketched in illustration of the way in which free inquiry was welcomed by the Church in the seventeenth century of the teachings of the one divine religion.

At Paris Vanini set to work on a book probably designed to promote inquiry, while removing suspicions of his own orthodoxy. It was magniloquently entitled *Amphitheatrum Aeternae Providentiae divino-magicum Christiano-physicum, nec non Astrologo-Catholicum, adversus veteres Philosophos, Atheos, Epicureos, Peripatheticos et Stoicos, Lugdani, 1615*. This defence of Eternal Providence Durand regards as ironical, and Cousin as suspicious. Although usually set down as an Atheist, and burnt as one, Vanini's mind may have been only partly emancipated on the God question. In setting forth the various opinions of philosophers on the subject, he probably designed to induce doubt and inquiry, though it must be remembered that he wrote with the fear of the Sorbonne and the Inquisition before his eyes.

His next work, *De Admirandis Nature, Reginae Dereque Mortalium, Arcanis: Dialogi, 1616*, showed a bolder front in its very title. "The Admirable Secrets of Nature, the Queen and Goddess of Mortals. He had now obtained a patron, the Marshal Bassompierre, to whom this book of dialogues is dedicated. It purports to be the record by his disciples of conversations with Vanini. Whomever written by, it certainly had his revision; and this form of writing enables him to put heretical questions and sentiments into the mouth of the interlocutor, "Alexander"; while "Julius Cæsar," the teacher, remains comparatively orthodox. His doctrine essentially is Pantheism, which, as Earl Beaconsfield said, is "Atheism *in domino*," while in ethics it is Epicurean. Vanini, in short, teaches Naturalism, and he says plainly that there were things in the *Amphitheatre* he no longer believed, and that "infants born with weak minds are so much the fitter to become good Christians." Asked his opinion of the immortality of the soul, he says: "I have sworn to my God not to treat of that question till I am old, rich, and a German." The work was certified by two doctors of the Sorbonne, but it is said to have been, soon after publication, re-examined, and condemned to be burnt by that body.

Vanini removed to Toulouse, where he lived by teaching. It was not long ere he roused the clergy against him, and in August, 1618, he was arrested for Atheism and

blasphemy.\* Vanini was then only thirty-three years old. The chief evidence against him was "a pious gentleman"—one de Francon, who played the same Judas-like part that Moccenigo did towards Giordano Bruno. We have no particulars of the trial, but it is said that, in answer to the charge of Atheism, he took up a straw and said that would suffice to prove the existence of God. Gramond makes out that he argued for Theism from fear, not from conscience. The judges preferred the testimony of de Francon that Vanini had, in the intimacy of friendship, admitted to him his utter disbelief in the being of a God, asserting that Nature was the sole ruler of the universe, and her laws the supreme standards of action, to which all things must conform. He was found guilty, and condemned as an Atheist to have his blaspheming tongue cut out, to be strangled at the stake, his body afterwards to be burnt and scattered to the winds. This truly Christian sentence was duly executed before the Church of St. Stephen—Mr. Owen says on the same day, February 9; but Signor Palumbo and other authorities say the 19th. That Vanini died heroically is certain. *Le Mercure François* said "he died with as much constancy, patience, and fortitude as any other man ever seen." He said in Italian: "Come, let us die cheerfully like a philosopher." It adds that he declared, in the presence of thousands, that there was neither God nor Devil.

The pious Gramond writes: "I saw him in the tumbrel as they led him to execution, mocking the Cordelier who had been sent to exhort him to repentance, and insulting our Savior by these impious words: 'He sweated with fear and weakness, and I, I die undaunted.'" Gramond relates, with evident approval, the brutal operation which forced a shriek of pain from the poor martyr to Free-thought. "Before putting fire to the stake," he says, "Vanini was ordered to put forth his sacrilegious tongue for the knife. He refused. It was necessary to employ pincers to draw it forth, and when the executioner's instrument seized and cut it off, never was heard a more horrible cry. One might have thought he heard the bellowing of an ox which was being slaughtered."†

The abbé Ladvoeat, the learned librarian to the Sorbonne, in his biographical and historical dictionary issued in the middle of last century, says that Vanini was burnt alive,‡ and adds: "Were justice equally severe as present, many persons would have met with Vanini's fate." Oh, these good Christians, how merciful they have been made by their beautiful creed! J. M. WHEELER.

### DEBATE IN DERBY.

UP to last week many of the good people of Derby had been for some considerable time in a high state of excitement, through the announcement of a public discussion which was to take place between Mr. G. W. Foote and Mr. T. W. Lee, of the Christian Evidence Society, upon the question, "Atheism or Theism: Which is the More Reasonable?" The anticipations thus raised were realised on the evenings of Wednesday and Thursday, May 15 and 16, when the debate was held in the Temperance Hall, a fine building capable of holding a thousand persons. On this occasion it was crowded. Of course by far the great majority of the audiences were Christians; still, upon the whole, they listened fairly well to Mr. Foote. At times, when heavy and well-aimed blows were dealt at the popular faith, the more orthodox present manifested signs of uneasiness; but Mr. Foote's tact and the Chairman's kindly admonitions speedily allayed the theological irritation.

\* Gramond, in his *History of France from the Death of Henry IV.*, says: "He pretended to teach medicine; in reality he was a misleader of youth. He made a mockery of sacred things. He blasphemed the incarnation of Christ. He did not acknowledge the existence of God. He attributed everything to chance. He worshipped Nature as the excellent mother and source of all beings. This was the chief of all his errors, and he had the audacity to teach it in Toulouse, that holy city."

† Calvin similarly wroule of the cries of Servetus as "stupid bellowing."

‡ In the Abbé Migné's *Catholic Dictionnaire de Biographie* it is also said, "*Il fut livré aux flammes.*" The *Mercure François* bears its account, "*Un Atheiste Italien brûlé vif à Toulouse.*"

## SECULARISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

## THE GLASGOW DEBATE.

ON the evenings of May 6, 7, 8, and 9, in the North Saloon of the City Hall, Mr. Charles Watts debated with Dr. A. Jamieson, Glasgow, the proposition for the first two nights being, "That Secularism is Superior to Christianity," and on the following nights the converse of this. Owing to the lateness of the season, the attendance suffered somewhat, although the meetings were fair throughout, and the audiences behaved with exemplary patience and decorum.

At the outset of his opening speech Mr. WATTS warned his hearers against confounding what was loosely called "Infidelity" with Secularism. By the first term was generally understood any form of revolt against the authority of theology; but Secularism was something more, inasmuch as it represented a body of ethical truths, and so claimed to set up a new discipline of life. As most of them knew, the word "Secularism" was first used, in its specific sense, as a doctrine-name by G. J. Holyoake; and both he and those who co-operated with him in establishing Secularism were constrained to that course alike by a lively belief in the soundness and salutariness of Secularist principles, and by a clear recognition of the fact that as Christianity, after nineteen centuries of power, had not only failed to better, but had positively worsened, the world, it was high time some different plan should be tried. It was a common idea among religious people that belief was voluntary, and that, therefore, anyone who disowned all religion must do so through sheer wantonness. But it was now an axiom in psychology that the act of belief in itself was purely automatic. Men did not command their convictions, but were commanded by them. Did any sane person imagine that, if the individual could persuade himself of the truth of anything, he would deliberately elect to become an outcast for opinion's sake. Yet that was what many Secularists had reluctantly done. It went without saying, then, that conviction being determined, it was monstrously unjust to penalise the opinions of minorities. So much for the intellectual and moral prerequisites of Secularism. Members of all schools of thought were at one as to the need for some authoritative rule of life; but there the agreement ended, for every school has a different standard. The Secularist alone proclaims the supremacy of reason, overtly and unreservedly; for, while some Christian divines like Hooker, Chillingworth, and Butler feel themselves logically bound to own the sovereignty of reason, the vast majority of Christians assign it an inferior place, setting the authority of the Church or the Bible above it, although, by an unconscious yet whimsical inconsistency, it is actually by an exercise of their reason that they discover what seems to them to be the true Church or revelation. He would now proceed to recite the articles of the N.S.S.—Declaration of Principles and Objects, defining all the capital terms, like "reason," "happiness," "duty," "utility," etc. Having gone over the various items of the Declaration, and enlarged upon the practical bearings of the principles there set forth, Mr. Watts concluded with a quotation from Mr. Holyoake, vividly contrasting Christianity with Secularism, with especial reference to the absence from the latter of the detestable dogma of exclusive salvation, with all its inevitable horrors of religious strife, social confusion, and moral suffering.

Dr. JAMIESON complained that his opponent had not instituted any real comparison between Secularism and Christianity. To do so, they must be brought into opposition; but Mr. Watts had kept strictly to Secularism, and as long as he did so there could be no valid application of the comparative method, and consequently no settlement of the question of relative merit. What he proposed to do was to go through the N.S.S. principles one by one, and demonstrate that they were all anticipated in the New Testament. They had heard from Mr. Watts that he approved of some phases of theology, while condemning theology as a whole. What a shocking example of stultification! Then it appeared that Secularism only came into existence with Mr. Holyoake. But what did he find in one of Mr. Watts's own pamphlets? That Secularist principles existed long before Christ. Yet in all these centuries Secularism had been dormant or obscure, while Christianity spread and flourished. And to-day, when Secularism was pining away, the banner of the Cross was being planted everywhere. If the principles of Secularism were so far above those of Christianity, how did it come that Christians won all the prizes in the race of life? Even Charles Bradlaugh himself once admitted that they had all the wealth, talent, and power. Where were the Atheistic men of science, of letters, of genius? His opponent could not give a solitary name of a man of the first rank in these walks who was an Atheist—not one. Mr. Watts emphasised the Secularist doctrine of the equality of the sexes, and notably of husband and wife; but the New Testament

Mr. Piper, editor of the *Derby Daily Telegraph*, presided on both evenings, and an excellent chairman he made. His brief addresses at the commencement and at the close of the debate were models of concise and appropriate comment upon the proceedings. He spoke of the ability of the disputants, and of the attention paid by the crowded audiences to statements which, to many of them, were no doubt new and startling. This, he remarked, was a striking contrast to what had happened under similar circumstances in that town ten years ago. He thought this pleasant change was an encouraging proof of the progress of liberal ideas upon theological questions. It occurred to me whether the Christians present understood to what we are indebted for this improvement. Certainly it could not be to the influence of Theism, for that was more powerful in the past than it is at present. In my opinion, this advancement is the legitimate result of the Secular tendencies of the age. The spirit of inquiry is abroad, bigotry has more than ever to yield to fair play, and the tempest of theological passion is supplanted by the influence of calm reasoning.

As to the ability of the disputants as debaters, I desire to express my opinion frankly and honestly. Of Mr. Foote I need say but little, inasmuch as his polemical skill is well known. Personally, I was exceedingly pleased with his methodical and dignified mode of conducting his side of the controversy. His thorough examination of, and effective replies to, all that was relevant in his opponent's plea on the first night were, to my mind, grand specimens of perceptive power and readiness of argumentative retort. On the second night, when Mr. Foote led the debate, he, avoiding the puzzle of metaphysics, made a brilliant attack upon the Theistic position, showing how the misery, the suffering, and the inequalities of existence, together with the sadness, cruelties, and injustice recorded in history, contradict the theory that the universe is governed by a God who has unlimited power, wisdom, and goodness. Mr. Foote was in splendid form, and his earnest and eloquent expositions were frequently so powerful and commanding that he won the enthusiastic applause even of a large portion of the Christian audience, including the Chairman.

Mr. W. T. Lee is a good debater and a gentlemanly opponent, judging from his manner in the Derby debate. I regard him, apart from Dr. Harrison and Dr. McCann, as being by far the best advocate the Christian Evidence Society have on their staff. A less able debater than Mr. Foote would find in Mr. Lee a difficult opponent. He knows much of the art of debate, and he has sufficient tact to overlook the strong points against him, and to make much of minor features that seem to tell in his favor. Before an audience mainly in agreement with him, he spoke with a confidence that, probably, would be wanting were he addressing a hostile assembly. While not wishing to deprive him of any credit to which he is entitled, I would, in all kindness, suggest that he should not assume, as he did throughout the debate, that he has all the truth on his side, and that those who differ from him are necessarily in error. If that were so, all debating would be useless. Still, it appeared to me that, as a rule, Mr. Lee managed his difficult task much better than others on his side would have done.

I am pleased to know that the discussion is to be printed verbatim, and it is to be hoped that it will have a large sale, as the reading of it cannot but prove of great benefit to the Secular party. I shall be much disappointed if the local society does not increase its members in consequence of the discussion.

After the conclusion of the debate on the second night a large deputation, composed of Secular friends, waited upon Mr. Foote to thank him for the admirable fight he had made. Mr. Whitney delivered a neat little speech, in which, on behalf of the Derby Branch of the N.S.S., he assured Mr. Foote that all the members felt proud of their President, and congratulated him upon "the efficient and dignified manner" in which he had defended their position in the debate which had just finished. They were, indeed, more than satisfied; they were "delighted." Mr. Foote made an appropriate reply.

Mr. S. P. Putnam and myself accompanied Mr. Foote to Derby, and our American visitor was delighted. In America they seldom have such debates, and, therefore, to Mr. Putnam it was a treat which he fully appreciated.

CHARLES WATTS.

nowhere declared the inferiority of women. The injunction, "Wives, be subject to your husbands," meant no more than did the subjection of himself and Mr. Watts to their present chairman. Surely no one in his senses would argue that they, as disputants, were necessarily inferior to the chairman, because they were subject to him for the time being. Similarly, the Pauline prescription implied subordination in function merely—not degradation. They had been told that the only sanction requisite for truthfulness, etc., was that the practice of lying, and vice or crime generally, militated against social stability and well-being. In other words, the Secularist set the observance of good morals on the low ground of expediency; and, as an illustration of the practical outcome of this grovelling opportunism, he would prove to them that Mr. Watts himself would permit lying and hypocrisy in certain circumstances. Concerning the dogma of exclusive salvation, over which Mr. Watts waxed so indignant, Christianity did not create hell. It simply warned men of the existence of a place of punishment for sinners beyond the grave, and since it pointed them the way of escape from that doom, Christianity was really man's best friend. Mr. Watts evinced great anxiety to dissociate Secularism from "Infidelity"; but, after all, they were one at bottom. Holyoake (quotation from *Reasoner*, vol. vi., p. 270), Bradlaugh, and Mrs. Besant, all contended for the substantial identity of the two; and Dr. Sexton, who knew more about the secret history of Secularism than anyone living, asserted positively that "Secularism begins and ends in Atheism." Now, what is Atheism?—a blank negation, an intellectual nihilism. And yet, forsooth, we are told that Secularism is a philosophy of life. As if any philosophy deserving of the name could be based on zero. He would now, by an appeal to the New Testament, make it clear that all the principles of Secularism were derived thence. The remainder of Dr. Jamieson's speech consisted of the reading of a series of texts from the Gospels and the so-called Pauline Epistles, to show that these authorities enjoin the free exercise of Reason, the diligent pursuit of knowledge, the doing of good works, the aspiration to happiness—recognise the legitimacy of utility as a test of principles and conduct, and the necessity of liberty as the concomitant of progress. While the Christian view of the interdependence of liberty and progress is rational, the Secularist tenet is absurd; for the Christian is a libertarian, but the Secularist is a necessitarian, who, in Mr. Watts's own words, regards "virtue and vice as being as much the consequence of natural laws as the fall of a stone." What has Secularism done for progress? If it boasts of martyrs, it will be a necessary, if painful, task to say plainly why they were put in prison or buffeted. Then Secularists pride themselves on their freedom from superstition, but "Saladin" actually wrote a poem in which he deified the late Charles Bradlaugh. Finally, what had Secularism done for education, and where was its Bible?

In his second speech Mr. WATTS traversed most of the topics introduced by Dr. Jamieson. So far from having omitted to systematically contrast Secularism with Christianity, that was the last thing he did in his first speech. The poem of "Saladin's," which had been quoted as a proof of Secularist superstition, was plainly ironical; but, to remove all possible doubt, he had "Saladin's" own assurance to that effect. Dr. Jamieson had labored to make out that Secularism was a poor imitation of Christianity, but his citations were lopsided. What of the numerous passages putting the alternative of belief or damnation, of those setting a premium upon improvidence, or of those expressly disparaging and anathematising knowledge? When he said that Secular principles existed before Christ, that was a widely different thing from saying that Secularism itself was pre-Christian. The taunt that Secularism had achieved nothing came with ill grace from those who supported Christian-made laws that robbed Secularists of dead men's money, interfered with their meetings, and intimidated public opinion. Besides, it would be time enough to reproach Secularism with failure when it had enjoyed the same terms of existence and opportunity as Christianity. It might be true that most men of science were nominally Christians, considering the political and social power of Christianity that was to be expected; but what of men like Darwin, Tyndall, Huxley, and others?—no one dare claim them as Christians.

In his subsequent speeches Dr. JAMIESON reverted repeatedly to the subject-matter of his previous ones. Secularism begins and ends in Atheism. It encourages dissimulation by admitting "passive members," who may at the same time continue to masquerade as believers. It never does more than prate about science and education; for they had it on the authority of Dr. Sexton that the so-called "Halls of Science" were no better than drinking and dancing clubs, and Secularist lectures were as ignorant of science as their hearers were indifferent to it. If Secularists could not bequeath their money at death, let them hand it over to their Societies during life. Secularism struck at the very root of marriage. Mr. Bradlaugh had expressly laid it down in the King debate that if a woman lived with a

man and bore children to him she was his wife; and he had also practically countenanced polygamy when he addressed as Mrs. Sharples Carlile the woman with whom, while his legal wife was still living, Richard Carlile consorted. Secularism pretended to have as one of its objects the promotion of peace; yet representative Secularists were at continual strife with one another. The truth about Secularism is that it is all talk, talk, and nothing but talk.

On Tuesday evening Mr. WATTS opened by reaffirming and reinforcing the case for Secularism, recapitulated the points of contrast between Christianity and Secularism, and enumerated the six articles in the Secularist Bill of Rights, summing up the whole in the aphorism that Secularism proclaims freedom for all and persecution for none. Having completed this work of exposition, he would now assume the defensive. The night before his opponent had frequently quoted from "Saladin's" writings, describing him as a Secularist. He (Mr. Watts) had denied the accuracy of that description, but Dr. Jamieson seemed to doubt his word. He now read "Saladin's" answer to a correspondent from a number of the *Agnostic Journal* for 1894, in which "Saladin" states: "We are not a Secularist." He had thus vindicated his veracity.

Dr. JAMIESON'S contribution to this evening's debate was such skimble-skamble stuff that, in mercy to him, the most of it is better left unrecorded. There was the old fatuous insistence on trivialities, the almost monomaniacal harping on the sterility of Secularism in the matter of education, benevolent institutions, etc., on its demoralising doctrine of marriage, copious quotations from old journals like the *Shield of Faith* and the *Secular Review* to prove that Secularists are all that is vile and contemptible, the reading of a sentence from a correspondent warning Dr. Jamieson to watch Mr. Watts's quotations narrowly, with general observations, drawn chiefly from Dr. Sexton's *Fallacies of Secularism*, to show that Secularism is entirely destructive in its propaganda, and that, in fine, it is a goddess, bibleless, unethical, and anti-social abortion. The overwhelming dreariness of this wilderness of drivel was only relieved by one or two far-sundered spots of green, and these patches were verdant with a vengeance. Referring to Mr. Watts's strictures upon the doctrine of eternal punishment, Dr. Jamieson exclaimed that, although it suited Secularists to raise a *brutum fulmen* against it in public, they sometimes admitted *sub rosa* that that doctrine had its uses. For example, in an old *N.S.S. Almanack* he found, under the date of the anniversary of the Great Comet, "Populace panic-stricken. Seven hundred kept mistresses married." Here the fear of divine vengeance prompted seven hundred men to make reparation for the wrong inflicted on as many women. Surely this was a moral gain. Then, too, in appealing to Christians to be just to Secularists, Charles Bradlaugh sometimes urged: "If you believe that the heretic is doomed to everlasting misery hereafter, surely the thought of his awful fate should move you to tenderness towards him here." That is to say, Bradlaugh saw clearly that the logical consequence of a belief in eternal punishment ought to be that of awaking pity, and even love, for those in danger of it.

It was in vain that Mr. Watts struggled manfully to redeem the debate from utter frustration, by an eloquent appeal to his opponent to abstain from personalities, and a studied avoidance of all causes of digression. The spirit of divergation had smitten the protagonist of Christianity, and the voice of reason fell on unheeding ears. Whenever any scrap of argument did come his way Mr. Watts made short work of it. This was conspicuously the case with Dr. Jamieson's attack on the teaching of Secularism as to marriage.

Having first of all cleared Mr. Bradlaugh's memory from the charge that he sponsored Free Love, Mr. WATTS affirmed the Secularist view of marriage as essentially one of monogamic union, in which one man lived with one woman in true and lasting affection. But what of the Christian theory of marriage? There was not one word in the Bible which forbade polygamy, and Luther himself in the case of the Landgrave of Hesse, authoritatively sanctioned that prince's bigamy. As for Dr. Jamieson's diatribes upon the characters of prominent Secularists, his rule seemed to be: If Secularists are bad men, Secularism is to blame; but if Christians misbehave, they cannot be Christians at all. However, what was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander, and he could easily and abundantly prove that in all ages professing Christians had not only been accused, but had been convicted, of every imaginable vice and crime. Mr. Watts illustrated and enforced this indictment by conclusive quotations from Mosheim, Miall, Dick, Wesley, etc.

(To be concluded.)

"I wonder why people persist in wearing squeaking shoes on Sunday?" "That is the day set apart for manifestations of the sole."

J. P. GILMOUR.

## INGERSOLL AND SAM JONES.

(Continued from p. 317.)

## INGERSOLL ON JONES.

AFTER obtaining the views of Rev. Sam Jones on Colonel Ingersoll and the influence of his lectures and teachings, the *Globe-Democrat* sent a stenographer to the latter, as already explained, with instructions to ask questions as nearly identical as possible with reference to views entertained as to the Georgia revivalist and his methods. It was impossible to carry out the instructions literally, as Mr. Ingersoll, after a little hesitancy, finally warmed to the subject, anticipated queries, and really delivered a very forcible lecture on the question of revivals past and present, with a very lucid definition of Agnosticism as compared with Atheism, and more especially immorality, or indifference as to right and wrong. The Colonel was in the best of humors, told each friend who was admitted to the room that he was in perfect health and was carrying his sixty-one years without an effort, and assured the interviewer that he had nothing of any particular interest to say about Sam Jones or any other religious enthusiast. When pressed for an answer to the question, "What do you think of Mr. Jones and of the influence of his preaching?" he at length said:—

"Assuming that the gentleman's sermons are correctly reported, and basing my opinion on what little of them I have read, I cannot say that I particularly admire the style, though the argument does not appear to differ very much from that which revivalists have used ever since I can remember. When I was a boy the people had very few amusements. There were no theatres in the smaller towns, no museums, and nothing in the way of entertainment except the travelling circus which came round once a year. This circus generally carried a few mangy-looking animals, so that religious people could have a satisfactory excuse for going. In the winter the little towns were cut off from the rest of the world. There were no railroads, the rivers were frozen, and the mail arrived about once in every week. As a result, the people amused themselves every winter in 'getting religion.' The towns would be invaded by two or three evangelists, who derived great pleasure from exciting their audiences by vivid descriptions of the future home of the unconverted. They would describe the caverns of hell into which rolled and dashed the waves of brimstone, and also the tortures and agonies inflicted by the worm that never dies. These meetings were held every evening, and the people were invited to come forward to the 'anxious-seat,' very much as they have been asked every evening for the last two or three weeks in St. Louis.

"I remember that the first to come forward were generally the little girls, who, recalling that they had pilfered a little sugar, or, perhaps, a piece of cake, felt conscience-smitten, and were hence the first to respond. Then some of the men would join in the procession, and some few would be converted every evening amidst great rejoicing. This thing would last about a month, and nothing was talked about except religion. The majority of the people were about half-crazy—the preachers altogether so. They would convert from fifty to one hundred, and then, when business brisked up in the spring and people began to resume their usual vocations, most of the converts would backslide. But, in justice to them, I must add that the following winter they would be on hand again, ready to reoccupy the anxious-seat. Nearly every town had what you might call a stock company of periodical converts, who went through the same experience every winter, told how wicked they had been, how happy they were, how ashamed they were of having backslidden, and how gratified they were to be again redeemed."

"Did they become better citizens?"

"I never knew anybody to become better by being what Mr. Jones and other orthodox preachers call 'converted.' On the contrary, I have known many young generous fellows who got religion, and immediately became sour, unsociable, and mean. There is a conversion, if I may use the word, which comes in the nature of things. There is a time in the life of a young man when he feels responsibility touching him, when he makes up his mind to leave the follies of youth and become a man, with a goal fixed in his mind. This often comes when he falls in love, and feels that he wishes to do something for somebody else. This is what I call genuine conversion, not born of excitement, or bad air, or an overheated room, or an idiotic impulse. We may go a step farther, and say that the same thing happens with animals. There comes a time when the colt quits kicking over the traces and goes to pulling and eating his oats like a well-regulated horse, and when the dog quits chasing his tail, begins to look dignified, and assumes an air of partnership with the proprietor."

"Do you think the influence of Mr. Jones's revivals is injurious?"

"Yes, I think the so-called religious revival is hurtful as well as useless. The methods used are calculated to excite,

not to enlighten. There is no appeal to the judgment; the reasoning faculties are not called into play. The passions are aroused, and especially the fear of punishment and the hope of reward. Thousands and thousands of men and women have been excited to such a degree that they have become partially insane—many wholly so. Religious excitement has unsettled as many minds as any other cause, and the asylums to-day are filled with men and women who have lost their reason in consequence of these foolish revivals, conducted by orthodox ministers. Men and women are made to believe that they have offended an infinite God; that they have hurt the feelings of the Holy Ghost; that their actions here, and especially their beliefs, are to have eternal consequences; that they deserve to be eternally damned for what they have done, and that God is anxious to damn them, but is held back by his son, who seems to have a little more mercy than is credited to the old gentleman himself.

"They are also told that they can have an eternal reward of infinite joy if they only repent and believe in this son. In the conflict of emotions produced by these idiotic sermons many, as I said before, have lost their reason. If the sermons of Mr. Jones, or any other revivalist, could be answered from the same platform by a philosopher, by a humanitarian, or by a man of sense, no human being would ever be 'converted.' Such a proceeding would end forever the revival system.

"Another great fault of these revivals is, that people are told that those who do right have to carry a cross, while those who do wrong have the benefit of the pleasures of this world—that the wicked have their good time here, while the good suffer on account of their goodness and self-denial, but will be rewarded in another world. All this is not only idiotic, but it is positively immoral. The facts are exactly the reverse. Only those carry a cross who do wrong. On the shoulders of those who do right the cross changes, and the man is borne upward and onward.

"That is the true philosophy of life. Men should act right because right action pays; men should shun wrong because wrong inflicts and produce suffering. Everything is moral that tends to increase or to preserve human happiness and human well-being; everything is immoral that decreases or puts in peril human well-being. In other words, all that preserves or increases happiness is right. There is no necessity for being miserable here in order to secure happiness in this world; and if you are really happy in this life, happy by virtue of living consistently and doing right, there is no danger of being damned in another world. I know of no form of orthodox religion that contains any philosophy, and I never knew of a philosopher occupying a pulpit."

"In one of his recent sermons Sam Jones said that the terms 'Agnostic' and 'fool' were synonymous. What is your reply to that criticism or statement?"

Mr. Ingersoll laughed good-humoredly, and said: "Coming from the Georgia evangelist, I think the remark calls for no reply, and it is certainly no argument. It is a curious fact that the savages are perfectly certain about things that philosophers admit are beyond the limitations of the human mind. The savage of Central Africa knows all about his god or gods. He knows just how the world was made, and how the human race was started. He knows exactly where we are all going after death. He doesn't know anything about this world, but he does know all about the other two worlds. He doesn't know anything about man, but he knows all about the gods. Now, if the Rev. Sam Jones would just think for a few moments, he would probably admit that he doesn't know that any God exists at all. No doubt he believes it, but he certainly does not know it; and if he is honest enough to admit the truth, he admits that he is an Agnostic, or, to use the word he seems to prefer, a fool.

"I confess that I don't know whether a God exists or not. This is the only world I have ever lived in or have any memory of, so that I might be called a provincialist. That there may be other worlds, I don't deny. There may be a God. There may be many. If there is one, I hope there are more, for one would be so lonesome. I don't know the origin of the universe, having no evidence on the subject. It is beyond my mind. I cannot conceive of the creation of something from nothing, nor can I conceive of something being changed back again to nothing. In other words, I cannot conceive creation, and consequently cannot conceive a creator. I don't say there is no God—I simply say I don't know. So far as my acquaintance extends, I can truthfully say I never met a minister who did. Mr. Jones may be in the possession of facts of which I am ignorant, but if he knows there is a God I would like to have him tell his next congregation how he knows, and what his evidence is.

"Mr. Jones says an Agnostic is the same as a fool. The difference between an Agnostic and a fool is about this: The Agnostic doesn't know. He has sense enough to know he doesn't know, and honesty enough to admit it. A fool, on the other hand, says he knows, whether he really thinks he does or not. Now, I am not prepared to admit that Humboldt was a fool, yet he said he didn't know whether

there was a God or not. Few men would call Louis Agassiz a fool, yet he said that science had not advanced far enough to say with any certainty whether God exists or not. I don't think Darwin was a fool, yet he stated distinctly that the questions of God and immortality were beyond the limits of his powers of reasoning. Ernst Haeckel, the greatest naturalist in the world, is no fool, yet he says he doesn't know. Does Mr. Jones suggest that Huxley was ever a fool? As a matter of fact, he is the man who invented this definition of Agnosticism as representing this certain stage of thought. As a matter of fact, the greatest thinkers and scientists of this century have adopted this position, and I don't think that the fact of the Rev. Sam Jones denouncing them as fools will have even a tendency towards dimming the splendor of their reputation."

The next question put to Colonel Ingersoll was the following: "What have you to say in answer to the contention of Mr. Jones, that the moral influence of your lectures is calamitous, especially among those who have not had the benefit of being reared in a Christian home, as you were?"

Without hesitating a moment longer than was necessary to shake hands with an old friend who entered the room while the question was being asked, the Colonel replied: "Mr. Jones evidently doesn't possess a clear conception of morality, or he would not insinuate that what I say has an immoral tendency. He seems to think that certain beliefs are essential to morality, that it is moral to believe in the supernatural, in the inspiration of the Bible, in the atonement, and in the scheme of redemption; and immoral to believe in absolute liberty of thought—immoral to advocate investigation and the use of the natural reasoning power that we possess. He seems to regard blind credulity as moral, and intellectual courage of thought as immoral. I, on the other hand, think morality lives in the domain of action rather than in the realm of belief. A man may accept a creed blindly and at the same time be a very immoral person; while, on the other hand, if a man is really moral, it makes but little difference what creed he may accept or deny. Every religion preaches ordinary morality, and, in addition to this, the necessity of belief in certain supernatural things and the observance of certain ceremonies. Now, if you were to take morality from religion, nothing of any value would be left; whereas, if you take from morality itself its religion, it would remain just as valuable as ever, and even more valuable."

"I deny having said anything in my lectures that is calculated to make people immoral. I have told them that the Bible is not inspired, but that what is true in it is just as good as if it had been; while the bad in it could not be made good by being inspired. I have told people that men wrote the book called the Bible, and that it is full of the ignorance of the times in which it was written. Also, that some of the things in it are noble and lofty, while it also contains things that are cruel, heartless, and even infamous. I have said that we should throw away the bad and preserve the good. I have told everyone to be honest with himself, and to express his opinions honestly. I have warned my hearers against being controlled by prejudice or educational influences, and I have also said that the world was for the living and not for the dead, but that each one should live in accordance with his ideal. I have said all in my power in favor of intellectual liberty; I have spoken in favor of all that is good and just and generous and noble. I deny that I have ever uttered a word calculated to make anyone immoral."

"I have not been guilty of the inconsistency of telling people they can act like devils for seventy years, and then be forgiven in a moment, and be carried up to heaven by hosts of angels. Such a doctrine is immoral. I don't tell the cashier of a bank that it is wrong to steal, and then add that if he steals every dollar in the vault he can repent and be forgiven as well in Canada as in the United States; neither do I tell him that when he repents there will be more joy in heaven than over ninety and nine honest cashiers who never stole a dollar. That doctrine is immoral, but it is not mine. Neither do I tell people that they are accountable for the sins of a couple of people who lived 6,000 years ago, and that they can be justly punished for offences they never committed. That would be immoral. Nor have I told people that they can get to heaven by the virtues of another man, or that another man or god can be good and they can get the credit for it. That, too, would be immoral."

"I have not told people that they ought to become heavenly paupers and enjoy the glories of another world purchased for them by another person. That would be immoral. But I have told them that if they would be happy they must earn happiness; that happiness cannot be received as alms; that, as a fact, happiness is the interest which decent actions draw; that they must be good for themselves. I have also told people that there is no such thing as forgiveness; that everybody has to bear the consequences of his own acts, and that these consequences are a universal police, whom nobody can bribe and no one avoid. That is moral, and in addition to being moral it is true."

"I have never told any one that a God of infinite wisdom and goodness could make hundreds of millions of people,

knowing that they would be eternally damned. That would be immoral, because it makes the God revivalists talk about a monster. A God of infinite wisdom and power has no right to make a failure, and certainly a man who is born to eternal damnation can hardly be called a success."

"If I could change a stone into a human being, knowing that he would be a murderer and be hanged before he could get religion, and hence, according to orthodoxy, go to hell, I think I might far better leave the stone alone. If God makes people out of dust and knows they will be damned, he had far better leave the dust alone. I don't think that any God has a right to add to the misery of mankind. To think otherwise seems to me to amount to an insinuation that God is a monster and a savage."

"In other words, Colonel Ingersoll, while Sam Jones thinks the tendency of your lectures is immoral, you think the criticism applies more accurately to his preaching?"

"I don't want to criticise any one man in particular," was the reply. "The religion of our day is immoral. Most of the sermons preached are immoral, and, as a rule, they are subversive of the aims and ends of justice. I do honestly think that if we had a few less sermons and a few more lectures of a sensible kind, the world would actually grow better, brighter, and happier."

"Do you think the revivals of to-day are as useless and hurtful as those you have described as being held when you were a boy?"

"In answer to that I would say we are passing through a change. People are slowly becoming more and more thoughtful, and I think the evangelist will, in consequence, soon become a thing of the past. The preacher of the future will be a teacher. He will be one of the high priests of nature, and he will tell people how to live in this world, and how to enjoy the sunshine of this life. The sensational exhorters will have to go to the rear. They are no longer useful, if they were ever so. They are, indeed, a hindrance. Only a little while ago, in Spain, the people who were afflicted with cholera mobbed the doctors, looted the drug stores, and relied upon religious processions to stay the pestilence. They were behind the times, just as is the revivalist who tries to stay the onward march of crime by appealing to heavens or hells. He is pursuing the same course, with a certainty of achieving the same results. The world is beginning to see that people act and think for themselves under the circumstances of the hour, and to realise that to improve people their condition must be changed. This can be done only by developing the brain and civilising the heart. We must convince the people that wrong-doing is an ignorant blunder, that to get right is an effort of intelligence, and when these thoughts are firmly embodied in the minds of the people there will be no further use for medicine men, for augurs, or for evangelists. To appeal to the supernatural will be useless."

"When that time comes man will cease to think that a God controls the forces of this world, and man will become the providence of man."

—St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

## MR. PUTNAM'S ENGAGEMENTS.

MR. CHARLES WATTS has made the following lecturing engagements for Mr. S. P. Putnam:—

May 26, Liverpool.

June 2, N.S.S. Conference; 9, Glasgow; 10 and 11, Aberdeen; 13 and 14, Dundee; 16, Edinburgh; 23, Manchester; 24, Derby; 30, Sheffield.

July 6, Chester-le-Street; 7, Newcastle-on-Tyne; 14, Bristol; 16 and 17, Plymouth; 21, Birmingham.

August 11, Failsworth.

Mr. Putnam will return to New York in August, therefore friends who have not engaged him should communicate with Mr. Watts at once. Societies near any of the above towns requiring week-night lectures should arrange for Mr. Putnam to visit them when he is in their district on the Sunday.

In the *Revue Scientifique* (May 11) there is an interesting article by M. J. V. Laborde on "Microcephales and the Descent of Man." It is accompanied by portraits of microcephales and a chimpanzee. M. Laborde holds it as a biological law that the brain cannot be reduced below a certain weight and size without the intellectual functions being reduced. The microcephales mentioned in intellectual status to the chimpanzee. M. Laborde, however, repeats the saying of M. Broca: "I would rather pass for an intelligent ape than an imbecile man."

## ACID DROPS.

FLORENCE was shaken by an earthquake on Saturday night, May 18. Bells were set ringing in many houses, and people ran in crowds into the streets. Of course the performances were at once stopped at the theatres. Some persons were killed and a great many injured. At Grassina forty houses were laid in ruins; at Lapaggi several buildings fell in, burying some persons who were unable to escape. At San Martino the church was destroyed, the congregation being overwhelmed by the falling masonry. Several were crushed to death, and a large number badly injured. Believers in "Providence" should ask themselves why the worst mischief was wrought in a place of worship.

Thirty persons have been burnt to death in the Russian town of Brest-Litewski, which has been destroyed by fire. This, however, is a trifle to eternal hell hereafter. The buildings destroyed included three Russian churches and one Catholic church.

Our readers will probably remember our review of Mr. Kernahan's *God and the Ant.* It appears to us a worthless book, but the *Methodist Times* calls it "a very fine study." "It is really an apology for God," says the Methodist organ, "and the solution is that he suffers more than we do." Poor God! It is sad to know that he suffers so much, and all for nothing; but the saddest thought is that he has to leave his "apology" in the hands of little people who, on their own showing, are relatively like maggots crawling about in a mouldy cheese.

The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children held a meeting recently at the Mansion House. One of the speakers was Lady Ancaster, who stated that the Queen had said to her: "Oh, dear! to think that it should be necessary to have such a society in this country." It was a very natural exclamation. England often boasts of being the most Christian country in the world, yet savages would be ashamed to treat their children as thousands treat theirs in this Bible-reading land.

Mr. Price Hughes wants the Wesleyan Methodists to raise £300,000 for "missionary" purposes. One of these days the people to whom missionaries are sent will learn of our brutality, and send over some of their own missionaries to teach us the error and wickedness of our ways.

Mr. Waugh, secretary of the Cruelty Society, has never apologised for the monstrous lie he once uttered, that Secularists were the worst ill-users of children. He may choose to forget it, but we shall remember it against him. Unfortunately, from his point of view, some of the very worst cases his Society has taken in hand have disproved his lying assertion. The culprits have been Christians, and occasionally very pious Christians. Not one of them has been a Secularist.

We like to acknowledge any good work that Christians are engaged in, and we congratulate the Rev. W. Douglas Morrison, the chaplain of Wandsworth Prison, on the partial success of his efforts to improve our penal system, which is a scandal to our civilisation. We had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Morrison at a recent Conference of the Humanitarian League, and he was certainly far more sensible and humane than another prison chaplain who talked nonsense with a God Almighty air.

Mr. Morrison is justly praised in the *Methodist Times*, which rather naively remarks that his "principles are all laid down by that great jurist, Jeremy Bentham, but have hitherto been disregarded." Our contemporary forgets that Jeremy Bentham was an Atheist.

The Methodist writer rebukes Lombroso, the great criminologist, for his low estimate of human nature. A little further on the Methodist writer states that "Christians believe that the image of God is even in a man or a woman predisposed to vice and crime." This is going a great deal beyond Lombroso, who regards the criminal as an abnormal specimen of humanity. According to the Methodist writer, we are all afflicted with the same evil predisposition; so that Christianity is more pessimistic than Science.

Talmage says that sceptics are always asking, Why? This is how he answers them: "There are so many things they cannot get explained. They cannot understand the Trinity, or how God can be sovereign and yet man a free agent. Neither can I. They say: 'I don't understand why a good God should let sin come into the world.' Neither do I. You say: 'Why was that child started in life with such disadvantages, while others have physical and mental equipment?' I cannot tell. They get out of church on Easter morning and say: 'That doctrine of the resur-

rection confounded me.' So it is to me a mystery beyond unravelment."

It is foolish to let the cat out of the bag in this fashion. Still, the folly has its compensations. For one thing, it saves Talmage the trouble of discussion. Why should he debate the Resurrection? It is a mystery. The sceptic who wants to discuss it mustn't apply to Talmage. He must apply to someone who is a *little more* foolish; someone who doesn't see that discussing Christianity only demonstrates its utter irrationality.

The New York *Sun* suggests that Talmage should get stereopticon views to illustrate his realistic sermons. It says that his verbal descriptions of the scenes in the skies of the New Jerusalem and those down in limbo, or deeper still, really ought to be translated from language into stereopticon pictures, which would have a hundred times the potency of his words, even with his widest mouth and wildest gestures.

Dr. Heber Newton, of New York, gave a sermon on the resurrection of Jesus, which he declared was spiritual, though his disciples mistakenly supposed it to be material. He has been denounced by many of his fellow sky-pilots, Dr. Tyler declaring that he denied in his sermon what he teaches in the service, for he repeats every Sunday the Apostles' Creed, which declared "the resurrection of the body." The Rev. Mr. Harsha accuses Dr. Newton of striking a blow at the Christian faith. He says, if the disciples were mistaken, all the Christian Church is, and has been, at sea. The Rev. I. M. Haldeman declares that Dr. Newton is a traitor to the Christian cause and worse than an infidel.

The Roman Catholic clergy are expressly forbidden to conduct the funeral service of any one who dies in the Orthodox Greek faith, so that Russian sailors, who happen to die in France, run a considerable risk, in spite of French enthusiasm for Russia, of being refused Christian burial.

The Abbé Lemire reports from Rome that the Pope was so painfully affected by the new tax on the religious orders in France as to shed tears. He would not counsel resistance, but says he was only prevented from breaking off diplomatic relations with the Republic because it might be detrimental to the Catholic schools and other missionary enterprises in the East. The pocket seems to be the vital point in all religions.

*Appropos* of the reception given by the Pope to the ex-Duke of Parma, the following anecdote is told: The Pope, wishing to console his deposed and melancholy visitor, said: "Never mind, one must be resigned to the decrees of heaven, which prove to us the iniquity of the world. I also, as you know, am the victim of the evils of the time." "Your Holiness," interrupted the ex-Duke, "is not so badly off, being in your own house, while I must seek for hospitality far away." The Pope changed the subject.

Mr. Carvell Williams asked a question in the House of Commons relative to the teaching of "The Children's Hymn Book," which is a Church of England production, "arranged in the order of the Church's year," by the School Board of Hambledon, Hants. The only satisfaction he received was the statement by Mr. Acland that the Education Department consider that School Boards will be wise to refrain from providing hymn-books for children which are connected with any particular church or denomination, and to which objection might be taken by some of the parents.

M. Pierre Courbet writes in *Cosmos* against Professor Max Müller for saying that, if the Buddhist Life of Jesus, brought forward by M. Notovitch is true, "It would demonstrate once for all that Jesus is a real historic personage." He says: "What! because there has been discovered in an obscure monastery of the Himalayas a manuscript that nobody knew about up to this day, do you pretend that this manuscript constitutes such an historic monument that it would smooth away all difficulties relative to the life of Jesus? When an historic work has not been known to its contemporaries, it is necessary, if we are to accord it serious belief, that its author should be known, and that we should be able to show that the work in question is really his."

M. Courbet thinks there is no need of any new document to establish the historic character of the life of Jesus; but he does not bring to the evidence the sceptical criticism which he brings to the work of M. Notovitch. He displays his own ignorance of the subject by talking as if the Gospels were demonstrated to be the actual work of eye-witnesses, and by quoting the palpable forgery in Josephus and the questionable passage in the *Annals* ascribed to Tacitus, as if these were decisive. He even makes out that the Toldos Jeshu says that Jesus raised the dead. What the Toldos Jeshu does say may be seen by any reader of *The Jewish Life of Christ*.

The following comes from America, and is not vouched for. Some may think that, if not true, it deserves to be: "A Congo native, who has been taught to read and write, has just sent a letter (his first) to the Archbishop of Canterbury. It reads as follows: 'Great and good chief of the tribe of Christ, greeting: The humblest of your servants kisses the hem of your garments, and begs you to send to his fellow servants more gospel and less rum. In the bonds of Christ. UGALIA.'"

The Holy Carpet has gone, as usual, from Cairo to Mecca; but many intending pilgrims have been scared by the early outbreak of cholera. Even Muslims are becoming too infected with rationalism to fancy that the holiness of the carpet will ward off disease germs.

Catholicism has been defined as a religion of candle-grease; but this definition will no longer serve, since the Pope has given his sanction to illuminating churches by electricity, except on the altars, which, as before, will only be lighted by wax candles or lamps with olive oil, the altar being specially dedicated to God, who is fond of the old fashions.

Mariano Gentile, the millionaire, who died recently at Messina, left his immense fortune to the Jesuits, although he had many poor relations. The fact has caused much indignation in Sicily.

The foundation-stone of the projected Roman Catholic cathedral for Westminster will be laid by Cardinal Vaughan on June 29. There is to be a great gathering of the faithful from all parts on this occasion. According to the prophecy of the leading Catholic organ in this country, the crowd will be the "biggest ever gathered for a single service since the time of the Reformation." Perhaps it will be, and perhaps not. In any case, the London *Echo* says, it will not be a bigger crowd than other religious bodies, "or even Secularists," could bring together, if they made as great efforts as the Roman Catholics have made to secure a gigantic display. Still, it is no use blinking the fact that the Catholic Church is making headway in England. It seems destined to absorb a large part of the Protestant Church; and, as Charles Bradlaugh predicted, the great fight of the future will be between Catholicism and Freethought—the two logical extremes of Faith and Reason.

The confession of Arthur Orton, the "Tichborne claimant," whose case excited so much attention about twenty years ago, ought to remind people of the little weight to be given to popular judgment of evidence. The mass held that the claimant, having been recognised by his mother, in the dark, must be the real Sir Roger, and, with his counsel, Dr. Kenealy, he was, for a time, one of the most popular men of the day. Such facts should serve as a warning against the too ready reception of strange stories of years gone by.

W. D. Howells, the American novelist, in a recent interview, said: "I do not go to church, because the sermons I am likely to hear make me antagonistic. I feel that I want to get right up in my seat and refute, then and there, many of the dogmas and arguments of the so-called Christian life."

The Messiah business is not as flourishing as in the old days. Mr. Christ Koresh Teed has suspended his *Flaming Sword*; the prophet, T. L. Harris, who captivated Laurence Oliphant, and was said to have been rejuvenated, is showing signs of age, and losing the regard of young lady followers; and Christ Schweinfurth, known as the Rockford Messiah, has been indicted by the grand jury of Waukegan county, with three of his "angels," who, it is said, have become mothers under his ministry, professedly through the instrumentality of the Holy Ghost. They are charged with living in open defiance of morality. It always was a risky profession.

At a banquet of ministers in Chicago, on the evening of May 1, Fred L. Chapman, editor of a church paper, said he had thoroughly investigated the cost of conversions in that city, and he found that each soul saved by the Baptists cost \$285; by the Methodists, \$384; the Presbyterians, \$533, and the Congregationalists, \$580, the average being \$443. Under the law of competition it would appear that the Baptists will ultimately possess the earth.

Under the heading, "A Christianised Kafir," the Pretoria *Press*, of South Africa, reports the case of a native charged with rape and attempted murder. It says: "The accused was a member of a choir of Christian natives in this city. A hymn-book was found near the scene of the struggle, and, after being arrested, he asked for a Bible, which he said had been in his pocket." Perhaps he had been reading the choice stories in the book of Judges, how the Israelites took the daughters of Shiloh, and how the Levite treated his concubine.

It is reported that a son of Mr. Frederic Harrison, the famous Positivist, has just joined the Catholic Church. Our readers will remember that Mrs. Besant's daughter was recently reported to have joined the same community. Those who are tired of thinking, or incapable of it, find Catholicism a soft pillow for their poor heads.

In the case of the young lady librarian who sued a man of God at Los Angeles for a slander uttered in public prayer, the court decided that no prayer containing a slander, publicly uttered, can be exempt from the legal consequences, and that no communication made by a pastor to his congregation is privileged because of such relation.

On Sunday, at Clermont Ferrand, they celebrated, with a grand historical cavalcade, the eighth centenary of the First Crusade which Pope Urban II. preached at Clermont, and which the people received with shouts of "God wills it." The religious wars then began lasted for centuries, involved millions of lives, and finally left the hated Moslem in possession of the holy places at Jerusalem, while Turkish soldiers still have to keep the peace between rival Christian sects.

It is noted as a somewhat curious coincidence that, just as the Crusades are occupying the public mind in Paris once more, arrangements are being made for building a Mohammedan mosque in Paris.

In Paris there is now open a Buddhist Temple, so M. Lafont assures us in his new book on Buddhism. He also mentions that he knows of Christian missionaries, sent out to convert the Buddhists, who became adepts of the Buddhist faith.

Dean Farrar has just issued a book on *The Lord's Prayer*, which is advertised in the *Spectator* as "Most racy and readable." Has the new Dean been perusing the *Freethinker*, and has he caught its profane infection?

The Rev. Scott Hershey, of Boston, is reported as saying that there are two millions of young men in America "who are practical and theoretical unbelievers in the Christian religion, through the influence of Colonel Ingersoll." Let us hope it is true.

Four youths have been charged before the Dover magistrates with playing football on Sunday. The gravamen of the charge was that the game "was played during the hours of divine service." But as it was not played near a church the case was dismissed. Those four youths have much to be thankful for. In the old Bible days a man was put to death for picking up firewood on the Sabbath. Playing football would have meant roasting alive, at the very least.

Last Sunday evening a sermon on "The Use of Atheists" was preached at Westminster Chapel by W. Evans Hurndall, M.A. The chapel is a large edifice, and the preacher (as we are informed by a friend who attended) was a man of eloquence. But he knew little of Atheism. He admitted the brilliancy of the Atheistic attack on Christianity, and alluded in highly complimentary language to the late Charles Bradlaugh; but he told his congregation that Atheism was "sin in its most shocking form," and that the Atheist had "no reason to lead a moral life." Mr. Hurndall mistakes his little tabernacle for the illimitable universe. He doesn't understand any way of being good but his own; and he forgets that the most immoral men of the age are professed Christians.

Parson Collins, of Blisland, near Bodmin, in Cornwall, has medieval notions as to the function and power of the Church. Four lads in his parish committed an assault on a servant girl, and the parson induced her to forgive them out of consideration for their parents. Two of the culprits agreed to go to church, confess their crime, and receive absolution. This they did, and after the service they distributed £2 worth of bread at the church gates, by way of penance. There was a great concourse of people and plenty of laughter and horseplay. One lad gave away the bread, and the other spooned out treacle from a big tin, while a member of the militia band discoursed upon a trombone. "Bread and treacle Sunday" will long be remembered in the parish. Whether morality has gained anything by the parson's interference we leave our readers to decide for themselves.

A "Christian Israelite" who has "served the Lord for forty years" advertises for some "kind Christian friend" to lend him £30. What on earth, or elsewhere, is Jesus Christ doing? Why doesn't he come to the relief of this servant? The streets of the New Jerusalem are paved with gold, and a few ounces might easily be spared (say when they are repaving) for a found sheep of the House of Israel.



Mr. Foote's Engagements.

Sunday, May 19, Hall of Science, 142 Old-street, London, E.C. : 7.30, "The Flight of the Jerusalem Ghost."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

MR. CHARLES WATTS'S ENGAGEMENTS.—May 26, Manchester. June 9, Camberwell.—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.

C. DOUG.—See paragraph. Liverpool is a big city, and should give Mr. Putnam big audiences. We note your memorandum re the old matter.

J. W. GOTT.—Glad to hear the Bradford Secularists were so pleased with Mr. Putnam. He will make friends, and keep them, wherever he goes.

W. WITTY (Hull).—Some comparative moral statistics of the religions in India appeared in the *Freethinker* of March 17.

A. McINNES (Glasgow).—As you are "a follower of Jesus," he may know something about you. We don't. It is kind of you to invite us to answer your letters in a Birmingham paper. Perhaps it is equally kind on our part to decline your invitation.

J. F. HAINES.—Shall appear in our next.

RECRUIT.—Pleased to hear that you thought Mr. Foote's lecture "grand and instructive." Father Furniss's *Sight of Hell*, denounced by "Dangle" in the *Clarion*, has often been held up to abhorrence in Freethought journals.

JAMES NEATE.—See paragraph.

PAT.—Joseph Barker was for a brief period co-editor of the *National Reformer* with Charles Bradlaugh. It was more than thirty years ago. Joseph Barker did return to Christianity, and the English Freethinkers thought it was because he could not "boss the show." He was a man of frequent changes, and nearly boxed the compass of opinion.

G. LOVETT.—Marchant is entitled to his opinion that he succeeded in closing Secular meeting-places. He is not cut out to do anything of the kind. Mr. Foote is perfectly indifferent to Marchant's opinion of him. He is content to let his pamphlets on the Atheist Shoemaker and the Hall of Science Libel Case speak for themselves. They will produce their effect on persons accessible to reason. Other persons must be left to their natural stupidity.

G. SWEDLEY.—(1) We do not remember such a sentence in Mr. Holyoake's writings. He is an Atheist himself, and the author of a very interesting and instructive *Trial of Theism*. It is impossible that he can regard an Atheist as "one who is without morality," though he may have said, and said truly, that the vulgar generally regard an Atheist in that light. (2) Lord Bacon's views on Atheism are expressed in his two essays on "Atheism" and "Superstition." There is a careful article on his lordship's criticism of Atheism in the second volume of Mr. Foote's *Flowers of Freethought*. (3) Catholic monasteries and nunneries are not subject to government inspection. They are treated as private houses. (4) We are quite satisfied that such institutions have been the scenes of grave scandals, and that they should be subject to inspection, in the common interest of human liberty.

J. K. MAAGAARD.—Shall appear.

C. W. SMITH.—The *Chronicle* correspondence on "Is Christianity Played Out?" appeared early in 1892, we believe.

J. KEAST.—Sorry to hear there are threats of disorder at the Bristol open-air meetings. We hope the local Secularists will support the Branch platform.

J. BURRELL.—Thanks. See paragraph.

THOR.—Shall appear.

S. H. ALISON says he is in Scotland for an indefinite period, and cannot book any dates for London Branches.

A. ADAMS, secretary, desires us to state that the Hull Branch has decided to discontinue its meetings during the summer. They will be resumed on the first Sunday in October.

A. C. L.—Cuttings are always welcome.

ABRAHAM.—Thanks for your interesting letter. The verses shall appear.

F. C. SMITH.—We are obliged for the copy of the Theosophist pamphlet, but we think we have given sufficient attention to Mrs. Besant, unless we notice a fresh development in her meteoric career. We dare say there will be something to report from Mr. Putnam's letters when the *Truthseeker* arrives.

J. BAUMERS.—Next week. Thanks.

A. J. WOODWARD.—The joke is an old one. We told it and printed it years ago.

PAPERS RECEIVED.—Dorby Daily Telegraph—Chat—Crescent—Accrington Advertiser—Islamic World—Twentieth Century—Post—Willesden Chronicle—Public Opinion—Open Court—Two Worlds—Birkenhead News—Light—Solidarity—Truthseeker—Progressive Thinker—Boston Guardian—Liberator—Leaves of Healing—Secular Thought—Boston Investigator—Echo—Isle of Man Times—Preston Guardian—Hull Times—Ilfracombe Gazette—Western Morning News—Morning—Builder's Journal.

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.

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

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.

ORDERS for literature should be sent to Mr. R. Forder, 28 Stonecutter-street, 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*:—One inch, 4s. 6d.; half column, £1 2s. 6d.; column, £2 5s. Special terms for repetitions.

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.

THE HALL OF SCIENCE.

SINCE my return from Derby I have been ploughing through tremendous arrears of work. During my absence from London I left certain critical matters in the hands of Miss Vance, who carried out my instructions with tact and loyalty. I desire to express the highest appreciation of the energy and attention she has displayed during the recent trouble in connection with the Hall.

The audience, on Sunday evening, were comfortably seated, and everything looked as usual. They little knew the narrow escape we had run, or what labor and anxiety had been incurred.

Owing to my preoccupation with so much other work—to say nothing of other reasons—I must defer giving the history of this Hall of Science affair. But I am thoroughly resolved to give it before the N.S.S. Conference, and therefore I shall give it in next week's *Freethinker*, unless the paper or I should be dead before then.

And really a Secular leader is liable to curious dangers. I have met with several madmen in my time, and a week or two ago I met with one who is now in an asylum. He called at the office and wanted to see me alone for a few minutes. I did not grant him the interview, but advised him to go home and see a doctor. He left a basket at the office, which he would call for presently. When the police opened it they found several things, including a nice, sharp carving-knife.

With respect to the Hall of Science, it will be remembered that Mr. R. O. Smith would not promise to extend the time of his offer to the end of May. So far as the time is concerned, after what has just happened, he cannot help himself. I am therefore keeping the matter open. At the finish he will either come to terms or he will not, and in any case I presume he will consult his own interest and convenience, so that it is not so very difficult to make a reasonable calculation.

A Dublin friend, who promises to take ten shares, expresses his surprise that my appeal has to be continued. He imagined that the £600 would be raised in a few weeks at the outside. In his own mind there is no doubt whatever as to the necessity of maintaining headquarters for our party in London.

Some Lancashire friends, who have previously subscribed to various objects in our movement, say they do not understand why the London friends cannot raise the £600 themselves. "How is it," said one of them to us, "that a well-to-do Londoner doesn't come along and say, Here is the whole £600 for you?" There is some force in the observation. But, on the other side, it must be said that London has furnished the major part of what has been received from this appeal; and that, after all, the provincial friends are not uninterested in the maintenance of headquarters in London. The metropolis is really a national centre, and a success in it reacts favorably upon the entire country.

I want Secularists, in the provinces as well as in London, to regard this matter very seriously during the next week or so; and to apply for shares, or to forward donations, during that period.

A Christian opponent at the Hall of Science on Sunday evening declared that if I devoted what he called my

"brains and eloquence" to Christianity, I should not need to appeal so long for £600. Perhaps not. But I make allowance for the relative poverty and disadvantages of Secularists. Still, I do think that the amount should be more than realised by the end of May.

The few donations that have reached me since last week will be acknowledged in the next issue of this journal. I will also state the exact number of shares applied for, the total of subscriptions, and the amount of conditional promises. Reckoning these we are not far off the requisite figure, and a little fresh effort should carry us to the point of success.

I desire to correct a misapprehension of my closing remarks last week. I do not mean to act—indeed I cannot act—except in concert with the Board of Directors and the shareholders of the National Secular Hall Society (Limited). If they do not approve my plan, I shall be unable to carry it out. If they do approve it, I recognise no right on the part of others to any sort of objection. All our troubles at the Hall have arisen from conflicting powers and divided responsibilities. My own view is that an enterprise in which money is sunk should be conducted on business principles; and I shall be much astonished if that view does not commend itself to the Directors and the Shareholders.

G. W. FOOTE.

## SUGAR PLUMS.

Mr. FOOTE occupied the London Hall of Science platform on Sunday evening, and lectured to a good audience on "Riddles of the Sphinx." He was listened to with profound attention, and tremendously applauded at the finish. Mr. Touzeau Parris, who kindly came and took the chair, said that such a lecture ought to have been heard in a hall twice the size and packed to the doors. He was glad to know that the President of the N.S.S. was one who could give real thought, as well as time and energy, to the work of the movement. Mr. Parris made an earnest appeal for support to the Hall scheme, which had his heartiest sympathy. His remarks on this point were supplemented by the lecturer; after which there was some good-tempered discussion. Mr. Foote lectures at the Hall of Science again this evening (May 26), taking for his subject "The Flight of the Jerusalem Ghost"—*apropos* of the Whitsuntide celebration.

The *Derby Daily Telegraph* devotes an editorial to the recent debate between Messrs. Foote and Lee. The following extract from this article will interest our readers: "For obvious reasons we shall make no attempt to report, even in summarised form, the arguments adduced; and we have the less hesitation in adopting this course because arrangements were made by the disputants themselves to have the debate reported at length and published in pamphlet form. But the considerations at which we have hinted need not stand in the way of our bearing testimony to the skill and ability with which the two opponents sustained their parts. Both men are born debaters. To earnestness of conviction, and the rare gift of submitting complex matter in an attractive form, they unite oratorical powers of a really brilliant type. Mr. Lee, despite his connection with the West of England, furnishes evidence, in moments of fervid declamation, of Hibernian origin. That he loves his work—that his heart and soul are in it, no listener to his eloquent appeals could fail to perceive. On Thursday he was manifestly suffering from weakness—he had, it transpired, been compelled to spend most of the day in bed—but he entered upon his task with an ardor which never failed him, and with a fascinating fluency which never for a moment flagged. Mr. Foote is more deliberate in his utterances, but his phraseology bespeaks the scholar no less than the elocutionist, and at times he rises to a very high level of oratorical expression. A more vivid and impassioned peroration than the one with which he brought Wednesday's meeting to a close it has rarely been our fortune to hear. We can pay its author no higher compliment than to say that it awakened recollections of Charles Bradlaugh in his best days. It is pleasant to be able to say the debate was marked by mutual courtesy. Mr. Lee gave to his conclusions the broadest basis. He made it clear, as may be imagined, that he was a whole-hearted believer in Theistic doctrine; but there was no suggestion, however remote, of the sectarian spirit. Mr. Foote, for his part, was studiously careful to avoid the aggressive style which debaters were accustomed to adopt a generation back. That he advanced many points and drew many conclusions which were distasteful to some of his hearers will, of course, be understood; but there was throughout a manifest desire on his part to uphold the dignity of the debate. The close

interest with which the argumentative duel was followed was quite remarkable. On each evening the spacious building was crowded, many being unable to find sitting accommodation. Now and again there was a disposition on the part of a few sensitive listeners to interrupt the outspoken advocate of Freethought; but, in the main, Mr. Foote was well and patiently listened to, and his own sympathisers in the room did not fail to punctuate his more powerful arguments with hearty cheers. It is hardly necessary to say that the great majority of the listeners—who included a good many ladies—were favorably disposed towards Mr. Lee, whose reception was of a most enthusiastic description."

Mr. Charles Watts had a capital audience at the Secular Hall, Camberwell, last Sunday evening. His lecture was enthusiastically applauded. Mr. Roger made an excellent chairman. Mr. Clarke, of the Christian Evidence Society, offered some opposition, and invited the lecturer to a public discussion, which Mr. Watts declined. Our colleague wishes it to be understood that he cannot meet third- or fourth-rate men in set debate. He is quite ready to discuss with representative Christians, but with no others.

To-day, Sunday, May 26, Mr. Watts lectures three times in the Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, Manchester. Of course, he will have good audiences.

Mr. S. P. Putnam, our American visitor, delivered three lectures to good audiences at Bradford on Sunday. His addresses were highly appreciated, and all who were present look forward with great pleasure to the time when Mr. Putnam will visit England again. At the close of the day's work a very hearty vote of thanks was accorded to the lecturer. It was coupled with a request that he would try to induce Colonel Ingersoll to visit the old country.

Liverpool friends will note that Mr. Putnam lectures in their city to-day (May 26). They will, of course, do their very best to give him crowded meetings in the Oddfellows' Hall. Many friends within easy railway distance of Liverpool will probably take this opportunity of seeing and hearing the President of the American Secular Union. In the chances and changes of things some of them may never have another opportunity; they should therefore seize this one.

The Battersea Branch, in defiance of the "sanctity of the Sabbath," is going to have a special entertainment and dance this evening (May 26) at 8. Members of the N.S.S. and their friends are heartily welcome. The tickets (3d. and 6d.) can be obtained at the Secular Hall or at the outdoor meeting. The proceeds will go to the Branch exchequer, which is in a depleted condition.

The Bethnal Green Branch deserves great credit for the brave way in which it has carried on the open-air propaganda in Victoria Park. It has had to suffer a good deal from Christian rowdiness, but it has never been intimidated. Last Sunday afternoon, we regret to say, it had another painful experience. A man called Eislein, who at one time asked assistance of Secularists on the ground that he was "a gentlemanly opponent of Atheism," has lately revealed himself in his true colors. He heads a band of rowdies who molest our speakers and disturb our meetings in Victoria Park. On Sunday afternoon this person's brutal tactics led to a scene of great disorder. We appeal to Freethinkers in the neighborhood to rally round the Victoria Park platform, and assist in maintaining order against these fanatical followers of the meek and lowly Jesus.

Delegates and individual members who will attend the National Secular Society's Annual Conference at Bristol, and who desire to have hotel accommodation secured for them, should communicate with the local Branch secretary, Mr. J. Keast, 32 Morgan-street, St. Paul's, Bristol.

Little time is now left to make arrangements for the Conference. The local Branch has everything ready as far as Bristol is concerned. All that now remains is for the Branches all over the country to see that they are represented. We hope to see a large gathering on Whit-Sunday.

The special Committee of the Bristol Branch will show the delegates places of interest on Whit-Sunday, as far as the time permits; and on the Monday they hope to have a pleasant outing with as many friends as can stay over.

The Manchester Branch has for some months supplied copies of the *Free Review* to the various Free Libraries in the city, numbering sixteen in all. The Libraries Committee have now undertaken to supply the magazine themselves. Up to the present the Branch has not been successful in its efforts to introduce the *Freethinker*, but it will make another attempt shortly.

## REPLY TO MR. PUTNAM.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Had you, as Chairman at the Hall of Science last Sunday evening, not deprecated (though you did not actually forbid) discussion after the lecture of the President of the American Secular Union, on "Freethought," I should certainly have at once offered myself as a speaker.

But though I considered Mr. Putnam's account of Christianity as a complete travesty of the facts, and therefore thought it called for some criticism from myself before the audience dispersed, I could not overlook your appeal to those present to spare the lecturer additional fatigue; especially as, when my name was called out, by someone unknown to me, your brief comment was a distinct discouragement of my being put forward as a representative of the Christian side: the instincts of a gentleman compelled silence on my part. Besides, whatever may be the views and utterances of American Freethinkers, they are men of like passions with Christians; and I could not help myself what warmly sympathising with the very genuine friendliness of the reception of a Transatlantic cousin. Had I spoken, my first words would have been those of welcome from an Englishman to one of the great English-speaking—and, in the main, English-feeling—Republic, unbroken amity with which would almost mean peace for the whole world.

But, as my abstinence from the discussion was due only to the reasons already given, I think it is due to me, or rather to Christianity—actual Christianity, not Mr. Putnam's presentment of it—that I should be permitted to state my criticisms of his statements in your columns, especially as I desire mainly to name certain facts which it will be wise for him to take into account before he commences his lectures in the provinces.

I.—In the first place, then, he went out of his way to nail his colors to the mast, by defining what he understood by Christianity. He distinctly restricted it to—made it co-terminous with—belief in these doctrines: (a) the total depravity of all mankind; (b) the vicarious sacrifice of Christ; (c) eternal damnation. And he added that faith was, for Christians, everything, and conduct and character nothing. And, further, he insisted that his definition was true of historical Christianity.

Under these circumstances, I need not go into the question whether the above-stated definition agrees with the New Testament or not; though my criticism would certainly not lose force by such an appeal. A reference to history (a) past, (b) present, will suffice.

(a) It is surely not unreasonable to appeal for the general Christian view of doctrine to what is, *par excellence*, the Christian summary of belief—the Apostles' Creed. Compare that Creed with Mr. Putnam's definition; and, though I am in no way desirous to minimise any common ground, I call upon the President of the American Secular Union to show any justification for substituting his statement for the Authorised Version. As to how far the doctrines, as defined by him, are in accordance with, or in antagonism to, those held by myself, I will state very briefly later on.

(b) For I will now pass from the Christian creed of the Ages to consider it in our own times. From the very nature of the case, unless he be a Don Quixote charging against windmills, the creed which Mr. Putnam devotes himself to opposing must be that which Christians *actually* hold now. He has surely not crossed the Atlantic to attack that which no longer exists! What, then, is the Christian creed as taught in all our churches and chapels?

It has occurred to me that Mr. Putnam may assert that in America the Christian creed is as he has defined it. I do not care at the moment to say what is or what is not the prevailing doctrine in his great country. I know that those of my own Episcopal Communion there are at one with us here. I know what was the general teaching of the two most-admired preachers in U.S.A. during the last quarter of a century—Mr. H. W. Beecher and Dr. Phillips Brooks. I know what is held by a great many leading American theologians, for I have read their books. And all this, which I know, is wholly against any very marked divergence of doctrine, such as could alone justify Mr. Putnam's statements.

But in England! *Risum tenentis, amici?* I do not ask Mr. Putnam to do it. But supposing some trustworthy English ally of his were to visit every church and chapel in London and large provincial city or town, not once, but many times, what proportion would the three doctrines with which he sums up Christianity bear to the general teaching of the preachers? At the most, a not large percentage.

Now I return to my own views. As to the "total depravity of all mankind," I entirely object to the phrase; but I entirely believe that the Fall is universal. As far as anything can be known by observation of all cases verifiable, every human being I have known has been sinful. As to the "vicarious sacrifice of Christ," I entirely believe in it, and believe it to be so much in accordance with the universe, as

it is known to us, that, did Christianity not teach it, it might appear opposed to fundamental natural laws. As to "eternal damnation," I accept what the New Testament says, but take the words therein written in their natural sense, by which I mean their connotation in the minds of the original speakers, hearers, writers, and readers.

(1) Archdeacon Farrar—now Dean of Canterbury—in his speech at the Manchester Church Congress, October 5, 1888, brought forward a mass of details: (a) as to the meaning of such words as "eternal"; (b) as to various views on the subject of "eternal punishment" held by the Church of Christ at various times of its long history, which anyone, honestly desiring to form a just opinion, should know. I am in no way referring to Dr. Farrar's views. I am simply calling attention to what he named as *his* facts.

(2) I also spoke on the same subject at that Congress, and named the opinion which I have, for nearly fifteen years, constantly expressed—*i.e.*, that belief is not at all the same as a creed, and that a so-called "infidel" may often be far more of a believer in God and in Christ than those intellectually accepting the Christian creed. I hold that it is natural and reasonable that the phrase, "belief in," in the Bible should mean what it means in ordinary life; and that, therefore, the man who shows every mark of the spirit of Christ is a believer in Christ. I fancy that many "infidels" will be in a future state (or, rather, are in the spiritual world now existing) far higher than multitudes of fairly sincere Christians; and everything I read about Christ in the Gospels, of which the latter half of St. Matthew xxv. is one remarkable instance, confirms me in this view. Nor do I recollect that any Christian to whom I have explained it has objected to it as un-Christian.

(3) But, as the name of Farrar may almost prejudice many against his views, and my opinion may be regarded as of little value, I will now bring forward the testimony of one whose ecclesiastical and theological learning was gigantic, whom no one could accuse of being Latitudinarian, and who, as his *Life* proves, was the last man to yield an iota of what he regarded as true dogma or Catholic truth in deference to the wishes or denunciations of the religious parties who might, at any given time during his career, be dominant in the Church. I mean Dr. Pusey.

In his volume, *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?* he states, as expressing the orthodox view of the Universal Church: "None will be lost whom God can save without destroying in them His own gift of freewill. None will be lost who do not obstinately to the end, and in the end, refuse God." Substitute in that quotation, for "God," "the ever-living Being Who is infinite Love and Truth and Equity and Holiness and Wisdom and Power," which sums up the Christian idea of God, and it would seem that the belief of the Church of Christ simply endorses the cry of Abraham, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?"

But to return to my main present thesis—*viz.*, the immense difference between Mr. Putnam's definition of the Christian creed and the creed itself, both past and present. How did that difference come about? Well, the only person who can fully explain it is that gentleman himself. Still, one may conjecture that, for his own purposes, he has chosen to name as the true Christian creed that which undoubtedly was for a long time very dominant in America, though never in England or on the continent of Europe. He has, I presume, Calvinism in view; but even in America Calvinism has, I believe, ceased to be dominant. The present danger in America—I speak from the Christian point of view—is not that too much Calvinism is preached, but that its many noble elements are likely to be overlooked and forgotten—*e.g.*, its splendid testimony to the exceeding sinfulness of sin, and to Christ being the only Savior from sin.

II.—But I have not yet done with Mr. Putnam's definition of the Christian faith. I have dealt with it as regards the Church's creed, but I have hardly touched at all so far on his statement—which it is difficult to quote without indignation—that "faith was, for Christians, everything, and conduct and character nothing."

I have already pointed out that faith in the Bible covers conduct and character; but it is better, because simpler, to ask whether any considerable section of the Christian Church has ever held a view so dishonoring to God and so lowering for man. Did Calvinists, when they were dominant in what is now the U.S.A., speak lightly of holiness? Were they indifferent to conduct and character? Was it not the very nobility of their lives which almost commended what was narrow and untrue in their setting forth of the creed? Is Mr. Putnam so ignorant of the history of his own people as not to recognise that, to their indomitable resolution and martyr spirit, and zeal for righteousness and abhorrence of falsehood, the American Republic, to a great extent, owes its very existence? Again, he has probably heard of Mr. Moody, a renowned American Evangelist, who has more than once visited our shores. Would it not be unjust to the last degree to say of Mr. Moody that he had not with burning enthusiasm declared the absolute necessity of a converted life, full of goodness in thought and word and deed?

But, taking the widest view possible, whom has the Christian Church ever honored the most? Why, the saints. And what does "saint" mean but an eminently good man—loving, humble, self-sacrificing, truthful, honest, just, temperate, pure?

III.—And this leads me, in conclusion, to contrast so-called "Freethought" and the Christianity Mr. Putnam has crossed the Atlantic to oppose. As he is a stranger here, he ought to be thankful to me for naming some facts emphasising the contrast.

(a) He was in the "Hall of Science." Is science taught there now? Not much, I think. I am not at all a likely person to be unjust to "Freethinkers." Often the sense of their extreme weakness in numbers, and in means, and in power, so appeals to my feelings of pity that I would fain abstain from drawing attention to that weakness. And so it was that, when three ladies of great intelligence and earnestness were, for a time, holding classes in the Hall of Science, I went out of my way in conversation with Christians, and in speaking to Freethinkers in the hall itself, to draw attention to the extraordinarily high percentage of honors attained by Mrs. Besant, Mrs. Bonner, and Miss Bradlaugh's pupils. *But how long did this last?* A few years only; then—I believe I am right in saying so—the classes ceased to exist in that hall. What had gained my sincere admiration turned out to be a mere flash in the pan; and I could not help thinking of the old Christian standard of "patient continuance in well-doing." And, because I was almost more than fair to Freethinkers, I am entitled to point to the hundreds and thousands of Christians who, with no desire for popularity, and out of pure love of their kind, continue, year after year, in ceaseless efforts for the intellectual (for I am not now speaking of the spiritual) improvement of their younger brothers and sisters. A single Christian man, Mr. Quintin Hogg, out of his own resources, has done more for the scientific education of the millions of our metropolis than fifty Secular Halls of Science (*if they had existed!*) would have done in a century!

(b) I repeat, Mr. Putnam was in the "Hall of Science." It is the cathedral of his English comrades. It does not strike one by its vast dimensions. It is not very noble in its architecture. Its adornments are not remarkable. In the same street is St. Luke's Church. It is in a poor neighborhood, with small resources. From mere curiosity I looked in last Sunday night, and was astonished at its dimensions, its architecture, and its adornments. I had anticipated nothing of the kind.

But, farther, how many "Halls of Science" or the like are there in the country? There is one at Leicester. Are there ten of any pretension in the whole of England? I trow not. But churches—why there are, I suppose, from 10,000 to 15,000; and in saying that I am speaking of the Church of England only.

Again, you, Mr. Editor, congratulated Mr. Putnam on the very large attendance. Well, the hall was crowded, but it was an altogether exceptional occasion, and there are many Nonconformist chapels which can boast a congregation far larger every Sunday in the year. *Why is that?* Have you, after all, made a mistake as to human nature, and have we blunder-headed Christians, by some happy piece of luck, managed to come into touch with the great heart of humanity?

(c) Once more, Mr. Putnam was in the "Hall of Science," the English headquarters of Secularism. If Secularism fails to be secular, where does it expect to succeed? Well, Mr. Putnam can inquire of you what Secularists are doing—of you, Mr. Editor, and all your lieutenants, who are for ever denouncing us for our lack of good deeds, as is natural, considering our creed knows nothing of "conduct and character." I do not mean "doing" on the platform or in the press, but I mean in good works. I urge him to inquire carefully how many children the members of the National Secular Society instruct, how many sick persons they visit, how many poor they relieve, how many hospitals they provide, how many drunkards they reclaim, how many of their fallen sisters they restore to the paths of virtue, to how many mourners they speak words of comfort. This is good secular work, is it not? I do not ask Mr. Putnam to inquire how much you talk about these works of mercy, but how many you do. And Christians—what of them? I will take but one single instance, though in my own experience I have known, and sometimes taken part in, scores of a like character.

Last Sunday morning I received by post the May number of the *Plaistow Parish Messenger*. I put it in my pocket to refer to when my opportunity came in the evening to reply to Mr. Putnam. That opportunity you did not offer, so I refer to that "Church Monthly" now. You will, I am sure, recollect that not so many years ago Secularism was jubilant in Plaistow, London over the Border. It had a local habitation (not always its good fortune elsewhere), the Cromwell Club. That Club, by the way, had rather a bad name in the neighborhood. It was not, I have been told, a centre of "light and leading." The Club has long departed from the building. The Christian Evidence Society gives lectures in it now, and Christianity is *doing* something for the 21,000 odd persons in that desperately poor parish.

What is it doing? Of course, nothing as regards the improvement of "conduct and character," for Mr. Putnam is quite clear about that. That was what the Secular Cromwell Club existed for; Christianity, historically, never! How ever, I open Mr. Given-Wilson's "Church Monthly." In it are many things of a religious and spiritual character; but, as these are to the Presidents of the N.S.S. and the A.S.U. what a red rag is to a bull, I will not hurt your feelings by naming them. I will speak only of the secular undertakings it records. (1) "Our Labor Fund." (2) "Children's Annual Excursion." (3) "St. Mary's Day Nursery." (4) "St. Mary's Hospital for Sick Children." (5) "St. Mary's Medical Mission." (6) "St. Mary's Home for Children." (7) "St. Monica's Home of Rest for Women." (8) "St. Mary's Parish Sale Room." (9) "St. Mary's Garment Society." (10) "The Annual Parochial Tea." (11) "St. Mary's Gymnasium." (12) "Church of England Temperance Society." I observe, also, that there are acknowledgments of gifts from just 250 persons. You will pardon me for naming the saints so often; I must apologise for such hypocrites and fanatics having, by some sort of accident, got connected with secular works of mercy. It has just occurred to me that I am sadly mistaken. Mr. Given-Wilson is a Freethinker in disguise, and, had he not been Jesuitical, he would have omitted all the saints and put instead the "N.S.S.'s Day Nursery," the N.S.S.'s Hospital," etc. As to the 250 contributors, they must certainly be *habitués* of the Hall of Science, Old-street.

This is, indeed, a subject for inquiry. Should my surmise be justified by facts, these generous Freethinkers, who in their modesty pose as Christians, must no longer bring credit to that detested name, but avow themselves for what they are—the only honest men. But, in the meantime, I will ask Mr. Putnam to inquire whether all the adherents of the N.S.S., through the length and breadth of England, do as many secular good works as one vicar of a poor parish, and those who respond to his appeals.

C. LLOYD ENGSTRÖM,  
Secretary of the Christian Evidence Society.  
13 Buckingham-street, Strand, W.C., May 11, 1895.

## DON'T RAKE UP OLD GRIEVANCES.

THE spook of the Rev. H. P. Hue,  
When expelled from Mother Earth,  
With spookily speed to Paradise flew  
To claim his abode with the saintly crew,  
And join in their dismal mirth.

Saint Peter looked out, "Who the dickens are you  
Comes hammering thus at the gate?"  
"I'm the spook of the Rev. H. P. Hue,  
Who so long have harassed the infidel crew,  
Come at last in a sanctified state."

"Nay, nay," said Saint Peter, "that story won't do;  
Your lying is known too well.  
If you are the Rev. H. P. Hue,  
You know that all liars must get their due  
With the fibbers that frizzle in hell."

But the spook of the Rev. H. P. Hue  
Smole a Cheshire grimalkin's smile,  
As shrilly he crowed "Cock-a-doodle-doo,"  
And made St. Pete look exceedingly blue,  
As he stirred up his heavenly bile.

"For God sake," he cried, "come in, Brother Hue;  
Don't rake up that wretched old score;  
My skin was at stake when that d—d rooster crew.  
But just let it drop, and I promise you true  
That I'll mention shoemakers no more."  
T. CLARK.

Here is a good specimen of honest prayer, said to have been made by a disappointed Scotch immigrant: "O Lord, we, thy disobedient children, approach thee this night in the attitude o' prayer (an' likewise o' complaint). When we cam tae Canady, we expectit to find a land flowin' wi' milk an' honey. Instead o' that, we foun' a place peoplit wi' ungodly Irish. Scoor them oot, drag them o'er the mooth o' the bottomless pit, but ye needna let 'em drap in. Drive them to the uttermost pairts o' Canady. Mak' them but hewers o' wood and drawers of water; but, O Lord, we'er mak' them magistrates, members of Parliament, nor any kind o' rulers o'er the people. An', O Lord, gin ye hae got ony lan' tae gie awa', gie tae thine ain peculiar people, the Scotch. An' the glory be all thine ain. Amen." —*Toronto Secular Thought.*

PROGRESS IN AMERICA.

As an instance of how the work of Ingersoll and the "infidels" is telling on American opinion, we cut the following from an article contributed by Mr. R. B. Marsh to the *Non-Sectarian* :—

"The Bible idea of the ways and times in which this earth and man began to be ; of man's fall, and the curse upon him and the earth ; of the need of an atonement, were all well enough when men knew no better, and could not see any higher ; but when these ideas were used to check, to torture, and to kill those who tried to read God's real book, then it was harmful, and was the moving cause and justification of great injustice and wrong. We know there was no 'Fall,' no curse ; that labor is the salvation, not the curse, of the race ; especially that God could not have been circumvented, surprised, angered, or led to repent. We cannot believe that a woman was an after-thought, nor that she was the author of man's sin, or the cause of his 'fall.' We do know that polygamy, slavery, wars of conquest, persecution for belief's sake, have been, and some of them yet are, excused and justified by many passages in the Bible. When men are so far inspired by the spirit of the truth that wherein the Bible and the creeds oppose facts and righteous acts they can say, 'All the worse for the Bible,' as the anti-slavery men said when told that the Bible taught slavery, all will then be well, and we will cease to object.

"The common view of the merits of Christ are based on the Fall and the Curse, though Jesus never referred to them. We do not believe that Jesus could have had as truthful a view of the laws of the universe as we have to-day. His idea of prayer, since he knew little of natural law, may not be true. If believers can have anything they ask for, we have had no true believers ; and we can easily see that nothing would so quickly and surely ruin the race as that way of getting things done. We cannot believe that Jesus is the sole hope of the race, since but a small part of the world has ever heard of him, and the ages before his time could not have accepted him. If God is limited in his 'plan' by so narrow a 'scheme' as this, our belief in him and reverence for him would suffer such a shock that nothing but cowardly fear could induce us to worship him."

Witches.

"O. J. L." says—and says truly—that (theological) "Christianity decidedly holds that" communication between the seen and the unseen world "is not only a possibility, but an absolute, unquestionable fact"; and he might have gone on to add that it holds with equal decision the reality of demoniacal possession, of divination, and of sorcery generally. Now, is there one syllable in the entire Bible about the cessation of these supernatural or extra-natural phenomena? An ignorant man at the present day, who has faith in Biblical inspiration, is bound to believe in the existence of witches, sorcerers, evil spirits, diviners, media, and all the rest of it. Not the slightest hint is anywhere given that such persons are ever to cease out of the land as long as the world endures ; and, this being so, the wretched creatures whose pitiful stories you narrate in your leading article had no small amount of justification for their belief that they were dealing with the powers of evil. If, instead of wasting time and money in attempting to make these poor creatures understand subjects which can scarcely by any possibility ever be of any use to them, they were taught that the so-called demoniacs were merely people afflicted with epilepsy and mania, and that the Witch of Endor was nothing but a fortune-teller and ventriloquist, and as big an impostor as any of the scoundrelly "media" who so cruelly and wickedly humbugged poor Miss Florence Marryat, the Clonmel and other ghastly tragedies might well have never happened at all.—*A Fellow of the Royal Astronomical Society, in "English Mechanic."*

How to Help Us.

- (1) Get your newsagent to take a few copies of the *Freethinker* and try to sell them, guaranteeing to take the copies that remain unsold.
- (2) Take an extra copy (or more), and circulate it among your acquaintances.
- (3) Leave a copy of the *Freethinker* now and then in the train, the car, or the omnibus.
- (4) Display, or get displayed, one of our contents-sheets, which are of a convenient size for the purpose. Mr. Forder will send them on application.
- (5) Distribute some of our cheap tracts in your walks abroad, at public meetings, or among the audiences around street-corner preachers.
- (6) Get your newsagent to exhibit the *Freethinker* in the window.

OUR TASK.

SOME people, not over wise, often advise me to let the parsons and theology alone. Why? We, the Freethinkers, began our open attacks upon the Protestant fetish, the Bible, considerably over two hundred years ago. If our attacks had been fruitless, we might have been discouraged, and even dropped the task. But has it been? Is there a single point upon which we have directed our guns which has not suffered? I know of none. We have been answered, refuted, imprisoned, ostracised, abused, slandered, refused the rights of citizens ; but somehow the Christian scholars have been compelled to adopt our principal views and drop the principal ones they formerly held. The early unbelievers who attacked the Bible were very much milder than the Bible's defenders of to-day. They have lost the battle, and we have won. Our views are now in possession of foremost scholars and of the Universities. Then why should we cease to attack the Bible and theology? We must convert the masses, and rescue them from priestly and parsonic bondage. That is our task, and we shall certainly accomplish it.

Besides, people who bid us drop it are unphilosophical. It is only by canvassing the past and present notions of mankind that we can work improvement. All true education must take man as he is, study his present state, and teach him its defects. There is no other basis for true education for the individual or the world. Socrates took the Athenians as they were, canvassed their current and most familiar views and prejudices. So did Plato, Aristotle, and the rest of the philosophers. Not to multiply examples, if the Reformers had not discussed Aristotle and attacked at least the dominant post human folly had assigned to him, they must have labored in vain. Were Aristotle or any other philosopher at present dominating men as that name had done for ages before the Reformation, we should be compelled to attack him in the interests of human advancement. Ay! and if Aristotle had been all his worshippers averred, it was still necessary to attack him, for, right or wrong in his views, his name dominated and enslaved the European intellect. And let me say, an enslaved intellect, even if right in its views, is immensely worse off than a free intellect, even if its main opinions should be false. It is the dominance of an opinion or of a name that man has most to dread. And so now, if Jesus and the Bible were all their votaries say, it would be necessary to attack them both, to rouse thought and doubt and disbelief and keenest criticism, in order to emancipate the human intellect from the thralldom they have produced. Yes, we must begin with man as we find him, if we would work reform. We must canvass the views he holds, whether in politics, social life, or religion. There can be no improvement without this. I defy my critics to name any reform in the history of man which did not spring from a sifting of the prejudices and views before held. There never was, there never can be, a reform without this course being pursued. And our critics themselves see this plainly in other departments of life ; but for some unexplained reason cannot see that it holds good in religion.—*J. Symes, in "Liberator."*

PROFANE JOKES.

"Your new servant girl is very pious, I hear?" "Yes. If she was as careful about the crockery as she is about the Ten Commandments, she would be a jewel."

Pulpit sensationalism has reached a climax in San Francisco, where a young preacher illustrated his sermon on dancing by waltzing through it. It was a very moving discourse.

Missionary—"Has the Lord been good to you since my last visit?" Native—"Yes, de Lord was bery good to us till last spring, when de Debil put it into de head of some man to build a lighthouse on dat p'int, and we hasn't had a wreck since."

Joe—"There goes a man who for ten years never drank liquor, used tobacco in any form, or stayed out after 9 p.m., and never missed a Sunday at church." Bill—"A model man, indeed. Is he a missionary?" Joe—"No ; he's an ex-convict."

"I never take a lad into my employment who does not know his Bible, and know it well," said the smug individual in sombre black. "Quite right, sir," said the sky-pilot, warmly ; "nothing like a knowledge of the Scriptures for fitting a lad for any walk in life." "I find it so," replied the sombre one ; "I am a grave-stone cutter ; and when Christians come to bury a relative they like to have a nice, smooth, fire-insurance text to put on the tomb. They never know where to find those texts, and I make the lads find 'em for 'em. It pays." "Er, yes," said the sky-pilot, as he moved away to think it over.

## 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.) : 7, musical selections ; 7.30, G. W. Foote, "The Flight of the Jerusalem Ghost."  
BATTERSEA SECULAR HALL (back of Battersea Park Station) : 7.45, special entertainment and dance. Tuesday, at 8.30, social gathering.  
CAMBERWELL (North Camberwell Hall, 61 New Church-road) : 7, conversation for members and friends.  
WEST LONDON BRANCH ("Sun in Splendor," Portobello-road, Notting Hill Gate) : Monday, at 8.30, business meeting to discuss the Conference agenda.  
WEST LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Princes' Hall, Piccadilly) : 11.15, Dr. Stanton Coit, "The Workings of Conscience in Shakespeare's Plays."  
WEST HAM SECULAR ETHICAL SOCIETY (61 West Ham-lane) : 7, Councillor Ward, "Nunquam's Merrie England."

## OPEN-AIR PROPAGANDA.

BATTERSEA PARK GATES : 11.30, "The Two Adams."  
CAMBERWELL (Station-road) : 11.30, S. E. Easton, "Is the Bible Man's Highest Guide to Morality?"  
CLERKENWELL GREEN : 11.30, A. B. Moss, "Antidotes to Superstition."  
DEPTFORD BROADWAY : 6.30, debate between W. J. Ramsey and H. Cheavers, "Is the Bible Account of Creation in Accordance with Science?" Thursday, at 8, C. James, "What Think ye of Christ?"  
EDMONTON (corner of Angel-road) : 7, C. James, "God at the Bar of Humanity."  
FINSBURY PARK (near the band-stand) : 11.15, C. Cohen, "The Fruits of Christianity"; 3.15, W. J. Ramsey, "Salvation, True and False"; 6.30, J. Rowney will lecture.  
HAMMERSMITH BRIDGE (Middlesex side) : 7, Stanley Jones, "Woman : Past, Present, and Future." Thursday, at 8, a lecture.  
HYDE PARK (near Marble Arch) : 11.30, Stanley Jones, "The Soul and Science"; 3, "Woman : Past, Present, and Future." Wednesday, at 8, Arthur B. Moss, "Some Delusions of Theology."  
ISLINGTON (Prebend-street, Packington-street) : 11.30, J. Rowney will lecture.  
KILBURN (High-road) : 6.30, St. John will lecture.  
KINGSLAND (Ridley-road, near Dalston Junction) : 11.30, T. Thurlow, "The Bible v. Science."  
MILE END WASTE : 11.30, F. Haslam, "Bible Stories : Are they True?"  
OLD PIMLICO PIER : 11.30, W. J. Ramsey, "The Kingdom of Heaven."  
REGENT'S PARK (near Gloucester Gate) : 3, a lecture.  
VICTORIA PARK (near the fountain) : 11.15, W. H. Vining, "The Great French Revolution"; 3.15, C. Cohen, "The Existence of God."  
WOOD GREEN (Jolly Butchers' Hill) : 11.30, Stanley Jones, "Our Lord Jesus Christ"; 7, "What is there Left of Christianity?" Thursday, at 8, C. Cohen, "Christ as a Teacher."

## COUNTRY.

CHATHAM SECULAR HALL (Queen's-road, New Brompton) : 11, T. Garner, "Christian and Secular Redemption"; 7, "The Secret of England's Greatness."  
LIVERPOOL (Oddfellows' Hall, St. Anne-street) : 11, S. P. Putnam, "The Bible and Modern Thought"; 3, "Christianity and Woman"; 7, "Christ and the Nineteenth Century."  
MANCHESTER SECULAR HALL (Rusholme-road, All Saints) : 11, Charles Watts, "Trust in God a Delusion"; 3, "Mohammed and Christ"; 6.30, "Man and the Universe—from a Christian and Secular Standpoint."  
SHEFFIELD SECULAR SOCIETY (Hall of Science, Rockingham-street) : 11, W. Heaford, "God and Morality"; 3, "The Lord's Prayer Critically Examined"; 7, "The Creed of an Unbeliever." Tea at 5.  
SOUTH SHIELDS (Seaman's and Fireman's Union Hall, Coronation-street) : 7, O. Aarstad will lecture.  
SUNDERLAND (Lecture Room, Bridge End Vaults, opposite Echo office) : 7, The Secretary, "Brain and Soul."

## OPEN-AIR PROPAGANDA.

BRISTOL (Eastville Park, lower end) : 7, Mr. Smith, "The Creation."  
DERBY (Market-place) : 11, W. Dyson, "The Origin of Man"; 7, "Historic Man."  
NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE (Quayside) : 11, debate between Mr. Mitchell and the Secretary of the local C.E.S.  
SOUTH SHIELDS (Market Place) : 3, O. Aarstad will lecture.

## Lecturers' Engagements.

C. COHEN, 12 Merchant-street, Bow-road, London, E.—May 26, m. Finsbury Park, a. Victoria Park, e. Wood Green; 30, Wood Green.

STANLEY JONES, 53 Marlborough-road, Holloway, London.—May 26, m. Wood Green, a. Hyde Park, e. Hammersmith; 30, Hammersmith. June 2, m. Kingsland; 9, m. Pimlico, e. Camberwell; 13, Wood Green; 13, m. Wood Green, e. Edmonton; 20, Hammersmith; 23, m. Victoria Park; 26, Hyde Park; 30, m. Battersea, a. Victoria Park, e. Deptford.

ARTHUR B. MOSS, 44 Creden-road, Rotherhithe, London.—May 26, m. Clerkenwell. June 2, Camberwell; 9, m. Mile End, a. Victoria Park, e. Tottenham; 16, m. Mile End; 23, m. Wood Green, e. Tottenham; 30, Clerkenwell, a. Finsbury Park.

T. THURLOW, 350 Old Ford-road, E.—June 2, m. Finsbury Park; 19, m. Kingsland. July 17, m. Kingsland.

STANTON, the People's Dentist, 335 Strand (opposite Somerset House).—TEETH on VULCANITE, 2s. 6d. each; upper or lower set, £1. Best Quality, 4s. each; upper or lower, £2. Completed in four hours when required; repairing or alterations in two hours. If you pay more than the above, they are fancy charges. Teeth on platinum, 7s. 6d. each; on 18 ct. gold, 15s.; stopping, 2s. 6d.; extraction, 1s.; painless by gas, 5s.

TO FREETHINKERS.—Ladies and Gentlemen requiring SUPERIOR OUTFIT GARMENTS at moderate prices. First-class Style and Fit Guaranteed.—H. HAMPTON, Artiste Tailor, 14 Great Castle-street, W. (three doors from Regent-street). Patronised by leading Freethinkers.

## Freethought Publications.

**Crimes of Christianity.** Vol. I. 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. Cloth, gilt, 216 pp., 2s. 6d.

**The Jewish Life of Christ.** Being the *Sepher Toldoth Jesus*, 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.

**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.

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

## Works by Colonel R. G. Ingersoll.

SOME MISTAKES OF MOSES. The only complete edition in England. Accurate as Colenso, and fascinating as a novel. 132 pp. 1s. Superior paper, cloth 1s. 6d.

DEFENCE OF FREETHOUGHT. A Five Hours' Speech at the Trial of C. B. Reynolds for Blasphemy. 6d.

THE GODS. 6d.

REPLY TO GLADSTONE. With a Biography by J. M. Wheeler. 4d.

ROME OR REASON? A Reply to Cardinal Manning. 4d.

CRIMES AGAINST CRIMINALS. 3d.

ORATION ON WALT WHITMAN. 3d.

ORATION ON VOLTAIRE. 3d.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN. 3d.

PAINE THE PIONEER. 2d.

HUMANITY'S DEBT TO THOMAS PAINE. 2d.

ERNEST RENAN AND JESUS CHRIST. 2d.

TRUE RELIGION. 2d.

THE THREE PHILANTHROPISTS. 2d.

LOVE THE REDEEMER. 2d.

IS SUICIDE A SIN? 2d.

LAST WORDS ON SUICIDE. 2d.

GOD AND THE STATE. 2d.

WHY AM I AN AGNOSTIC? Part I. 2d.

WHY AM I AN AGNOSTIC? Part II. 2d.

FAITH AND FACT. Reply to Dr. Field. 2d.

GOD AND MAN. Second reply to Dr. Field. 2d.

THE DYING CREED. 2d.

THE LIMITS OF TOLERANCE. A Discussion with the Hon. F. D. Coudert and Gov. S. L. Woodford. 2d.

THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH. 2d.

ART AND MORALITY. 2d.

DO I BLASPHEME? 2d.

THE CLERGY AND COMMON SENSE. 2d.

SOCIAL SALVATION. 2d.

MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE. An Agnostic's View. 2d.

SKULLS. 2d.

THE GREAT MISTAKE. 1d.

LIVE TOPICS. 1d.

MYTH AND MIRACLE. 1d.

REAL BLASPHEMY. 1d.

REPAIRING THE IDOLS. 1d.

CHRIST AND MIRACLES. 1d.

CREEDS & SPIRITUALITY. 1d.

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

Handsomely bound in cloth, post free 7s. 6d.,

**BIOGRAPHICAL DICTIONARY**  
OF  
**FREETHINKERS OF ALL AGES AND NATIONS.**

BY  
J. M. WHEELER.

"The Dictionary has involved enormous labor, and the compiler deserves the thanks of the Freethought party."—*National Reformer*.  
"The work will be of the greatest value."—*Freethought*.  
"At last we have the long-wanted means of silencing those Christians who are continually inquiring for our great men, asserting that all great men have been on the side of Christianity."—*Truthseeker* (New York).  
"The most important Freethought work published this year."—*De Dageraad* (Amsterdam).  
"A good and useful work that was much needed."—*Commonweal*.

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

**FOR CIVIL SERVICE** and ALL OTHER EXAMINATIONS.—**FULL SOLUTIONS, MODEL ANSWERS, ETC., at the CITY CIVIL SERVICE COLLEGE,** Fenchurch House, Fenchurch-street.—Apply Principal, CYRIL BEDE, M.A., 4 Victoria-terrace, Tollington-park.

# 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, Diarrhea, Ulcerated Legs, Tumours, etc.

**MEDICAL ESSAYS.** Vol. III. For Postal Order for 1s. 2d.  
Contains Articles on No More Death, Management of Young Children, Unsuspected 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, Rills and Carbuncles, Sebaceous Tumors and Wens, Hay Fever, Winter Cough, Chills, 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 Lice, Chicken-Pox, Synovitis or Inflammation of the Joints, Tonsillitis or Quinsy, Herpes (Tetter or Shingles), Erysipelas, Ulcer of the Stomach, Epidemic Influenza, Scatica, Psoriasis or English Leprösy, 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.

# 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 causes 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.**

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

Recommended by Mrs. Besant in *Law of Population*, p. 32, and Dr. Allbutt in *Wife's Handbook*, p. 51. Made solely by J. PULLEN, 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.**

# Colonel Ingersoll's Great New Lecture ABOUT THE HOLY BIBLE

Price Sixpence.

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

## Works by G. W. Foote.

**Flowers of Freethought. First Series.** 221 pp., bound in cloth, 2s. 6d.

**Flowers of Freethought. Second Series.** 302 pp., bound in cloth, 2s. 6d.

**Bible Heroes.** Cloth, 2s. 6d.

**Letters to the Clergy. First Series.** 128 pp., 1s.

**The Grand Old Book.** A Reply to the Grand Old Man. An exhaustive answer to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone's "Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture." 1s.; bound in cloth, 1s. 6d.

**Christianity and Secularism.** Four Nights' Public Debate with the Rev. Dr. James McCann. 1s.; superior edition, cloth, 1s. 6d.

**Is Socialism Sound?** Four Nights' Public Debate with Annie Besant. 1s.; superior edition, in cloth, 2s.

**Infidel Death-Beds.** Second edition, much enlarged, 8d. On superfine paper, in cloth, 1s. 3d.

**Darwin on God.** 6d.; superior edition, in cloth, 1s.

**Will Christ Save Us?** A Thorough Examination of the Claims of Jesus Christ to be considered the Savior of the World. 6d.

**Reminiscences of Charles Bradlaugh.** 6d.

**A Defence of Free Speech.** Three Hours' Address to the Jury before Lord Coleridge. With a Special Preface and many Footnotes. 4d.

**Comic Sermons and Other Fantasias.** 8d.

**Rome or Atheism—the Great Alternative.** 3d.

**Letters to Jesus Christ.** 4d.

**Interview with the Devil.** 2d.

**Philosophy of Secularism.** 3d.

**Atheism and Morality.** 2d.

**My Resurrection.** A Missing Chapter from the Gospel of Matthew, discovered by G. W. Foote. 2d.

**The Folly of Prayer.** 2d.

**Ingersollism Defended against Archdeacon Farrar.** 2d.

**Was Jesus Insane?** A Searching Inquiry into the Mental Condition of the Prophet of Nazareth. 1d.

**Christianity and Progress.** A Reply to Mr. Gladstone. 2d.

**The Impossible Creed.** An Open Letter to Bishop Magee on the Sermon on the Mount. 2d.

**What was Christ?** A Reply to J. S. Mill. 2d.

**The Bible God.** 2d.

**Salvation Syrup; or, Light on Darkest England.** A Reply to General Booth. 2d.

**Is the Bible Inspired?** A Criticism on *Lux Mundi*. 1d.

**The Dying Atheist.** A Story. 1d.

**The Rev. Hugh Price Hughes's Converted Atheist.** A Lie in Five Chapters. 1d.

**Mrs. Besant's Theosophy.** A Candid Criticism. 2d.

**Secularism and Theosophy.** A Rejoinder to Mrs. Besant. 2d.

**The New Cagliostro.** An Open Letter to Madame Blavatsky. 2d.

**Bible Romances.** New Edition. Revised and largely re-written. (1) The Creation Story, 2d.; (2) Eve and the Apple, 1d.; (3) Cain and Abel, 1d.; (4) Noah's Flood, 2d.; (5) The Tower of Babel, 1d.; (6) Lot's Wife, 1d.; (7) The Ten Plagues, 1d.; (8) The Wandering Jews, 1d.; (9) Balaam's Ass, 1d.; (10) God in a Box, 1d. (11) Jonah and the Whale, 1d.; (12) Bible Animals, 1d.; (13) A Virgin Mother, 2d.; (14) The Resurrection, 2d.; (15) The Crucifixion, 1d.; (16) John's Nightmare, 1d.

**The Shadow of the Sword.** A Moral and Statistical Essay on War. 2d.

**Royal Paupers.** Showing what Royalty does for the People, and what the People do for Royalty. 2d.

London: ROBERT FORDER, 28 Stonecutter-street, E.C.

# Read "THE TRUTH SEEKER."

MONTHLY, PRICE 1D.



Edited by JOHN GRANGE.

Of all Newsagents to order. Wholesale, Mr. Forder.

A FEW LEFT.

LOT 11.

19/- CARRIAGE PAID.

3d.  NOW READY  64pp.

THE  
HALL OF SCIENCE  
LIBEL CASE.

WITH A  
FULL AND TRUE ACCOUNT  
OF

"THE LEEDS ORGIES."

EDITED, WITH INTRODUCTION,  
BY  
G. W. FOOTE.

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

Price 1s. ; bound in cloth, 1s. 6d. post free,

THE GRAND OLD BOOK.

A REPLY TO THE GRAND OLD MAN.

BY  
G. W. FOOTE.

An Exhaustive Answer to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone's  
"Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture."

CONTENTS:—Preface—Preliminary View—The Creation Story—The  
Fall of Man—The Psalms—The Mosaic Legislation—Corroborations of  
Scripture—Gladstone and Huxley—Modern Scepticism.

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

Freethought Headquarters

AND  
BRADLAUGH MEMORIAL.

In order to provide Suitable Headquarters for the Secular Party  
in London, which shall also be a worthy Memorial of its late leader,  
CHARLES BRADLAUGH, the

NATIONAL SECULAR HALL SOCIETY (LIMITED)

has been formed under the Friendly Society's Acts. Of this Society  
Mr. G. W. FOOTE, *President of the N.S.S.*, is *Chairman*, and every  
one of the Directors is, and must be, also a member of the N.S.S.

This can only be done by the assistance of the whole Secular  
Party, who are hereby appealed to earnestly. The shares are £1  
each, payable in easy instalments of 2s. 6d. on application, 2s. 6d.  
on allotment, and 2s. 6d. on each call, of which two months' notice  
must be given.

FORM OF APPLICATION.

GENTLEMEN,—

Please allot me.....Shares in the "National Secular  
Hall Society, Limited," on account of which allotment I herewith  
hand you the sum of.....pounds.....shillings, being a deposit  
of.....pounds.....shillings per share thereon. And I hereby  
agree that, if admitted a Shareholder in the above-named Society,  
I will conform to its rules, and to such of its bye-laws as may be  
from time to time in force.

Name (in full).....

Postal address .....

Occupation (if any) .....

CUT THIS OUT AND FILL IT IN,

and forward (with remittance) to the Secretary—

MISS E. M. VANCE,  
28 Stonecutter-street, London, E.C.

Printed and Published by G. W. FOOTE, at 28 Stonecutter-street,  
London, E.C.