

# THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXI.—No. 8.

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1901.

PRICE TWOPENCE.

## Is the Queen Saved?

THE death of Queen Victoria has, of course, furnished abundant material to the reflecting mind as to the mental processes which "royalism" and "loyalism" connote. The outrageous and fulsome laudations, retailed by the yard in the newspapers, of a career of which the most that can honestly be said is that it was respectably harmless, really take one's breath away. Queen Victoria was, we are assured, a good wife and mother, which no doubt can be said for hundreds of thousands of women who deserve infinitely greater praise in that they are heroic and kind in face of far greater difficulties and far greater temptations than are ever likely to have beset the dead monarch; and, for the rest, Queen Victoria was a mediocre person, who did nothing in particular, and who did it fairly well. She left no statue or painting or work of art, no book, not even a witty or remarkable saying, by which her name will in after days be remembered. And the time must surely come, if humanity ever reaches saner and more balanced judgments, when the servant-girl who slaves and pinches herself to maintain her love-child will be regarded as an infinitely more heroic human soul than a queen who observed all the conventions and provided admirably for her offspring—at the public expense. And, whilst all this would be somewhat ungracious to say of a mere ordinary private character after death, it becomes almost necessary to say it by way of protest against the preposterous fustian of the daily press, Tory and Radical alike. Perhaps this fustian touches the depth of bathos and absurdity in a double-page plate published in *Black and White*, representing angels descending from heaven to crown the dead Queen, who is portrayed in a not very dignified attitude, as seated on an elaborate chair; underneath this production—issued with ostensible seriousness—runs the legend: "The earthly crown passes; the heavenly crown endures." The whole thing takes us back to a mediæval stage of Catholicism, even still surviving amongst the less educated Catholics of various countries, in which pictures circulated representing the death of the repentant sinner, and in which lurid and vivid images were drawn of the future abode of the unfortunate "redeemed."

The immediate occasion of this article, however, happens to be a pastoral letter issued by Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster, on the death of the Queen, and ordered to be read in the Catholic churches of the diocese of Westminster. And one is led to deal with it because it exhibits the halting and half-hearted way in which, in face of ordinary humanitarian feeling, even the Catholic Church is obliged to water down its dogma, or, to vary the metaphor, take the edge off the callousness of its damnation doctrine.

The late Queen was, as everyone is aware, Supreme Head of the Anglican Church, a position which is presumably now filled by the elderly gentleman who has succeeded to the Throne. The Queen, therefore, as far as Cardinal Vaughan was concerned, was not merely a heretic, but the head of a heretical sect. She was outside the "communion of the Church." One would suppose, therefore, that her case was hopeless.

Let us, then, turn to the Cardinal's address. From this document we learn that the heretic possessed "rich natural virtues" which "exercised an influence under which vice lay abashed in her presence." Moreover, the arch-heretic, it seems, "offered to her people a priceless

example of moral virtue." "To excellence in the domain of domestic and private life she united all those gifts and civic virtues that have endeared her to the Empire"—and so forth. Altogether, in fact, one gathers that the heretic was a really noble and admirable moral example. What, then, of her future prospects? On that point the Cardinal says:—

"Of public religious services for the dead the Catholic Church knows of none but such as she has instituted for the souls of her own children. For them the Requiem Mass....."

"No one would feel it to be right that, in our grief, we should so far forget ourselves, or the proprieties due to her deceased Majesty and to the official position she filled, as even to appear to claim her as a member of our Church, which we should be doing were we to perform in her behalf religious rites that are exclusively applicable to deceased Catholics. Of other rites for the dead the Church has none."

"At the same time, we may remind you that it is lawful to those who believe that any persons have departed out of this life in union with the soul of the Church, though not in her external communion, to offer privately prayers and good works for their release from purgatory. The Church herself forms no judgment on a matter which must remain the secret between God and the individual soul."

There is, of course, nothing novel in this. It is merely the antiquated academic dogma of the Church, which, having comprehensively damned all heretics, graciously and mercifully leaves the door ajar for them, and modestly "forms no judgment" as to how many of them may enter. And the policy of the "open door" in this case furnishes an interesting means of escape from a revolting dogma. If you tackle educated and humane Catholics who understand the theoretic niceties of the matter, they will make as much use of the open door as they can. On one occasion, discussing the question, as it concerned even Professor Huxley, with an educated Catholic, he was reluctant, or perhaps ashamed, to admit that Huxley even was irrevocably "damned" according to the Church. It was "permissible" to believe that at the eleventh hour, or at fifty-nine minutes past the eleventh hour, he "made peace" with the Church—and was only mercifully condemned to a certain dose of purgatory. It is scarcely possible, I think, that a heretic of any kind could really enter, off-hand as it were, into that heavenly bliss which is exclusively reserved for good orthodox Catholics. But the heretic may be let in ultimately by a back door when he is sufficiently purged.

Thus it will be seen that the doctrine of belonging to the "Soul of the Church," whilst not in her "external communion," ingeniously fulfils a double purpose. The Church damns the heretic—and she does not damn. After condemning the heretics *en masse*, there is the supreme mercy and humanity of allowing—in individual cases such as deceased monarchs—that the offender may not really have been so bad, and may escape; on that question the Church, with startling modesty, "forms no judgment." Of course this applies with particular force to dead potentates, or exalted personages. Cardinal Vaughan, one may be sure, would publicly profess little doubt as to a common plebeian Atheist like Charles Bradlaugh. In order to enjoy the benefit of the Church's doubt, you must never have associated with anyone below the rank of a stockbroker.

Seriously, of course, no one of any sense would be bothered arguing for five minutes over Cardinal Vaughan's fooleries. The damnation-doctrine is not rendered any the less vicious and repulsive in principle

because it is made conditional. The criminality of condemning a man because of his honest opinions is in essence the same whether the condemnation be for a long or short period, whether to the Church's mythical hell or to the Church's mythical purgatory. If Parliament passed a law that all men with red hair should, on that account, be imprisoned for life, it would not much mend matters by graciously altering the law so that red-haired men were only to be imprisoned for two years as first-class misdemeanants. In either case we would be confronted with a cardinal and revolting injustice—rendered none the less odious because it was grotesque.

FREDERICK RYAN.

## The Mighty Riddle.

*The Riddle of the Universe.* By Ernst Haeckel. Translated by Joseph McCabe. (Watts & Co., London.)

PROFESSOR HAECKEL'S book has long been mutely beseeching our notice. We have not been able to find time to do it justice, but rather than keep it waiting any longer we have resolved to introduce it, however imperfectly, to our readers' attention. The transcendent Darwin being dead, Professor Haeckel is probably the greatest of living biologists. Anything he has to say, therefore, on the general questions of religion and ethics should command a profoundly respectful hearing. Nor must his translator be forgotten. Mr. Joseph McCabe has apparently done his work with faithful thoroughness. It reads more like an original book than a translation; which is one of the highest compliments we can pay it. What was doubtless good German has been turned into certainly good English; and it is easy enough to see that this was by no means a simple task, for the book naturally abounds in scientific terminology, and there must have been a thousand opportunities for an ill-informed translator to go very badly astray.

After carefully perusing Professor Haeckel's final utterance on this great subject—for such we gather that it is from his own Preface—we are once more struck by the truth of Huxley's statement that modern science has invented no new argument against the belief in God, in free will, and in immortality. All it has really afforded is illustration and emphasis. Here is a world-famous scientist, at the end of a long career of hard thought and patient investigation, who can throw no more real light on the questions raised by metaphysics than existed two or three thousand years ago. One is reminded of Macaulay's observation that with respect, for instance, to the doctrine of a future life, a North American Indian knows just as much as any ancient or modern philosopher. That is to say, he knows nothing—and they know nothing. There is speculation—which is simply guessing in the dark; and there is revelation—which is simply ancient guessing passed off as modern information. Beyond that all is blank. Man still shouts into the infinite unknown, and as ever he hears no answer but the echo of his own voice. Some are satisfied with that as a divine oracle. Others regard it as a warning that man should desist from troubling his poor head about "ultimates," or, to use Mr. Spencer's expression, the Unknowable; that he should recognise his inevitable limitations, which is always one great stride of practical wisdom; that he should cease to be a metaphysician and become a positivist.

The scientific part of Professor Haeckel's book is valuable, nevertheless, as far as it throws light upon the nature of man and his physical, intellectual, and moral development. He is always admirably lucid, and his vast wealth of knowledge is handled with splendid mastery. This part of his work should be read again and again. When he advances to what he calls "the Law of Substance," he is immediately confronted by those who, like Huxley, maintain that besides force and matter—whatever they are—there is a third and different existence called "consciousness." Our own opinion is that Monism has the most to say for itself. After all, perhaps, we come at last to what Emerson called "the old Two-Face." Professor Haeckel himself professedly adheres to the "unequivocal monism of Spinoza."

"Matter, or infinitely extended substance," he says, "and Spirit (or Energy), or sensitive or thinking substance, are the two fundamental attributes, or principal properties, of the all-embracing divine essence of the world, the universal substance." Some will regard this as satisfactory, some will think it an evasion of the chief point at issue, and others will call it a flowery robe of metaphysical rhetoric hiding an essential ignorance.

What our readers will be most interested in is Professor Haeckel's criticism of the religious ideas of Christendom. He admits himself to be an Atheist in the strict privative sense of the word. Witness the following passage:—

"Atheism affirms that there are no gods or goddesses, assuming that god means a personal extra-mundane entity. This 'godless world-system' substantially agrees with the monism or pantheism of the modern scientist; it is only another expression for it, emphasizing its negative aspect, the non-existence of any supernatural deity. In this sense Schopenhauer justly remarks: 'Pantheism is only a polite form of atheism. The truth of pantheism lies in its destruction of the dualist antithesis of God and the world, in its recognition that the world exists in virtue of its own inherent forces. The maxim of the pantheist, 'God and the world are one,' is merely a polite way of giving the Lord God his *congé*.'"

If we want logic in theology we must turn to the popular religion rather than to the religion of subtle divines, who endeavor to patch up a peace between science and theology. The vulgar, both in pulpits and in pews, treat God as the source of all good, and the devil as the source of all evil. This may not be true, of course, but it covers the facts, as Professor Haeckel cheerfully allows.

"Amphitheism is undoubtedly the most rational of all forms of belief in God, and the one which is least incompatible with a scientific view of the world. Hence we find it elaborated in many ancient peoples thousands of years before Christ. In ancient India Vishnu, the preserver, struggles with Shiva, the destroyer. In ancient Egypt the good Osiris is opposed by the wicked Typhon. The early Hebrews had a similar dualism of Aschera (or Keturah), the fertile mother-earth, and Elion (Moloch or Sethos), the stern heavenly father. In the Zend religion of the ancient Persians, founded by Zoroaster 2,000 years before Christ, there is a perpetual struggle between Ormuzd, the good god of light, and Ahriman, the wicked god of darkness. In Christian mythology the Devil is scarcely less conspicuous as the adversary of the good deity, the tempter and seducer, the prince of hell, the lord of darkness. A personal devil was still an important element in the belief of most Christians at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Towards the middle of the century he was gradually eliminated by being progressively explained away, or he was restricted to the subordinate *role* he plays as Mephistopheles in Goethe's great drama. To-day the majority of educated people look upon 'belief in a personal devil' as a mediæval superstition, while 'belief in God' (that is, the personal, good, and loving God) is retained as an indispensable element of religion. Yet the one belief is just as much (or as little) justified as the other."

With regard to the "proofs" of the immortality of the soul, Professor Haeckel observes that "not a single one of them is of a scientific character." He takes them one after another—the theological, the cosmological, the teleological, the moral, the ethnological, the ontological—and declares that they are "definitely annulled by the scientific criticism of the last few decades." Then he urges scientific reasons *against* this belief; and, finally, expresses his "firm and honest conviction" that the definitive abandonment of future-life illusions would involve "no painful loss, but an inestimable positive gain to humanity."

Christianity, as one of the great world-religions, is treated by Professor Haeckel as an outcome of emotional ignorance, guided and exploited by priestcraft. Even its ethics are very far from being perfect, or up to the level of the highest modern civilisation. While praising the Golden Rule, he points out that it belongs to systems which preceded Christianity; moreover it is carried by Christianity to a point of wild and noxious exaggeration.

"The supreme mistake of Christian ethics, and one which runs directly counter to the Golden Rule, is its exaggeration of love of one's neighbor at the expense of self-love. Christianity attacks and despises egoism on

principle. Yet that natural impulse is absolutely indispensable in view of self-preservation; indeed, one may say that even altruism, its apparent opposite, is only an enlightened egotism. Nothing great or elevated has ever taken place without egoism, and without the passion that urges us to great sacrifices. It is only the excesses of the impulse that are injurious. One of the Christian precepts that were impressed upon us in our early youth as of great importance, and that are glorified in millions of sermons, is: 'Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you.' It is a very ideal precept, but as useless in practice as it is unnatural. So it is with the counsel to 'If any man will take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also.' Translated into the terms of modern life, that means: 'When some unscrupulous scoundrel has defrauded thee of half thy goods, let him have the other half also.'

Christianity has always waged war against the very essentials of secular civilisation. It has regarded man, not as a citizen of earth, but as a candidate for heaven. Whatever bound him to earth was therefore intrinsically sinful. This idea was carried into the domain of sexuality, and produced a rich crop of anti-social doctrines and practices. Professor Haeckel writes.—

"Another of the most deplorable aspects of Christian morality is its belittlement of the life of the family, of that natural living together with our next of kin which is just as necessary in the case of man as in the case of all the higher social animals. The family is justly regarded as the 'foundation of society,' and the healthy life of the family is a necessary condition of the prosperity of the State. Christ, however, was of a very different opinion: with his gaze ever directed to 'the beyond,' he thought as lightly of woman and the family as of all other goods of 'this life.' Of his infrequent contact with his parents and sisters the Gospels have very little to say; but they are far from representing his relations with his mother to have been so tender and intimate as they are poetically depicted in so many thousands of pictures. He was not married himself. Sexual love, the first foundation of the family union, seems to have been regarded by Jesus as a necessary evil. His most enthusiastic apostle, Paul, went still farther in the same direction, declaring it to be better not to marry than to marry: 'It is good for a man not to touch a woman.' If humanity were to follow this excellent counsel, it would soon be rid of all earthly misery and suffering; it would be killed off by such a 'radical cure' within half a century."

Professor Haeckel's general point of view, as a scientist, a philosopher, and a sociologist, is exhibited in the following passage:—

"The older view of idealistic dualism is breaking up with all its mystic and anthropistic dogmas; but upon the vast field of ruins rises, majestic and brilliant, the new sun of our realistic monism, which reveals to us the wonderful temple of nature in all its beauty. In the sincere cult of 'the true, the good, and the beautiful,' which is the heart of our new monistic religion, we find ample compensation for the anthropistic ideals of 'God, freedom, and immortality,' which we have lost."

It cannot be said that this is a low ideal. It was the ideal of the great Goethe. In the long run, the good depends upon the true, and the beautiful upon both. Shakespeare saw this long before Goethe. "Truth can never be confirmed enough," he said; and again, in one of his magical flashes into the heart of things, "Beauty dwells with kindness." On the whole, it must be said that Professor Haeckel is in very good company. Indeed, it seems that one of the functions of the greatest men of science is to corroborate the intuitions of the greatest poets.

G. W. FOOTE.

### Evolution and Creation.

THE attitude of theologians towards science has always been inconsistent. They did their best to prevent its development, although they were ever anxious to avail themselves of its manifold advantages. It has been aptly remarked that all scientific discoveries have had to pass through three stages—namely, vehement opposition, attempted reconciliation with Bible teachings, and, lastly, general recognition. This has been particularly so in reference to the treatment by theologians of the facts of evolution. At first they declared such facts to be absurd; then that they must be rejected because they were opposed to the teachings of the

Bible; and, finally, subject to theological application, the truth of the evolution theory was admitted. When, in 1859, Darwin published the first edition of his work on *The Origin of Species*, the book fell like a thunderbolt into the religious camp. The commotion it caused was tremendous, and the effect to-day can hardly be imagined, such a change has passed over the scene within the past forty years. The most violent opposition raged against the new views; ridicule, denunciation, and abuse were hurled at the head of the man who propounded so preposterous a theory as that all organic things had sprung from a few simple living forms very low down in the scale of being. Then came his larger work, entitled *Animals and Plants under Domestication*, full of facts of a most startling character, supporting the theory advanced in the previous books, and challenging refutation on all hands. In the face of these facts the public mind cooled down a little, opposition became milder, some opponents were converted, and others manifested indifference. The major portion of those who still adhered to the supernatural and special creations held that, even if the theory of evolution turned out to be true, it would not apply to man, who was a being possessed of an immortal soul, and who therefore belonged to a different order of creatures than any other animal; and that Darwin never intended to include human beings in the organic structures thus originated. In this state the controversy remained until 1872, when Darwin took the bull by the horns, and at one stroke swept away the last stronghold of special creation by showing that humanity was no exception to the great law of evolution; for man, like other animals, had originated in natural selection. The facts given in the book on *The Descent of Man* are both powerful and pertinent, and no theologian of repute has even attempted to refute them.

The opposition to the theory of evolution was not confined to professors of religion, for even the eminent physicist, Sir David Brewster, termed the discoveries of Darwin "speculations which trench on sacred ground, which run counter to the universal convictions of mankind, poisoning the fountains of science and disturbing the serenity of the Christian world." He condemned them as "dangerous and degrading." Fortunately, all such opposition has now ceased, and, although some religionists maintain "that the power and wisdom of God are seen in the process of evolution," it is generally admitted by those who are capable of giving a scientific opinion upon the subject that the theory of evolution, if not a demonstrated science, has at least in its favor the "science of probabilities"—an advantage that cannot be fairly claimed for the Biblical account of the origin of phenomena. It is granted on all hands that there was a time when no life existed on the earth. The question is, how and where life began. The supernaturalist seeks to get out of the difficulty by cutting the Gordian knot rather than by untying it, and falls back upon a special creation, and so avoids any further trouble about the matter. But the evolutionist thinks that he can see his way clearly in what must necessarily be to some extent a labyrinth, because no one lived at that time to observe and record what was taking place. One thing is clear, which is that living things were made or came into existence—whatever the mode may have been, or the power by which it occurred—out of non-living matter. Even the believers in special creation will not deny this. The only question is, therefore, whether the process occurred in accordance with natural law, and whether the forces by which it was brought about were those which then existed in material nature. For it does not follow that, if such phenomena do not occur to-day, they could never have taken place in the past. The conditions of the earth were different then to what they are now, and forces may have been in operation that are now quiescent. Professor Huxley, who thought that no instance has occurred in modern times of the evolution of a living organism from dead matter, and that the experiments that have been conducted on the subject are inconclusive, said that, if we could go back millions of years to the dawn of life, we should, no doubt, behold living bodies springing from non-living matter.

Recently a "second Daniel has come to judgment," his object being to prove that Christianity and Evolution are strictly in harmony. This "new light" of the

Church is the "Very Rev. Canon Bonney, B.D., D.Sc., F.R.S., etc.," who lectured under the auspices of the Christian Evidence Society, on January 27, at St. Stephen's Church, Uxbridge-road. His subject was "Christ and Evolution," and the lecture was, "by permission," fully reported in the *Kensington News*, dated February 1, 1901. We have read the report with great attention, and the lecture is certainly one of the weakest attempts ever made to reconcile science with Christian teaching. It is strange that the rev. gentleman should have undertaken such a task after the following confession at the Norwich Church Congress, held in 1898. We quote from the *Daily Telegraph* of October 10 of that year:—

"Professor Bonney, in the course of his paper, said he could not deny that the increase of scientific knowledge had deprived parts of the earlier books of the Bible of the historical value which was generally attributed to them by our forefathers. The story of the creation in the Book of Genesis, unless we played fast and loose with words or with science, could not be brought into harmony with what we had learnt from geology."

These words were uttered in the presence of scientists; but when the Professor lectured to a Christian congregation, in a church, he tried to make his hearers believe that evolution does not contradict the Bible record. Truly these pious exponents are, like St. Paul, "all things to all men."

The Rev. Canon says: "It is frankly recognised by almost all naturalists at the present day that evolution is a fact, whatever may be its most immediate cause or causes"; but he contends that evolution is not a denial of the Christian teaching "that God is creator of the earth and everything of which we have any cognizance." We are not told what is meant by the word "creation," nor how the Bible statements that man was suddenly made from the dust of the earth, and that he fell from a higher to a lower condition, can be made to harmonise with the theory of evolution, which teaches that the universe and man are not the product of a sudden creative act, but rather the result of innumerable changes from the lower to the higher, each step in advance being an evolution from a pre-existing condition. It is utterly impossible to reconcile the two—Bible teaching and the facts of evolution. Canon Bonney alleges that God is the creator of all things; but no proof is given of this assertion. We submit to the Rev. Canon that, if a God exist who is infinite, he is everywhere; if everywhere, he is in the universe; if in the universe now, he was always there. If he were always in the universe, there never was a time when the universe was not; therefore it could never have been created. If it be said that this being was not always in the universe, then there must have been a period when he occupied less space than he did subsequently. But lesser and greater cannot be applied to that which is eternally infinite. Further, before we can recognise the soundness of the position taken by the advocates of special creation, we have to think of a time when there was no time, of a place when there was no place. Is this possible? If it were, it would be interesting to learn where an infinite God was at that particular period, and how in "no time" he could perform his creative act. Besides, if a being really exist who created all things, the obvious question at once is, "Where was this being before anything else existed?" Was there a time when God over all was God over nothing? Can we believe that a God over nothing began to be out of nothing, and to create all things when there was nothing? Moreover, if the universe were created, from what did it emanate? From nothing? But "from nothing, nothing can come." Was it created from something that already was? If so, it was no creation at all, but only a continuation of that which was in existence. Further, creation needs action; to act is to use force; to use force implies the existence of something upon which that force can be used. But if that "something" were there before creation, the act of creating was simply the re-forming of pre-existing materials.

When the Rev. Canon approaches even the threshold of reasoning, he adopts the theological method, and not that of the scientist. This we will endeavor to show in our article next week.

CHARLES WATTS.

## Christianity and Civilisation.—XIII.

"THOU SHALT NOT SUFFER A WITCH TO LIVE."

If one had to express in a single sentence the credulity and cruelty of human nature, or compress within the same limits a statement of the evil effects of allowing religious beliefs to dominate life, I question if this could be better done than by quoting the text placed at the head of this article. To the belief in witchcraft, more, perhaps, than to any other single belief, can be traced some of the most refined methods of torture and the largest number of murders. And these not always of strong, clear-headed men and women, who could, and did, brave the forces of religion, and thus may be said to have gauged the consequences of their action and paid the penalty with their eyes open; but of children—for even children were not secure against this terrible text—and of poor, demented old women, whose delusions might cause laughter did not their weakness and their punishment excite such profound pity and indignation.

It is true that the belief in witches, in magic, or in evil spirits, is a belief that is not peculiar to Christianity, but is common to all forms of religion; but it is, nevertheless, true that no religion has ever produced such a profound terror of evil spirits as Christianity has done, nor has any other religion ever made the extirpation of supposed traffickers with the Devil such a serious and such a bloodthirsty business. The "sacred" books of Christianity are permeated with the belief in the agency of evil spirits, and in the Old Testament the command to extirpate witches and sorcerers is both clear and frequently repeated. In the New Testament demonology is more in evidence than even in the Old. Here the supernatural is everywhere exalted, and the natural reduced to a minimum. The power of demons is asserted, and the possibility of communication between them and man proclaimed; and it was, indeed, to the New Testament itself that the champions of the belief in witchcraft triumphantly appealed against those who attacked it in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The early Christians believed themselves, not unnaturally, to be surrounded by demons of a more or less malevolent description. In the commonest, as well as in the rarest, phenomena of life, demoniacal agency was seen. Demons were all around—in the air, on the land, in the sea—inhabiting the bodies of both men and animals. One Jewish writer asserts that each man has ten thousand demons at his right hand, and one thousand at his left. "The crush on the Sabbath in the synagogue arises from them, also the dresses of the Rabbins become so soon old and torn through their rubbing; in like manner they cause the tottering of the feet. He who wishes to discover these spirits must take sifted ashes and strew them about his bed, and in the morning he will perceive their footprints upon them like a cock's tread. If anyone wishes to see them, he must take the after-birth of a black cat which has been littered by a first-born black cat, whose mother was also a first birth, burn and reduce it to powder, and put some of it in his eyes, and he will see them."\* Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Jerome, Justin, Cyprian, all subscribe to the belief that man is surrounded by demons, and that these are responsible for nearly all that occurs.

But, although the intellectual foundation for the belief in witchcraft was always present with Christianity, what one may call the "Witch Mania" belonged to a comparatively late date in the history of Europe. There were persecutions during the whole of the Dark Ages for practising magic or professing heresy; but the witch mania only assumed its full proportions in the latter half of the fifteenth century. How far this was due to the endeavor of the Church to combat the rising tide of heresy, it is impossible to say; but if we take the middle of the fifteenth century as the commencement of the outbreak, we can trace it growing in extent during the sixteenth century, rising to its full height under Protestantism during the seventeenth, and finally dying out with the collapse of Puritanism at the Restoration.

\* See a collection of curious instances in *Supernatural Religion*, vol. i., chap. iv.

The above dates are only rough approximations, as all such calculations must be; but we are on definite ground in saying that a tremendous incentive was given to the witch hunts by a proclamation issued by Pope Innocent VIII. in 1484. This precious production says:—

"It has come to our ears that numbers of both sexes do not avoid to have intercourse with the infernal fiends, and that by their sorceries they afflict both man and beast. They blight the marriage bed; destroy the births of women and the increase of cattle; they blast the corn on the ground, the grapes in the vineyard, the fruits of the trees, and the grass and herbs of the field."

It was this Pope who commissioned the famous Inquisitor Sprenger to root out witches; him whose book long remained the guide for all engaged in the work.

Owing to the terrible ignorance that prevailed, the belief in witches assumed the form of an epidemic. The number of people burned almost staggers belief. Seven thousand people are said to have been burned at Treves, six hundred by one Bishop of Bamberg. At Geneva 500 were burned during three months in 1515. One thousand were burned in Como in a single year. Over 100,000 are said to have been killed in Scotland—for a period of thirty-nine years the number killed averaged 200 annually. In England, from 1600 to 1680, during the ascendancy of Puritanism, the annual number killed averaged 500. The celebrated witch-finder, Hopkins, hung sixty in one year in the county of Suffolk; and Grey, the annotator of Hudibras, says that he had seen an account of between three and four thousand witches who were executed between 1640 and the Restoration.\*

The majority burned were women. It was held that women had a much greater affinity with the Devil than had man, and, besides, it was through woman that the Devil had seduced Adam, and it was only natural that he would utilise the same agency on subsequent occasions. Probably the more hysterical temperament of women may account somewhat for their being oftener charged, but the fact remains. It was, we are assured, a common prayer with the women of the lower classes that they might never grow old.

The most remarkable, and the most horrible, executions of all were those that occurred in Wurtzburg in February, 1629. Here there were twenty-four batches of people burned, numbering in all 162 persons. Among these no less than thirty-four were children. The following are a few details of some of the more important burnings:—

7th	burning	numbered	7.	Among	them	1	girl	aged	12.			
13th	"	"	4.	"	"	girl	of	10	and	young	sister.	
15th	"	"	2.	"	"	boy	of	12.				
18th	"	"	6.	"	"	2	boys	of	10,	girl	of	14.
19th	"	"	6.	"	"	2	boys	of	10	and	12.	
20th	"	"	6.	"	"	2	boys.					
23rd	"	"	9.	"	"	3	boys	of	9,	10,	and	14.
24th	"	"	7.	"	"	2	boys	brought	from	hospital.		
26th	"	"	8.	"	"	little	boy	and	girl.			
27th	"	"	7.	"	"	2	boys	of	8	and	9.	
28th	"	"	6.	"	"	blind	girl	and	an	infant.	†	

Upon the most trivial signs women were accused of dealings with the devil, and, once the charge was made, conviction usually followed. If the crops went wrong, the milk turned sour; if the head of a local magnate ached, or a minister of the gospel fell ill, if a cow sickened or sheep died, at once some poor demented old woman was charged with witchcraft, and tortured until she confessed the justice of the charge. A mole or wart on any part of the body was a sign of commune with the devil. Every woman who had such dealings was believed to have one portion of the body that was impervious to pain; and women were stripped naked and long needles driven into their bodies in order to discover the devil's mark. If a suspected witch would not shed tears, if she kept a black cat, if she failed to repeat the Lord's Prayer backwards, here were infallible signs of guilt. Another test was to tie a woman's legs across, and so seat her on them that they bore the weight of the entire body. In this position she would be kept without food for twenty-four hours, and on the first sign of pain was summarily condemned. A favorite test was by water. The right hand was tied to the left foot, the left foot to the right, and in this position

the witch was thrown into a pond. If she sank—and was drowned—she was innocent. If she floated, she was guilty and was burned. This was Mathew Hopkin's favorite test, and it is pleasing to learn that he was eventually tried by his own method—and floated.

More barbarous methods of torture were by the boot, a frame in which the leg was placed and wedges driven in until the limb was reduced to pulp. A variation to this was an iron receptacle in which the leg was placed and then heated over a fire. There was also the thumb-screw, used for smashing the thumb by a slowly increasing pressure. More barbarous than any was the bridle. This consisted of an iron hoop which passed over the head with four prongs, two pointing to the tongue and palate and two to either cheek. The witch was then secured to the wall by a chair, and persons appointed to keep her from sleeping. The slightest movement caused indescribable torture, which, in the majority of cases, secured the desired confession and paved the way for the subsequent burning.

And let it be borne in mind that these were by no means rare cases. Witch finding was for nearly a century and a-half as much of a recognised profession as any occupation that one could name. Witch finders were sent for from one county to another, and travelled the country like judges on circuit. "Witch pricking" was also a recognised profession, and, from all accounts, a fairly profitable one. To raise one's voice against the belief was only to invite persecution in turn. Moreover, was there not the Bible, "the source of England's greatness," to appeal to for justification? The devil had afflicted Job with disease; why not others? The devil had lifted Jesus to the top of a high mountain; why could he not transport people through the air 1,600 years later? If the devil could produce pestilences, kill cattle, or commune with people in the bygone centuries, why can he not, argued the believers, do so now? The logic was all on their side. Given the Bible, the belief in witches and their execution was a plain duty incumbent on all believers; it is the modern believer, the man who, while professing to believe in the same book as his predecessors, turns his back on its plainest teachings and looks down with professed horror at their more logical practices, who is essentially unreasonable.

Nor is it possible for the Protestant, in this matter, to adopt his usual chivalrous practice of saddling all the persecutions on the Roman Catholic Church. As a matter of fact, the persecutions were more numerous and more deadly under the reformed than under the parent Church. In England, for example, there were more witches burned during the first sixty years of the seventeenth century than were put to death during the preceding 1,600 years. With scarce a single exception, the leaders of the Reformation encouraged the belief in witches, and urged their extermination. Martin Luther appears to have been obsessed by the idea of the Devil. He saw him everywhere and in everything. The Devil disturbed him at nights by rattling of pans, appeared to him while writing, and was received by Luther throwing the inkstand at his head.

The mark made by the inkstand on the wall is still shown on the wall to all those who are sceptical enough to doubt the truth of the story. When a storm arose, he said: "Tis the Devil who has done this; the winds are nothing else but good or bad spirits." Suicides, he asserted, were often strangled by the Devil. Moreover, "the Devil can so completely assume the human woman, when he wants to deceive us, that we may very well lie with what seems to us a woman of real flesh and blood, and yet all the while 'tis only the Devil in the shape of a woman." The Devil could also become the parent of children. He asserts that he knew one such case; and, said he, "I would have that child thrown into the Moldau, at the risk of being held its murderer."\* C. COHEN.

(To be continued.)

"Mamma, can a fellow have ice-cream every day in heaven?" "My dear, you wouldn't want it there." "I always knew heaven wasn't the place it is cracked up to be."

\* See note to *Hudibras*, Bohn's edition, p. 215.  
† Wright's *History of Sorcery and Magic*.

\* See chap. vi. of *Life of Luther*, by Michelet.

## Acid Drops.

ON Monday morning, as Mr. Foote was leaving Manchester by the London and North-Western, he observed a big board stuck up a long way down the departure platform of London-road Station, bearing a bill of the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes's "mission" in the Free Trade Hall. Had this announcement been placed with other advertisements, in the usual place for such things, there would have been no necessity to say anything about it. But there was no public advertisement within sixty yards of that flaring Price Hughes bill, and Mr. Foote naturally wondered why a Railway Company, which is supposed to do business with all sorts of citizens, should lend itself to that aggressive kind of religious proselytism. It would have been just as reasonable to put up a bill of Mr. Foote's lectures on the very same spot.

On Monday evening Mr. Price Hughes was suddenly taken ill at Manchester, and his wife had to be telegraphed for. Like other wives, Mrs. Hughes is no doubt anxious about her husband, and she has our sympathy. But is it not strange that "Providence" should lay the reverend gentleman low in the very thick of an extra special soul-saving mission?

The Christian Powers have killed and starved myriads of Chinese men, women, and children; yet they are still demanding the execution of certain important "criminals," and even suggesting the way in which they should be sent out of the world. One of the methods suggested is "quartering." Such is the sweet reasonableness of Christianity after two thousand years of pious training. No wonder the Chinese are so much in love with it that they dote upon its very absence.

Both Houses of Convocation voted (of course) a most loyal Address to the King. In the course of the speechifying the Bishop of Winchester remarked that Queen Victoria had, in a degree almost unknown, admitted the people to a knowledge of her domestic life. Well, if that is a merit, why does not the Bishop imitate the Queen's example? No doubt a good many foolish open-mouthed people in his diocese would be glad to know how he gets on with his wife, and whether the episcopal palace is ever desecrated by small talk about the size of milliners' bills.

The statutory declaration against Transubstantiation and the Mass which King Edward was called upon to make, and did make, at the opening of Parliament has aroused a good deal of indignation on the part of Roman Catholics. And well it might. The actual words of a part of the declaration are as follow: "I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the Invocation or Adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other Saint, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous."

The poor Duke of Norfolk, who, as Earl Marshal, stood on the right of the throne, had to listen in silence to this diatribe against his faith as it fell from the lips of his beloved Sovereign. It is reported that he looked down the Chamber with a stony stare.

Since then thirty Roman Catholic peers have memorialised the Lord Chancellor to take steps to dispense with this obnoxious formality. Most probably it is not at all to the taste of King Edward, who, however, was obliged to conform to it as a provision of the Bill of Rights. The *Times* thinks it might well be abolished, and so do a number of leading journals. In the religious press the *Church Times* is strongly against its continuance. On the other hand, the *Rock* regards it as an indispensable national safeguard, and the Church Association have issued a manifesto strenuously upholding it.

Assuredly it should be abolished as a survival of religious intolerance—a piece of archaic insolence quite unsuited to the age. A monarch who reigns over Protestants and Roman Catholics alike should not be asked to pledge himself on purely doctrinal questions, and in a way which gives offence to a section of his subjects.

*Apropos* of the Royal declaration against Romish doctrines, it is just as well to remember that Romanists administer oaths which are specially directed against Protestantism. A correspondent of the *Rock* states that every Romish bishop in the Empire is required to take an oath in which occurs the following sentence: "I promise and swear that I will with all my might persecute and combat all heretics [*i.e.*, Protestants], schismatics, and rebels to our Lord the Pope."

The "sacredness" of the cow in India has been enormously

costly during the recent famine. When the rains failed and the moisture dried up, instead of killing and curing the cattle for food, the natives kept and fed them even whilst they themselves were dying of starvation.

Poor God! He is made responsible for a great many things that one would charitably hope he has nothing at all to do with. For instance, a young man shot his sweetheart on Walney Island, and then shot himself. He left a note containing the laconic statement: "God's will." Someone abandoned a child in the streets, having first pinned to its clothes a note asking whoever found the child to take care of it, "and God will reward you." A Huddersfield man bigamously married a fellow chorister at the New Jerusalem Church. When she discovered his deceit, he said: "In the sight of God you are my wife." The Deity must be not a little ashamed at these of his creatures who thus invoke him. But then he knew it all from the first, and so can hardly be surprised.

Rev. Charles Lynn, of Newquay, Cornwall, seems to be a reputable sort of parson. He went to Birmingham, got "on the spree," and, finally, visited a house in a low quarter of the city. He went to sleep on a sofa, and was relieved of his gold watch and a £5 note. He is an elderly married man. He had had a living in Exeter, and as lately as the end of last year he had been officiating as a clergyman. He denied that he was drunk on the day of the robbery, which was all he could say in extenuation.

The minister of the New Jerusalem Church, Brightlingsea, said he wished himself "safely housed in the sunny land beyond." Whether he took any step to hasten his journey thither does not seem quite clear. Anyhow, he was found drowned in Brightlingsea creek. The previous day he had consulted a doctor as to heart trouble.

"Professor of religion" was the description Edward Shaw gave of himself at Westminster Police-court. In company with another man, he had forced the locked gates of St. Stephen's Church, Westminster, and when asked by the verger, who had been attracted by the noise, what he was doing, Shaw replied that he proposed going into the church in order to take money out of the poor-box and give it to the poor man with him. The "professor of religion"—by the way, there are a great many people who answer to that description—was remanded.

Prince Boris, who is ill at Philippopolis, is the little fellow who will one day, if he lives, rule Bulgaria. He is seven this year, but already he has been one of the most discussed Royalties in Europe. He is chiefly known as the baby whose religious faith was changed and fixed before he could properly stand on his feet. For months two great Churches fought an unholy struggle for his little soul, and the infant's cries were mingled with the bickerings and blasphemies of priests. Then, one day, the baby was set in the Sacred Chair, the mighty men of the Greek Church gathered around him, and Prince Boris, who had gone into the church a Roman Catholic, came out of it something else, bearing a talisman of gold filigree work sent by Abdul Hamid!—*The Umpire*.

The late ex-king Milan—in every sense ignoble—was a firm believer in God. When, in a whining letter to Queen Natalie, he threatens to commit suicide unless she gave him £14,000, he talks about answering for his misdeeds in the presence of God. He appeals to her "by the love of God" to impress upon his son not to trust the Servians. Queen Natalie, in her reply, does not appear to attach much importance to these pious allusions. Still the fact remains that this gambler, debauchee, and utterly-disreputable person was one of the great army of God-believers. Had he happened to profess Freethought, what should we not have heard?

A number of Barnsley shop-keepers have been summoned for a breach of the Lord's Day Observance Act. The proceedings have been instituted under the old statute of Charles II.—that high-toned monarch of pious memory. The cases have been adjourned for a month, during which time we hope some public protest will be made. When will these petty persecutions of small trades-people cease? If Sabbatarians weren't so dense, they would see that such vexacious proceedings create an immense amount of ill-feeling against the creeds.

The *Examiner* finds much to "arouse grave misgiving" in the new volume of the *Encyclopadia Biblica*. As an illustration of the startling way in which Canon Cheyne, the editor, has dealt with certain portions of the New Testament, it mentions his denial that Judas betrayed Jesus.

The *British Weekly* laments that "the honored leader of Old Testament criticism in England, Canon Cheyne, in the new volume of the *Encyclopadia Biblica*, has entrusted the supreme subjects to a critic who plunges the steel into the very heart of Christianity."

This cold-blooded assassin is the mild and amiable Dr. Schmiedel. Amongst other offences, he does not believe that the Apostle John is the author of the books attributed to him, and sets aside those who so believe as "theologians who feel themselves bound to the strictest conservatism." The *British Weekly* thinks that a remark of this kind ought to be considered "indecent" in the circle of scholarship. Dr. Schmiedel may now consider himself sat upon.

Dr. Parker has been called upon to review a work by Dr. George Adam Smith on *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*. He responds to the call with all his well-known fussiness and effusiveness. He must, however, be given credit for having stated the results of modern criticism pretty accurately. He says: "Later criticism has suggested at least, to use the mildest form of expression, that in many instances the dates are inaccurate, the accounts are discrepant, the occurrences are improbable, and the whole drama in many sections is almost a defiance addressed to nature and to reason."

Amidst much discursive matter, Dr. Parker throws in one remark that must be very comforting to the learned author. He says: "The author has evidently to make the best of a stubborn case. He must in some way or other find a path round a difficult position. That position must yield either by one means or another. The feeling of the reader is that the lecturer is determined to reach a certain point, and that he must reach it at all hazards and at all costs." Yes, of course; this is nothing new with Christian apologists. They all do it.

"God Save the King" is abject enough in all truth, but it seems it may be made still more grovelling. The Rev. C. Lloyd-Engström has written to the papers suggesting that it should be sung kneeling. Why not go a little lower down and sing it crawling on the belly? Mr. Lloyd-Engström says that the idea flashed into his mind all in a moment. Truly, a brilliant inspiration.

An inmate of the Homerton Workhouse recently refused to work on Saturday because, being a Jew, that was his Sabbath. The *Guardians* are rather puzzled what to do with him. Probably, if they granted him exemption on Saturday, they would like to make him work on Sunday; but then that would be against their own Lord's Day scruples. There is some advantage, after all, in being one of "God's chosen people."

The Rev. R. J. Campbell, of Brighton, says: "I do not see why the idea of a personal devil should usually produce an incredulous smile." Nor do we, if the persons who smile have any belief in the Bible.

According to the *Church Liberatorist*, in the first month of the twentieth century there were 147 livings for sale at prices varying from £250 to £9,000, the price in each case depending upon the age of the incumbent, as well as upon the amount of the income. The following particulars are given: £250 will buy a living with a net income of £160 besides a good house, with three reception-rooms and eight bed-rooms, delightful grounds and stabling. The incumbent is aged forty-six, hence the low price. The £9,000 living is worth £860 net with a "first-class" house, etc. This living commands a high price because the incumbent is seventy-nine years of age. The diocese of Norwich seems to head the list in the number of livings for sale, but purchasers on the outlook for a good thing have twenty-seven other dioceses from which they may pick and choose.

Commenting on the recent suggestion that the daily Press is captured by Jesuits, the *Christian World* says: "There are certainly Roman Catholic journalists in Fleet-street and 'Anglo-Catholic' journalists, but so there are Church, Protestant, and Nonconformist journalists, and unfortunately a large proportion who are practically Agnostics." If the *Christian World* had said the "greater proportion," it would have been nearer the mark.

A truly charitable Christian is the Rev. Dr. Horton, who is reported to have said: "What made men unbelievers in God was very seldom rational argument, but generally defects in the sphere of conduct. They suffered not so much from intellectual difficulties as from a paralysis of the will; they would not accept the truth, which yet was truth to them." We had thought that this stale device, adopted to account for the ineffectiveness of theological argument, had been long ago abandoned, but it would be idle to expect very much from Dr. Horton, especially in regard to the statement of fact.

Dr. Horton's reliability has been quite recently exemplified by his absurd statement that on almost every leading London daily newspaper there is a Romanist in disguise, whose business it is "to burke any book or speech or any unpleasant fact which reveals the dark side of the Roman Church." As if the thing were possible? Dr. Horton knows little, apparently nothing, about the working of a leading daily paper, or he would refrain from uttering such arrant bosh. Yet he

puts it forward as a serious, indisputable fact. Let him tell us how he obtained this special and exclusive knowledge. Is he, a rabid Protestant lecturer, in the confidence of the Jesuits, and entrusted by them with their secrets? Or have all or any of these pressmen confided in him?

Another instance of his recklessness of assertion, not to use stronger terms, is exposed in the *Church Times* of the 15th inst. The Rev. Edwin Green, of Walthamstow, writes drawing attention to the fact that in 1898 Dr. Horton stated that four hundred Anglican clergy had been secretly ordained by the Romanists. Of course, nothing of the sort had occurred, but that did not matter to Dr. Horton. It apparently suited his purpose to make the statement, and he stuck to it. The Rev. Green wrote to him asking him for his authority for it. Dr. Horton replied (Feb. 18, 1898) that a clergyman had told him so. The Rev. Green wrote again, asking him for the name of this clergyman who "told him so." That letter remains to this day unanswered.

And this is the man who levels a wholesale charge against unbelievers, accusing them of being influenced in their unbelief by their personal misconduct. Obviously, belief has done very little in the way of establishing a spirit of truthfulness in Dr. Horton.

A deadly attack on bishops in regard to their social conditions has been made by the vicar of St. Thomas's, Camden Town—the Rev. Hubert Handley. He has published a work called *The Fatal Opulence of Bishops*, in which he does not spare the Right Reverend Fathers-in-God. "Palace," he says, "as the name of a bishop's home, bristles with inconsistent suggestion and cross purpose. Its impropriety is far-fetched, audacious, complete." The Church, he says, "in spiritual things caters mainly for the well-to-do, and is socially pretentious."

Mr. Handley suggests that, as a first step towards removing the "fatal opulence," the Archbishop of Canterbury should content himself with a residence in part of Lambeth Palace and an income of £5,000, while the Bishop of London should occupy the house in St. James's-square with an income of £3,000.

One would like to know what the Rev. Handley's diocesan thinks of this philippic.

Here is a pretty specimen of the result of Sunday-school teaching: "Jacob," wrote an eleven-year-old child in a Sunday-school essay, 'was by trade a patriarch. But he didn't bring up his sons to be patriarchs, because they didn't take to it, except Joseph.....In them days people lived on corn, like horses do now.....not on vittles and tea.....They always called pudden and porrij and anything like that they called it messes in those days. Joseph could eat a good mess too; but Reuben and Juder, who was the oldest, couldn't eat as much as you might think. The patriarch Jacob never eat nothing, except when there was a famine.'

A canting, whining Uriah Heep sort of a cleric seems to be the Rev. James Clarke, of New-street, S.W., who was brought up in the dock at Marlborough-street the other day charged with drunkenness and disorderly behavior. "I feel humble before my Maker that such a thing has happened," he whined. Mr. Plowden: "It is very sad." The clergyman: "No one can feel more humble than I am myself." Mr. Plowden: "Pay the doctor's fee. Perhaps humility will suffice for the rest." But why should this Uriah Heep have been let off like this? Had he been John Smith, bricklayer, it would, almost for a certainty, have been "ten shillings or seven days."

"Time will not permit me," said an Indian bishop in a recent lecture, "to tell of the conversion of Ram Dam Chundet Bang; who, although a most enlightened man, became, by the grace of heaven, a Christian." The bishop didn't exactly mean what he said, but there was a point in his words all the same.

Rev. T. B. Paynter, who has failed for £30,000 of unsecured debts, and who formerly held a rectorship in the West of England, seems to have exhibited, to say the least of it, an astonishing want of prudence. He spent large sums in rebuilding churches, and his affairs becoming "involved," he devoted himself to commercial enterprises, which were unsuccessful. It is rather a poor consolation to his creditors to know that, if they have sustained serious monetary losses, a number of churches have been rebuilt.

"Science a Witness for God" was the subject of a lecture recently delivered in Huddersfield by the Rev. Dr. Adamson. It is very kind of science to bear witness in the way the rev. gentleman describes; but, if the existence of God is so self-evident, why should any testimony be necessary? Dr. Adamson's address abounds in familiar platitudes, and is marked by the usual absence of proof. Here is a sample of his logic, on which it is quite unnecessary to make any comment: "A

well-known Atheist had declared that they might live to the age of the longest-lived patriarch, and they could not understand a millionth part of the wonders which lay before them in Nature. It would have been impossible for this to have arisen if there had been no infinite mind behind it all."

A London daily, affecting to be very Radical, gave an elaborate account of the circus-show in which the King went to open Parliament. Naturally the new Queen (by courtesy) came in for a special description. She was represented as "a vision of radiant loveliness." We believe the lady is fifty-six.

Upper Eldon parish, in Hampshire, has a population of ten. It has a village church, but no parson. The living is only worth £45 a year, and no man of God wants to save souls at that price.

What a glorious institution is our so-called free press! One day last week the only news from New York consisted of the following items. Mr. James Henry Smith, who inherited four million dollars from "Chicago" Smith, who died in London, gave his "first party" in New York at a cost of fifty thousand dollars, a fifth of which was spent on flowers alone. There were 40,000 roses, 20,000 lilies, 5,000 tulips, 5,000 daffodils, and 50,000 sprays of rare smilax. The other piece of "news" was just as important. The Tammanyites had been eating one of their famous beef-steak dinners, and one municipal gormandiser had accounted "on his own" for fourteen pounds of beef. Such are the great events which are reported by trans-Atlantic telegraph for the information of the good Christians of England!

Mr. Philip Snowden, the Socialist and Labor candidate, has been discoursing eloquently at Blackburn on Socialism and religion. With most of what he said we are in hearty agreement. But is he not mistaken in talking about the "true principles of Christianity" as something that is still valuable? It seems to us rather absurd to take a few Gospel texts here and there, and label them "true Christianity" in disregard of all the rest. Mr. Snowden may think that this is politic. Certainly it is unphilosophical. And it will not answer in the long run.

Mr. Joseph Symes, of the *Liberator* (Melbourne), bursts into versification occasionally. We take the following from the last number of his journal to hand:—

We build a church to God above,  
The blessed fount of truth and love;  
And we consecrate the holy shrine  
To him who's one and also trine.  
But ere we consecrate that pile—  
Let not the jeering sceptic smile—  
And open the doors to catch the people,  
We fix a metal rod to the steeple.  
We've boundless faith in Almighty God;  
But we've very much more in the Lightning Rod!

You see! our "absent-minded" Dad—  
Not that his disposition's bad—  
May scatter about his thunderbolts  
To kill the vile and to frighten dolts;  
And a shot that he meant for some godless pub.  
May give to our temple a nasty rub!  
So we run up a rod of metal proper,  
I mean a genuine rod of copper.  
We've perfect faith in Almighty God,  
But we've very much more in the Lightning Rod!

Rabbi Hirsch, of Chicago, has to admit the decay of Judaism, which must ever be the case when Jews are no longer persecuted and thus stereotyped. "Our synagogues," he says, "have everywhere lost influence over their members." He tries to account for this on the ground that the majority of Jews cannot attend the synagogues on a Saturday; but that is a very inadequate explanation.

The Pope rejects Christian Socialism, but he recommends Christian Democracy. He does not propose, however, to carry it into practice in his own Church. He knows very well that the Catholic Church, like Catholic dogma, rests on authority. That, indeed, is the secret of its strength. All its resources would be useless without its discipline. And that discipline would soon disappear if the Pope's pronouncements on political and social questions were anything more than academical exercises. If he condescended to become precise and practical, he would very quickly split his Church into fragments.

The Christian Endeavor people are boasting their conquests in twenty years. On their own showing, they have gone almost everywhere and done almost everything. It is well to recollect, though, that they failed in their effort to convert Colonel Ingersoll. They offered up special prayers for his conversion, but the Lord was not in a complying mood. Perhaps he felt that the case of a man with Ingersoll's brains was perfectly hopeless. Anyhow, the great "infidel" died in his scepticism—with a pleasant word on his tongue and a smile on his face.

The Philippine Commission, appointed by the United States Government, reports against allowing the friars to return to the islands. The Filipinos hate them worse than the Devil hates holy water. With regard to the morality of the friars, or rather the way in which they keep their vows of chastity, the Commissioners write as follows:—"The common people are not generally licentious or unchaste, but the living together of a man and woman without the marriage ceremony is not infrequent, and is not condemned. It did not shock the common people or arouse their indignation to see their curate establish illicit relations with a woman and have children by her. The woman generally did not lose caste on that account, but often prided herself on the relation to the chief authority in the village, and on the paternity of her children, who were apt to be better looking, brighter, and more successful than the pure Filipino children. Of course there may have been instances in which a friar used his autocratic power to establish a relation of this kind against the will of the woman and her relatives. But it is conceded by the most intelligent and observant of the witnesses against the friars that their immorality, as such, would not have made them hateful to the people. On the contrary, the Filipino priests who have taken their places are shown to be fully as immoral as the friars, but the people do not feel any ill will against them on that account."

The doctor who wrote the report for the Middletown, N.Y., insane asylum a year or two ago drew the ire of the orthodox upon himself by his statement that the way to the madhouse often led through the church. The report of the superintendent of the Central Hospital for the Insane, just published at Indianapolis, Ind., shows that the Middletown doctor spoke the truth. The Indianapolis superintendent classifies the causes which led to the insanity of the persons committed during the year, and of the 570 nearly ten per cent., or fifty-five, were made insane by reason of religious excitement. The report says that none of the latter was affected by hereditary insanity. If patients afflicted with religious dementia could be brought under the influence of rational teaching in time, they would in all likelihood be cured; but, rational teaching being inconsistent with and destructive of faith in Christianity, the doctors are not going to risk their positions by recommending it. The sanity of thousands must be sacrificed in order that the ministers and priests may live.—*Truthseeker* (New York).

A collection was taken up at the recent anniversary service of one of the Leeds mission chapels, and amongst the offerings was found a set of false teeth. Perhaps the donor thought the teeth suited the preaching. Otherwise, on the assumption that he was giving to the Lord, it was a very odd present.

Dr. Guinness Rogers, in the *Christian*, says that Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall, and other redoubtable champions, had their strength "shattered against the impregnable fortress they assailed." Well now, let us take Darwin. What did he assail? The doctrine of special creation. Is there, we ask, a single minister of religion with a reputation to lose who will defend that doctrine to-day? Do not the leading lights of all the Churches talk about "evolution" as though they invented the word and it always belonged to them? What Dr. Rogers means, no doubt, is this—that the Christian Churches have not been *destroyed*. That is true enough, but they have been very much *altered*. The heaven of Freethought is working inside them all. Yes, even inside the Roman Catholic Church itself! The late Professor St. George Mivart was excommunicated, but it is well known that he left many sympathisers behind him.

### "Missionary Hymn."

LORD, from far western lands we come  
To save these heathen for thy own.  
We bring them bayonets and rum,  
We bring them death and woes and moan,  
Sweet fruits Christianity has grown.

Thou who hast been our guide and guard  
Half round the globe, be still our ark;  
Bless thou our guns, our faith reward,  
Speed every bullet to its mark  
Till rebels all are stiff and stark.

Thou who art peace, smile on our way,  
As erst thou didst on son of Nun;  
The heathen break, their courage mar,  
Hold up our hands till set of sun,  
Till we can get them on the run.

Thou knowest, Lord, how deep our zeal  
For heathen vile in darkness drear,  
Who fight with bows, who will not kneel!  
Help us, O Lord, to make them fear,  
And teach them how to drink our beer.

—Matthew Dix.



## Mr. Foote's Engagements.

Sunday, February 24, Athenæum Hall, 73 Tottenham Court-road, London, W., at 7.30, "The Fable of Jesus Christ."

March 3, Athenæum Hall.

March 10, South Shields.

## To Correspondents.

MR. CHARLES WATTS'S ENGAGEMENTS.—All communications for Mr. Watts should be sent to him at 24 Carminia-road, Balham, S.W. If a reply is required, a stamped and addressed envelope must be enclosed.

R. W. WILLIAMS.—You are mistaken. We have never treated or regarded Mr. Herbert Spencer as a Theist on account of his doctrine of the Unknowable. He is, as you say, a Monist. He does not postulate a personal God.

G. MULLETT.—Taylor's *Diegesis* could probably be obtained second-hand. It has long been out of print. We do not agree with the opinion you cite as Taylor's about the Jews.

MIMNERMUS.—Your rejoinder on the question of the remains of Voltaire and Rousseau is in type, but has to stand over till next week through pressure of other matter on our space.

H. LAWTON.—Whether Voltaire did, or did not, think that Christianity would be extinct in a century from his time, is a question of no importance whatever. Probably he meant that it would be extinct among men of intelligence, who do not in some way live by it, and in that sense he was right. But, after all, what the Bishop of Ripon has to do is to answer Voltaire's arguments. To do that is much harder than to reckon up the number of professed Christians.

F. E. WILLIS.—Thanks for cuttings.

J. R. WEBLEY says he agrees with Dr. Horton. His own experience convinces him that there is not a Liberal paper in this country or in the United States without a Romanist on its staff. He declares that he can trace the influence of Rome even in papers like the *Star*, the *Morning Leader*, and *Reynolds*'.

E. R. WOODWARD asks us to note that Mr. J. M. Robertson addressed a crowded audience at the Camberwell Secular Hall last Sunday evening on "The Struggle in South Africa."

H.—Mr. Foote is better, thank you. Mr. Cohen's articles now running through the *Freethinker* will no doubt be collected in a separate form.

W. P. BALL.—Always glad to receive your cuttings.

R. P. EDWARDS has changed his address to 98 Balmoral-road, New Brompton. Branch secretaries and others please note.

E. HOLLAND.—Received and under consideration.

S. HOLMAN.—We hardly know how to make a paragraph out of such vague material. Glad to hear the South Wales "saints" mean to persevere. Of course we shall be happy to insert Mr. Treharne-Jones's lecture appointments if they are sent us.

T. FISHER.—We will think over your suggestion, and give you an answer next week.

V. E. RAYNSFORD.—Received, but not yet read.

E. PAINTER is thanked for the £2 he kindly left with Miss Vance the other day to assist Mr. Foote in his dash for the seaside.

SHILLING WEEK.—Per Miss Vance:—Ernest, 2s.; D. R. Bows, 2s.; A. Carr, 1s.; W. W. Roberts, 2s.

SOME correspondence stands over unavoidably till next week, in consequence of extra-editorial demands upon Mr. Foote's time this week.

J. BARRY.—See reply to "H." We note your suggestion that a series of articles on the different versions of the Bible would be appreciated.

R. BROWN.—Thanks for the *Sketch* reference. "Mimnermus" has written a reply to Mr. G. Facer's communication, and it will appear in our next issue.

PAPERS RECEIVED.—Sunday Chronicle—Umpire—Huddersfield Examiner—Yorkshire Evening Post—Two Worlds—Crescent—Truthseeker (New York)—Challenge—Progressive Thinker—Liberator—People's Newspaper—Christian—Public Opinion (New York)—El Libre Pensamiento—Advertiser (Bishop's Castle)—Blackburn Weekly Telegraph—Torch of Reason.

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

THE National Secular Society's office is at 1 Stationers' Hall Court, Ludgate Hill, E.C., where all letters should be addressed to Miss Vance.

LECTURE NOTICES must reach 1 Stationers' Hall Court, Ludgate Hill, E.C., by first post Tuesday, or they will not be inserted.

ORDERS for literature should be sent to the Freethought Publishing Company, Limited, 1 Stationers' Hall Court, Ludgate Hill, E.C.

LETTERS for the Editor of the *Freethinker* should be addressed to 1 Stationers' Hall Court, Ludgate Hill, 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.

## Sugar Plums.

MR. FOOTE lectures at the Athenæum Hall, 73 Tottenham Court-road, London, W., this evening (Feb. 24), taking for his subject "The Fable of Jesus Christ."

Mr. Foote's lectures at Manchester on Sunday were well attended. There was a good morning audience, which highly appreciated the lecture on "The Pope, the Catholic Church, and the French Republic." The afternoon lecture on "Shakespeare and the Bible" was followed with intense interest by a still better gathering. Several questions were asked afterwards, and some discussion took place. Amongst the critics was a parson, who spoke with preternatural solemnity. He said that the lecturer had put a strain upon the courtesy of a Christian clergyman; but, when his little speech was ended, the man of God showed the extent of his Christian courtesy by walking out of the place without waiting for the lecturer's reply. In the evening the Secular Hall was full, and the lecture (given by request) on "The End of 'God Save the Queen'" was greatly applauded. Again there were questions and discussion. Altogether the Branch Committee were very pleased with the day's proceedings, and Mr. Foote was pressed to come again as soon as possible.

The Manchester Branch seems to be doing fairly well, but not so well as could be wished, in spite of the active efforts of the officers and committee. It appears that really good audiences only assemble on the occasion of Mr. Foote's visits. This is a great pity. There are other lecturers who ought to address good meetings from the Secular Hall platform. We hope the local "saints" will do their best, during the remainder or the winter season, to secure a better attendance at all special lectures. A good deal of effective advertising can be done in a quiet and inexpensive way, by giving publicity to the meetings amongst friends and acquaintances, and trying to induce as many of them as possible to attend.

Rev. Hugh Price Hughes was "missioning" at Manchester on Sunday. Occasionally his bills were on the hoardings side by side with Mr. Foote's. They were printed, too, in the same colors. On the whole, the contact and resemblance must have been distressing—to the godly.

Last Sunday evening Mr. Charles Watts lectured at the Athenæum Hall upon "The Evils of Christianity." The audience heartily applauded his treatment of the subject. The Rev. Mr. Coles offered some courteous opposition, and invited Mr. Watts to meet him in set debate upon the same subject. The invitation was accepted, and no doubt the discussion will take place at an early date.

Dr. E. B. Foote, of New York, has just completed the new and probably final edition of his *Plain Home Talk*, a work replete with valuable information conveyed in simple language, which has had an immense circulation throughout the English-speaking world. Dr. Foote is a veteran Freethinker, and one of the most amiable of men. He has long been a most liberal supporter of the Freethought movement in America.

Dr. E. B. Foote's second son, Dr. Hubert Foote, is a great dog-fancier. His wife, who shares his love of canine pets, is at present on a visit to England. We had the pleasure of spending an hour or two in her society a few days ago. She is a particularly bright lady, with a wonderfully expressive face. America seems to breed this type of woman (at present) more liberally than the old country.

After an adjourned discussion, the National Secular Society's Executive has accepted the President's suggestion that the outdoor propaganda in London during the summer should be centralised. A sub-committee of five—all vice-presidents—has been appointed to see to the details. Their business is to meet the Branch secretaries and arrange a Lecture Program for the whole metropolis. By this means the lecturing force in the field will be fairly distributed and rendered more comprehensively effective. All the lecturers' fees will be paid by the Executive, and the collections made at their meetings will be sent in to headquarters. It is a policy of "pay all and take all." The Lecture Program for all London will be printed on one advertising sheet. By this means it will strike the public who read it as a sign that the Freethought movement is a bigger thing than they imagined.

We much regret to hear, just as we are going to press, that the Camberwell Branch refuses to co-operate with the other London Branches in this attempt at organising the open-air propaganda. Having the use of a hall, provided years ago by the money of Freethinkers in all parts of London, and even, we believe, in the provinces, the Camberwell Branch prefers to make use of its special advantages for its own exclusive interest. This spirit has, unfortunately, always stood in the way of the effective organisation of Freethought in London. It is sad to confess that the Churches are "wiser in their generation than the children of light."

We make an earnest appeal to our friends throughout the country to do all they can to break down the boycott of the *Freethinker* by newsagents. Here is a case in point—one out of ever so many. A gentleman in Kent ordered some papers from one of W. H. Smith & Son's railway book-stand agents. The other papers were duly supplied, but the agent wrote: "I regret to say that I am unable to obtain for you the *Freethinker* of Dec. 29." Writing to us, the customer asks, "Is this real inability or something else?" As far as the local agent was personally concerned, it may have been real inability. Perhaps he sent his order to the central office in London, and was unable to obtain the *Freethinker* from it with other journals. But the central office people could have supplied this journal if they had chosen. It was not their inability, but their bigotry, that interfered; only they are not frank and honest enough to say so. In such cases the customer should say: "Well now, I know you can supply me with that paper if you like, and if you won't do so I shall place my whole order elsewhere. I shall not let you decide for me what papers I shall read." We believe this action would, in the course of time, bring stuck-up newsagents to their senses.

"I notice in your issue for the 17th instant," writes Mr. D. Frankel, of the East London Branch, "that you insert a paragraph to the effect that the Church Army in Middlesex-street, Whitechapel, on Sundays from 12 to 1 p.m., give an opportunity for questions and discussion. As this information is rather vague and not quite correct, I beg to say that it is in Blackhouse-yard, which is the first turning on the left from Aldgate (not Whitechapel) in Middlesex-street, which is better known as Petticoat-lane, that on Sunday mornings between 11.30 and 1 the Church Army are supposed to answer any questions or doubts on Christianity. I may say that the younger members of the East London Branch have been in the habit of attending these Church Army meetings during the winter season, and with some slight success, for we have succeeded in converting one of the young men who used to assist in the Church service at St. Mary's-at-Hill."

The Humanitarian League announces a lecture by Mr. J. M. Robertson on Tuesday evening (Feb. 26) in St. Martin's Town Hall, on "What War Means for Men and Animals." It is not stated that Mr. Robertson has any personal knowledge of this subject, but his lecture may be very interesting nevertheless. Mr. W. R. Cremer, M.P., takes the chair, and the admission is free.

The East London Branch holds its annual meeting to-day (Feb. 24), at the Stanley Temperance Bar, 7 High-street, Stepney, at 3.30 p.m. All members are requested to attend.

Mr. Maurice Russell asks voters to plump for him at the West Ham School Board election on Tuesday, March 5th. He has issued a striking address, which should bring him a large measure of support. He advocates the exclusion of religious teaching from the schools, and the substitution of sound moral training. We dare say the Secularists in the borough will endeavor to place Mr. Russell upon the new Board.

The Freethought Publishing Company has in the press, and will shortly issue, a little book by Mr. C. Cohen, on the important question of Foreign Missions. Mr. Cohen has taken a great deal of trouble to obtain full and accurate information. We believe this publication will be eagerly read by Freethinkers, who should try to circulate it amongst their more orthodox friends.

It is the custom of many writers, and especially of Catholic writers, to inveigh against purely secular education as if it were morally worthless, or even morally pernicious. I believe this to be a grave error. Education which is merely intellectual, by giving men a clearer view of their true interests, contributes largely to the proper regulation of life; by opening a wide range of new and healthy interests it diverts them from much vice; by increasing their capacity for fighting the battle of life it takes away many temptations.

—W. E. Lecky,

## Echoes from Olympus.

### VI.—ANGEL GABRIEL'S GARDEN PARTY.

MOVED, it may be, by the same spirit which induced the famous Hans Breitmann to give a "barty," the angel Gabriel, after mature consideration, determined to arrange a *fête* in the pleasure grounds surrounding his magnificent Crystal Palace, which is perched on an extensive eminence in the south-eastern region of heaven. The announcement that such an event was in contemplation aroused the liveliest interest in the more select celestial circles. There is so little to do in the eternal cycles of heavenly existence that even angels become victims of *ennui*.

Moreover, Gabriel felt that it was due to his high official position that he should once in a while extend some hospitality to his intimate angelic friends—something which should be a little different to their ordinary outdoor pleasures.

But, first of all, he thought it well to consult his friend Peter. For, though Peter, in his irascible way, occasionally treated Gabriel with no little brusqueness, Gabriel retained a great respect for the Apostle, and relied very much upon his judgment.

He, therefore, sought Peter, and laid the proposal before him. Peter, as it happened, was in a more unamiable mood than usual.

"A garden party, indeed!" he exclaimed. "I should have thought there had been enough of garden parties. There was that party of three in the Garden of Eden. *That* created the devil's own mischief in the world. We haven't got over it yet. What with that silly Eve and that blighted dolt of an Adam, the whole human race was brought as near hell as damn it. Are you going to invite the serpent, Gabriel?"

"Now, Peter, don't be irreverent," expostulated Gabriel. "Irreverent to *him*! What next! I only mention it because I'm not going to let him in—garden party or no garden party. He was here once upon a time till he 'got the push,' in the words of the immortal Milton. We couldn't do with him again."

"Do be sensible, Peter. You know very well what I propose. Why shouldn't we have a little gathering—say of about two or three millions? There's plenty of room. Of course, the novelty and attraction will mainly exist in the special amusements arranged."

"I tell you, Gaby, I'm against garden parties. There was one in Eden, and then there was obliged to be another in Gethsemane."

"But we are all more or less spending eternity in gardens up here."

"You may be, but I'm not. I'm tied to a gate day and night, year in and year out, and that doesn't dispose one to much reckless pleasure in the shape of walking under trees and sneaking the fruit when the keepers aren't looking, or lying on your back on the grass with your hat perched on your nose."

"That's a funny notion of a garden party."

"It's about as sensible as any other."

Gabriel saw it was useless to argue the matter any further, so he said: "Will you come, Peter, when it takes place?"

"I suppose I must," said Peter, rather glumpily; "I'll take a day off, and let those beggars from earth hammer at the gate till the next morning."

Being now determined to carry out his idea, Gabriel made the necessary preparations. Somewhat, however, to his dismay, he found himself so besieged with applications for cards of admission that he hardly knew what to do. This had largely arisen from a preliminary par. in the *Celestial Intelligencer*. He found that, instead of a modest three millions, he was asked to entertain nine millions of guests. That, he thought, was rather a large order. However, he instituted a process of selection, and succeeded in bringing the total invitations down to something like reasonable dimensions. He fixed the date without fear of meteorological possibilities. There is nothing but fine weather in heaven. All the bad weather is sent down to the planet Earth.

When the day arrived, there was a considerable gathering in the palace grounds—about three millions of seraphs and angels. Gabriel's domains could, of course, accommodate more, for there is no lack of space in heaven—room for more people than are ever likely to get there. But it was thought well not to have a crush.

All the *élite* were present, arrayed in robes of spotless white and resplendent with golden crowns, girdles, and bracelets set with precious stones—rubies, amethysts, sapphires, and diamonds—"sparkling in the light with defiant brilliance."

During the earlier part of the *fête* the guests quietly promenaded, or leisurely sailed in the air on "unopinioned wing." Later on the entertainments commenced. These were marked by great variety. So many different tastes had to be considered. There was a great football cup-tie match between the Protestant Albion and the Roman Catholic Villa, and a cycling contest in which Obadiah, Philemon, Haggai, and Jeremiah were amongst the competitors. Samson gave an exhibition of the way in which he slew his thousand men with the jaw-bone of an ass, and Jonah had a side-show all to

himself, in which he practically illustrated, by means of a dummy whale, how easy it was to get in and out of its gullet.

But that which attracted most attention of all was Moses on a motor-car. That novel event came about in this way: Elijah, since he was taken up in a fiery chariot with horses of fire that carried him to heaven as by a whirlwind, had always taken an interest in various forms of motor power. The invention of the steam locomotive on earth, as soon as it was made known, engaged his liveliest attention. He eventually had an engine made on the latest approved principles, and drove it himself up and down the streets of heaven. After knocking four or five angels down in his mad careers, and inflicting serious, though not, of course, mortal, injury upon his victims, the Lord thought it was time to put a stop to this inconvenient, if not dangerous, amusement. Elijah, therefore, had sorrowfully to put his locomotive up in a stable, where, however, he would visit it from time to time, and wistfully gaze upon it, polishing up its various parts, though they were no longer utilisable.

All this was, of course, some time ago. When, quite lately, the motor-car made its appearance on earth, Elijah's slumbering passion was fanned into a perfect flame. He was "dead nuts" on it at once. At the risk of incurring the divine displeasure, he had one very quietly made, and, trusting to luck, ventured to bring it out from time to time. This he did only at night, when most of the angels were fast asleep in their various domiciles. Further, he selected a lonely and secluded part of heaven, where he thought he might safely run his vehicle up and down without much risk of discovery.

He was not altogether undetected, even here. Several angels living in isolated dwellings in the vicinity complained of hearing an unheavenly throbbing, rumbling, whistling noise outside in the middle of the night, as if something were swiftly passing up and down. Furthermore, they complained of a vile smell of some sort of oil.

Elijah took no notice of these complaints. He hadn't the least bit of conscience when mechanical locomotion was concerned. Growing bolder by degrees, he brought his motor out in the daytime, and, with great pride, exhibited its powers to some friendly angels. Thus it came about that, on his own invitation, he brought it to Gabriel's garden party. Here it was the object of much curious inspection. A little group of angels, amongst whom were Moses, Ezekiel, Jehoshaphat, and Jeremiah, gathered around whilst Elijah, with much pride and voluminous detail, explained its mechanism and powers.

Moses seemed to be specially interested, and made many inquiries which showed intelligent appreciation. Much pleased by this, Elijah inquired of Moses whether he would like a ride.

"Yes," said Moses, as a man of tried courage, who had no fear of a mere vehicular invention. "Certainly, I should be very pleased."

"Then get up," said Elijah, "and sit by me, and we'll have a little spin. Oh, you *will* enjoy it!"

Nothing daunted Moses mounted on to the seat, and in another moment the motor-car started off under the able engineering of Elijah.

Away they went across a long open space, making for the Palace which rose, two or three miles ahead, above a rather deep declivity.

"Now isn't this fine?" asked Elijah ecstatically as they merrily spun along.

"Yes, beautiful!" said Moses.

Presently they began to descend the hill with a momentum which rapidly increased, until at last it became quite alarming—at any rate to Moses. Meanwhile Elijah tugged away at the brake for all he was worth.

"Can't you slow her down a bit?" inquired Moses, rather nervously.

"Well, I can't quite make it out," replied Elijah with evident anxiety as well as amazement, while beads of cold perspiration began to appear on his brow. "The blamed thing doesn't seem to act. I really believe there's something gone wrong with the works!"

It is unnecessary to say any more than that the motor, now quite uncontrolled, dashed headlong forward into the crowded portion of the grounds. Six angels were bowled over in its course. Eventually it dashed into Jonah's tent, smashed through the middle of the dummy whale, gave a snort, then toppled over on its side and pitched Moses and Elijah several yards away. They were eventually picked up by a number of affrighted seraphs and angels, and were found to be practically intact.

Elijah subsequently explained that he might have flown on his wings from the motor, but thought it was his duty to stick to the vehicle, and continue his endeavors to stop it from injuring angels in its path. Moses said he was so alarmed that this obvious method of escape did not occur to him. Besides, he said, if it had, he was so paralyzed that he couldn't lift a wing. Very soon afterwards everyone, including the two chief actors, were laughing heartily over the occurrence.

This episode was the most notable feature of Gabriel's garden party. Music and dancing followed, the grounds were beautifully illuminated with colored lamps, and the

whole ended with a grand display of fireworks, in which there was a set piece representing Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego standing unharmed in the fiery furnace.

FRANCIS NEALE.

## Ethical Culture versus Ethical Cult.

IN the *Standard Dictionary*—the latest and best—occur the following definitions: "*Culture*. (3) The training, development, or strengthening of the powers, mental or physical, or the condition thus produced; improvement or refinement of mind, morals, or tastes; enlightenment or civilisation. *Cult*. (1) Worship or religious devotion, as contrasted with creed; especially, the forms of a religion; a system of rites and observances; a cultus."

Etymologically "Culture" and "Cult" are related, both being from the Latin verb *colere*, which means both to cultivate and to worship; but in sense and substance they are fundamentally different, and the things respectively are historically opposed to each other. "Cult" implies a religious devotion to forms or rites apart from any creed or belief they symbolise; "Culture" means a development and strengthening of the mental or moral powers and their improvement, which involves a growth in thought and knowledge inconsistent with devotion to forms and rites. One implies fixity, the other change.

Let us now turn to the word "Ethical." Both "moral," from the Latin *mos*, custom, and "ethical," from the Greek *ethos*, custom, had the same sense originally, and alike signified the social regulations and conventional conduct held obligatory on each member of the community. But "mos" (plural "mores") more definitely than "ethos" connoted religious as well as social observances, customs, manners, while "ethos" more connoted character; and gradually *ethic* or *ethics* has been adopted as the word suited to the philosophical or scientific investigation of moral systems, and of individual conduct.

This has been a comparatively modern development. It has followed on the perception that morality is by no means the fixed system of rules which it was long supposed to be, and that a high morality required certain individual deviations from the *mos*, the custom or fashion prescribed by society or by the community. Best men have often found themselves impelled by their moral sense to confront usage, to oppose custom, to obey some conviction of duty which appeared to them higher than that of others around them. To justify this apparent eccentricity such have had to search into underlying principles of existing moral usages, point out those that appear to them untrue or unscientific, and set beside them the principles they believe true and higher.

This situation, philosophically considered, is anomalous. The rules, manners, customs—the morals—of a community, were they genuinely developed out of its actual needs and its common sense, would not be liable to any radical challenge by science or by justice. Moral growth would be normally represented only in improving means and methods of application of universally approved principles. The scandal—for it amounts to such—that there should be different and even antagonistic standards of morality in one and the same community must be sought for in the adulterations of traditional morality.

In the new Dictionary already cited, the *Standard*, the following is the first definition of the word "moral": "Of or pertaining to the practices, conduct, and spirit of men towards God, themselves, and their fellow men, with reference to right and wrong and to obligation to duty; pertaining to rightness and oughtness in conduct; ethical."

It will be observed that in this quite correct definition of the word "moral" the supposed obligation to God comes first, personal and neighborly conduct being subordinate. But is duty to God consistent with duty to one's neighbor, one's fellow men, one's self? That obviously depends on the question whether the God is a moral being in the strictly human and social sense of moral. Suppose the God is one requiring the blood of human victims on his altar. In the community believing in such a God, any attempt to rescue the victims would be supremely immoral; but in the view of "civilised" communities, so called, the rescuers would be the supremely moral people, and those fulfilling their duties

to God immoral. But the moral system of every nation calling itself civilised was formed amid similar beliefs to those which under "heathen" names and forms we pronounce savage, and every such system, however modernised and refined, is fatally adulterated by survivals of traditional duties to some God. For every such duty, so far as it differs from duty to man, is a human sacrifice, whether bloody or not, and is immoral morality.

I have said *fatally*—weighing the word. People may imagine the morals grown around Mumbo Jumbo eliminated in the services paid to their own deity; but the most refined conception of a God now known in Christendom cannot be introduced into the sphere of ethics without bringing with it a virus more fatal to human morality than any idolatry reeking with blood on its altars. Human sacrifices, in the literal sense, have now nearly ceased in every part of the world, and it is doubtful whether, within any year of the nineteenth century, as many were sacrificed as were last year murdered by American lynchers. But when the so-called "heathen" sacrificed men to his God it was not from worship, but from fear; it was not because he believed his God good, but because he believed him bad, and that unless a few were offered to appease his bloodthirstiness the whole tribe would suffer his vengeance. He did not—this "heathen"—hold up the invisible monster as a model for imitation; he did not suggest that the bloodthirsty God was a loving Father, demanding slaughter for the victims' benefit; the tribal ethic was thus not corrupted at the root. The evil was cured because it resulted from natural ignorance. Natural ignorance is easily outgrown, but not so educated ignorance. The once terrible Mumbo Jumbo has vanished from Africa as a supernatural phantasm, as the mediæval devil has vanished from Protestant Christendom; but, whereas the African demon has left no theoretic Mumbo Jumboism to succeed him, Protestant religion has long been educating the foremost nations to attribute to God all the evils formerly attributed to the devil. Whatever happens—not only Galveston cyclones, but Chinese Boxer cyclones, Maine explosions and consequent slaughter, Transvaal invasions, all despotisms and mobs and lynchings—they all occur under God. All were foreseen by his omniscience, therefore had to occur, and through them is worked out a divine purpose hid in the depths of the universe.

MONCURE D. CONWAY.

—Open Court (Chicago).

(To be concluded.)

### It's not all Grief that Crapes.

FOR once I'll speak the truth, sir,  
Though it ain't exactly nice;  
We men can't be all angels, sir,  
We must take a little vice.  
Victoria's dead, and I'm that glad  
In spite of this 'ere crape!  
Why! what's the matter? Ain't yer well?  
Yer needn't stare and gape!  
I've got to pull a churchyard face,  
I've got to squeeze out tears,  
I've got to sport a nigger suit,  
And talk of funeral biers.  
But my inside jumps up and down  
With laughter I daren't show;  
For feelin's ain't to be coerced  
Like 'ats and gowns, you know.  
I've waited for this blessed day—  
Don't screw up such a mug!—  
I'll fairly burst, if just for once  
I don't pull out the plug!  
I've waited for this blessed day,  
I'll spit it out and done!  
Yes, black my eye and knock me down,  
Yer can't upset my fun!  
For ten long years I've scraped to drink  
This cup of joy and crape;  
For years I've practised in the glass  
A broken 'eart to ape.  
The good old lady's gone! 'Urrah!  
The truth now shan't be 'id!  
I'll wear deep black, for I've insured  
'Er life for fifty quid!\*

WALTER K. LEWIS, B.A.

\* It is reported that the Insurance Companies have paid out half a million on small policies at the Queen's death.

### An Unique Gathering.

THE Rev. Alex. J. Harrison, of Newcastle-on-Tyne, has just concluded a course of lectures on Christian Evidences at Beverley. In response to requests from local saints, the rev. gentleman courteously cancelled the arrangement for his last lecture, and allowed the evening to be devoted instead to discussion. There were present about four hundred people, including many of the *élite* of Beverley and a fair sprinkling of the local clergy. The cause of Freethought was championed by Mr. G. Dawson Baker, who spoke for fifteen minutes on the supreme obligation of man. He contended that man's first duty is to his fellow men, and that God, even granting his existence, is too remote from human life to have any claim upon us. Mr. Baker spoke under some considerable disadvantage, the sympathies of his audience being mainly with the lecturer; but he sustained a difficult part with tact and ability, and his hearers were generous enough to accord him a hearty measure of applause at the close of his speech.

The meeting was conducted with perfect harmony and good feeling throughout. Mr. Dawson Baker seconded the vote of thanks to the chairman and the lecturer, and further acknowledged the facilities which had been accorded him by the conveners of the meeting. The lecturer, in responding to the resolution, reminded his hearers that they were brethren, and that the mere fact of their difference of opinion from Mr. Baker did not cancel that relationship.

### The Poor Heathen.

LET us go and find the heathen; let us take him by the hand;  
Let us take his evil from him; let us also take his land.  
Let us break it to him gently that it's wrong to be so nude,  
And inculcate proper notions of the style, as it's pursued.  
Let us show him all the glories of the white man's kingdom  
come,  
And, by way of introduction, sell him lots of white man's  
rum.

Let us seek our heathen brother in benighted lands afar,  
And impress him with the wrongness of his habits as they are;  
Let us guide him, slowly, surely, till he's nobly civilised,  
And has banished all his foibles, all his fancies, so despised;  
Let us show him how he's destined to go forward with a  
jump,  
Lest our grand, resistless progress takes him 'midship with a  
bump.

Let us teach him that the bolo and the dagger are not right,  
When the seven-shooter follows up its barking with a bite;  
Let us bring to him the gospel of the shirt and full-dress suit,  
And the glad and glorious tidings of the proper shoe or boot.  
Let us lift the poor old heathen from the bog wherein he sticks,  
And explain to him the beauties of the game of politics.

Thus we'll labor with the pagan till he understands our ways  
And will ponder with a shudder on his old unhappy days.  
We will stock his land with clothing, we will dot it with golf  
links,  
And he'll hail the architecture of the home of fancy drinks;  
And we'll get the glory for it—for the good that we will do—  
All the grand, impressive glory—and we'll get his money, too.

JOSIE WINK.

### The National Secular Society.

REPORT of adjourned Executive meeting held on Thursday, February 14; Mr. G. W. Foote, President, in the chair. There were also present Messrs. E. Bate, C. Cohen, J. Cooper, T. Gorniot, W. Leat, B. Munton, J. Neate, C. Quinton, E. Quay, E. Sims, T. Shore, H. Stace, T. Thurlow, C. Watts, T. Wilmot, and the Secretary.

After a general discussion on the Outdoor Propaganda, Mr. Gorniot moved, and Mr. Shore seconded: "That the open-air lecturing work in London be centralised during the coming summer to the following extent:—That the engagement of lecturers and their payment be left to a special N. S. S. Sub-Committee in concert with the Secretaries of Branches, and that the collections at all meetings be remitted to the Central Fund." An amendment, asking that a grant per lecture be made to all Branches during the coming summer, was put to the meeting and lost, and the previous resolution carried.

The following members were then elected on the Sub-Committee: Messrs. Roger, Quay, Stace, Thurlow, and Shore, and an early meeting arranged.

The Secretary was instructed to reply to the communications of Messrs. Moss and Heaford, and the meeting closed.

E. M. VANCE, Secretary.

## Correspondence.

## THE CREATION STORY.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Mr. Watts often writes in a manner which, to me, appears easy to be disproved; still, I have never yet attempted its refutation, lest I should seem obtruding myself too much. But I so repudiate his interpretation of Genesis i. in your last issue that, as a subscriber, I crave permission to give my own. And surely your readers will be interested to see an "orthodox" view of this debated chapter advance into the open, and challenge any scrutiny. More especially will this be the case after the uncomplimentary language applied to theologians in the paper I refer to.

Genesis i. 1 informs us that where before had been vacancy God called into existence the boundless universe—a glorious thought which heathen philosophy could never suggest. No note of time is given, but science teaches this creation took place at some date inconceivably remote. Between verses i. and ii. an immense lapse of ages is silently overpassed, the object of Scripture being to disclose our relation to God, not to teach us geology or any secular branch of knowledge. Our mental powers are given us to investigate these. The remainder of the chapter relates how, in six days of twenty-four hours each, a part of Western Asia was fitted for man's habitation after some earthquake or local disturbance of the earth's crust, which wrapped the region in gloomy vapor. Outside its bounds birds and beasts, trees and vegetables, flourished just as now, while, it is needless to say, the sun, moon, and stars were in no manner affected.

The Revised Version gives "one day" for "first day," "a second day," "a third day," etc., ending with "the sixth day." This correct rendering of the Hebrew suggests the six days (not of creation) of preparing the earth for man were selected for reasons unknown to us, and appear to human intellect no more suitable than others occurring before or since.

Did space permit, I might show that an immense void, long unsuspected, between the two first verses is quite in analogy with other Biblical passages. Or I might prove that weighty theologians, over a thousand years ago, held the existence of this void long ere geology was dreamed of. This fact shows the interpretation was not originated by stress of controversy. Lastly, let me say there is no difficulty about the work of the fourth day. The word translated "made" (verse 16), is different from that rendered "created" (verse 1). The former is rendered by various words. Thus 1 Samuel xii. 6 has it "appointed" in one version and "advanced" in the other, while the margin of both shows the Hebrew signifies "made." Suppose our translators had given Genesis i. 16 thus, "God advanced the two great lights," the meaning would have been plain—viz., that He caused their lustre to pierce through the gloom.

Can Mr. Watts show how increasing knowledge interferes with my interpretation? It is evidently no more concerned with geological discussions than with political.

HENRY J. ALCOCK, M.A.

## "ATHEIST" AND "FREETHINKER."

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—In the *Freethinker* for February to you give a courteous reply to a suggestion and criticism I made regarding the name of the *Freethinker*. The answer is not convincing, and perhaps you will allow me to show why it is not. But, before doing so, I must say a word or two about the terms Atheist, Freethinker, and Agnostic. You would not read, much less print, this letter if I went in detail into the etymology of the word Atheist; but it is worth trying to get at the right meaning of terms, and then sticking to it. This is the only way of keeping the wolf "muddle and metaphysics" off. Atheist belongs to a large group of words—*in, ise, ism, ist*—representing study or labour about a matter, and so belief about it. The words group in *mutually exclusive* or contradictory couples—as, e.g., realist and idealist, materialist and spiritualist, besides Theist and Atheist. I cannot think of another couple formed by means of the a privative; but there is Anarchist and Archist, showing that such couples must also be mutually exclusive. Hence Theist can only mean, in correct language, a person who holds that a God or gods exist, and an Atheist can only mean a person who holds that no God or gods exist. Reflect upon this statement, and you will see that it is sound. The words Agnostic and Agnosticism have, strictly speaking, nothing to do with this question. The Agnostic is the person whose way of thinking excludes the Gnostic way, and Gnosticism—i.e., the person who declares it is impossible to acquire positive knowledge of the Deity by taking a particular way of life, whether by practising ordinary morality—the Christian and ethical way—or by freeing the reason, through subjugation of the senses, by indulging them—i.e., until they no longer cause delight, and so disturb the pure reason; what

may be called the sugar-shop, apprentice-boy method. Agnosticism may be limited or unlimited. In the first case it simply states that no method or way of life has yet been found capable of giving us a precise knowledge of the Deity; but lately science has been going in for grand generalisations—many of them quite premature and unwarranted ones, so that an Agnostic now often means a person who holds it impossible for humanity by any method, way of life, or intellectual discipline whatsoever, to know anything at all precise about the Deity. Properly speaking, however, from the origin of the term itself, Agnosticism admits the existence in nature of an ultimate reality in some way corresponding to "all that we call God and worship"; for otherwise an Agnostic would simply call himself an Atheist, and hold aloof, not pit himself against the Gnostic's practice, which is the real battle-field of the *Agnostic*.

Correctly speaking, therefore, an Atheist can only mean one thing—that is, a person who declares that there is no God at all, and no ultimate reality whatever; and an Agnostic can only mean one of two things—(1) a person who declares that no way of life yet devised has led to any real and precise knowledge of the Deity and ultimate reality; and (2) a person who asserts that no way of life, or method of reason and experiment, ever can do so.

I will now, with your permission, show why your reply to my suggestion about the name of your paper is unconvincing. If I said that the editor and his staff are Atheists, but *not* Freethinkers, I made a mistake. But it is immaterial, you reply; we are Atheists *and* Freethinkers. This statement is ambiguous. It may mean that some of you are pure Atheists, others Freethinking ones, others Atheistic Freethinkers, others pure Freethinkers, or that all of you are Freethinking Atheists. And this I hold to be the true state of the case. The genus Freethinker is a very large one. It practically contains all believers and unbelievers who have thought for themselves at all; consequently, it is not perfectly honest for a species of the genus Freethinker—i.e., the Atheist—to label his intellectual output Freethought. And it is still less so when a large part of that output is combative and directed to prove that the documentary authority of a particular kind of Theists is false and valueless, and that they discredit their beliefs by the immorality or silliness of their lives and theories. The public would be justly displeased if the Hunterian Museum labelled itself "the Public Building," or even only "the Museum," and you yourselves would be equally incensed if a coterie of Christians started a paper, called it *Freethought*, and filled it exclusively with arguments to disprove the theories of you Atheists, and with scandalous and ridiculous stories about the inconsistencies and immoralities of this or that Atheist. To remedy this unsatisfactory state of things is easy. There are two ways. Either to call your paper—admirable as such—the *Atheist*, and continue it just as it is at present, or to make it a real expression of Freethought by enlarging its scope and its sympathies and leaving out the personal, and sometimes acrimonious, element. Freethought has nothing to do with discrediting belief by scandal-monger and *ad hominem* arguments, and would not be so strangely blind to the arguments on the other side as the *Atheist*—I beg pardon, the *Freethinker*—sometimes shows itself to be. I make these criticisms in a friendly, and not at all an antagonistic, spirit. W. W. STRICKLAND.  
Napoli.

[We did not succeed in convincing Mr. Strickland, and he does not succeed in convincing us. He can hardly expect us to accept a definition of Atheism which we have always repudiated. His letter is inserted to show that this journal is rightly called the *Freethinker*.—EDITOR.]

## Obituary.

I GREATLY regret to record the death of an esteemed member of the Bolton branch of the N.S.S., Mr. John Mawson, whose death took place on Tuesday, February 11. Mr. Mawson was in his seventy-sixth year, and had enjoyed good health up to a month ago. He never put himself forward before the public, but as a reasoner or debater on scientific as well as political subjects he had few equals. Mr. Mawson had almost completed a work on Taxation before he was taken ill, and I trust his sons will see it through the press, which they promised him to do. Mr. Mawson expressed a wish to his sons sometime before his death that no religious ceremony be performed at his funeral, which was carried out to the letter, Austin Holyoake's Burial Service being read at Tonge Cemetery, Bolton, by the undersigned. He was a regular subscriber to the *Freethinker*, and, when I called to see him a week before his death, I asked if he wished me to read anything from it, but he said he had read each number through as he got it. He was sensible to the last, and, as he had during the whole of his life striven to remove error and falsehood, he reasoned with these at his bedside as long as he could, and his life closed with the same desire. He had been a member of the Bolton branch for over twenty years.—JAMES F. HAMPSON, Secretary Bolton Branch.

## 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.

THE ATHENÆUM HALL (73 Tottenham Court-road, W.): 7.30, G. W. Foote, "The Fable of Jesus Christ."  
CAMBERWELL (North Camberwell Hall, 61 New Church-road): 7.30, Chilperic Edwards, "Creation."  
SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Masonic Hall, Camberwell-road): 7, Dr. Washington Sullivan, "The Riddle of the Universe."  
WEST LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Kensington Town Hall, High-street): 11, H. Burrows, "Tolstoy's Resurrection."

## OPEN-AIR PROPAGANDA.

HYDE PARK (near Marble Arch): R. P. Edwards—11.30, "Atheism and Morality"; 7, "Following Jesus."  
BATTERSEA PARK GATES: 11.30, A lecture.

## COUNTRY.

ABERDEEN (Northern Friendly Society's Hall): 6.30, P. Wood, "Principal Factors in Social Progress."  
BIRMINGHAM BRANCH (Prince of Wales Assembly Rooms, Broad-street): H. Percy Ward—3, "The Dangers of Socialism"; 7, "Bible Absurdities; or, The Ignorance of God." Tea at 4.50. Musical selections 6.30 to 7. At 11 (if fine), in the Bull Ring, "The Philosophy of Secularism."  
CHATHAM SECULAR SOCIETY (Queen's-road, New Brompton): 2.45, Sunday-school; 7, Dramatic Entertainment, "Single Life," a comedy in three acts.  
GLASGOW (110 Brunswick-street): 12, Discussion Class—A. M'Crone, "The Influence of the Inductive Method on Civilisation"; 6.30, R. Park, M.D., "On the Present Status of the Idea and Term 'God,' and on 'Life and Substance.'"  
HULL (2 Room, Friendly Societies' Hall, Albion-street): 7, Mr. Trumper, "Naturalism."  
LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Humberstone-gate): 6.30, Mr. Lawrence Small, B.Sc., "The Law of Progress."  
MANCHESTER SECULAR HALL (Rusholme-road, All Saints): 6.30, W. A. Rogerson, "Embryology." Lantern illustrations; slides by Mr. A. Flatters.  
SHEFFIELD SECULAR SOCIETY (Hall of Science, Rockingham-street): 7, C. Cohen, "Man: Whence and Whither?" Tea at 5.  
SOUTH SHIELDS (Captain Duncan's Navigation School, Market-place): 7, "Tolstoy's Resurrection"; 8, Lecture arrangements.

## Lecturer's Engagements.

H. PERCY WARD, 2 Leamington-place, George-street, Balsall Heath, Birmingham.—February 24, Birmingham. April 28, Glasgow.

## PECULIAR PEOPLE.

An Open Letter to Mr. Justice Wills.

On his sentencing THOMAS GEORGE SENIOR to four months imprisonment with Hard Labor for Obeying the Bible by not calling in a Doctor to his Sick Child.

By G. W. FOOTE.

16 pp. Price ONE PENNY.

London: The Freethought Publishing Company, Limited,  
1 Stationers' Hall Court, E.C.

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

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

Orders should be sent to the author,

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

## WORKS BY G. W. FOOTE.

- Crimes of Christianity.** By G. W. Foote and J. M. Wheeler. Hundreds of exact references to Standard Authors. An unanswerable Indictment of Christianity. Vol. I., cloth gilt, 216 pp., 2s. 6d.
- The Jewish Life of Christ.** Being the *Sepher Toldoth Jeshu*, or Book of the Generation of Jesus. Edited, with an Historical Preface and Voluminous Notes, by G. W. Foote and J. M. Wheeler. 6d.; superior edition, superfine paper, cloth, 1s.
- Letters to the Clergy.** By G. W. Foote. Subjects:—Creation—The Believing Thief on the Cross—The Atonement—Old Testament Morality—Inspiration—Credentials of the Gospel—Miracles—Prayer. 128 pp., 1s.
- Flowers of Freethought.** (First Series.) By G. W. Foote. Fifty-one essays on a variety of Freethought topics. 214 pp., cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Flowers of Freethought.** (Second Series.) By G. W. Foote. Fifty-eight essays on a further variety of Freethought topics. 302 pp., cloth, 2s. 6d.—These two volumes of *Flowers* form together a complete Garden of Freethought. Every aspect of Reason and Faith is treated somewhere, and always in a popular style. Contains much of the author's best writing.
- John Morley as a Freethinker.** By G. W. Foote. Valuable references to Mr. Morley's writings. Good for Freethinkers to read first, and then lend to their Christian friends. 2d.
- Is Socialism Sound?** Four Nights' Public Debate between G. W. Foote and Annie Besant. Verbatim, and revised by both disputants. 1s.; superior edition in cloth, 2s.
- The Sign of the Cross.** A Candid Criticism of Mr. Wilson Barrett's Play, showing its gross partiality and its ridiculous historic inaccuracy, with special reference to the (probably) forged passage in Tacitus and the alleged Neronian massacre of Christians. Handsomely printed, 6d.
- The Birth of Christ.** From the original *Life of Jesus* by the famous Strauss. With an introduction by G. W. Foote. A most thorough Analysis and Exposure of the Gospel Story by a Master Hand. 6d.
- Christianity and Secularism.** Public Debate between G. W. Foote and Rev. Dr. McCann. Verbatim Report, revised by both disputants. 1s.; superior edition in cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Bible Heroes.** From Adam to Paul. By G. W. Foote. Instructive, interesting, amusing and honest; in fact, the only honest book on the subject. 200 pp., cloth, 2s. 6d.
- The Grand Old Book.** A Reply to the Grand Old Man. By G. W. Foote. An Exhaustive Answer to Mr. Gladstone's *Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*. 1s.; cloth edition, 1s. 6d.
- Will Christ Save Us?** By G. W. Foote. An Examination of the Claims of Jesus Christ to be considered the Savior of the World. Contains much Historic Information on Slavery, the Position of Woman, General Social Progress, and the advance of Science and Freethought in opposition to Christian bigotry. 6d.
- Darwin on God.** By G. W. Foote. A full and minute account of Darwin's mental development, with a brief Memoir of his grandfather, the famous Erasmus Darwin; containing all the passages in Darwin's works, and in his *Life and Letters*, bearing directly or indirectly on the subject of religion. Every Freethinker should have, and keep, a copy of this important little volume. 6d.; cloth, 1s.
- Reminiscences of Charles Bradlaugh.** By G. W. Foote. Written directly after Bradlaugh's death, and containing personal anecdotes and characteristics not to be found elsewhere. Necessary to those who want to know the real Bradlaugh.
- The Shadow of the Sword.** A Moral and Statistical Essay on War. By G. W. Foote. Christian papers have called it "powerful" and "masterly." 2d.
- Infidel Death-Beds.** By G. W. Foote. Second edition, revised and much enlarged. Contains authentic details of the last hours of sixty-two historic Freethinkers, and in most cases a sketch of their lives. Precise references given in every instance. 8d.; cloth, 1s. 3d.
- Comic Sermons and other Fantasias.** By G. W. Foote. A selection of the author's best satirical writings. *Contents:*—A Sermon on Summer—A Mad Sermon—A Sermon on Sin—A Bishop in the Workhouse—A Christmas Sermon—Christmas Eve in Heaven—Bishop Trimmer's Sunday Diary—The Judge and the Devil—Satan and Michael—The First Christmas—Adam's Breeches—The Fall of Eve—Joshua and Jericho—A Baby God—Judas Iscariot. 8d.
- Theism or Atheism.** Public Debate between G. W. Foote and the Rev. W. T. Lee. Verbatim Report, revised by both Disputants. Well printed and neatly bound, 1s.
- Bible and Beer.** By G. W. Foote. Showing the Absurdity of basing Teetotalism on the Christian Scriptures. Careful, thorough, and accurate. Freethinkers should keep this pamphlet by them. 4d.
- Royal Paupers.** Showing what Royalty does for the People, and what the People do for Royalty. By G. W. Foote. 2d.
- Open Letters to Jesus Christ.** By G. W. Foote. Racy as well as Argumentative. Something Unique. 4d.
- Philosophy of Secularism.** By G. W. Foote. 3d.
- The Bible God.** A Scathing Criticism. By G. W. Foote. 2d.

London: The Freethought Publishing Company, Limited,  
1 Stationers' Hall Court, E.C.

# BANKRUPT STOCK.

14 Days' Sale. All Sound Goods.

Everything at Half-price or less.

- Men's Lounge Suits, Black, Navy, Brown, or Grey—Good Cloth, and well made and trimmed, 18s. each.
- Men's Overcoats, Black, Navy, Brown, or Grey. Doubled Breasted 17s. 6d., Single Breasted 16s.
- Youth's Suits, all colors, 14s. each.
- Youth's Overcoats, 12s. each.
- Boys' Suits, all colors, 10s. each.
- Boys' Overcoats, 9s. each.
- Juvenile Suits, 6s. 6d. each.
- Juvenile Overcoats, 5s. each.
- Little Boys' Sailor Suits, 3s. 6d. each.
- Little Boys' Reefer Overcoats, 3s. each.
- Men's Standard Screwed Sunday Boots, 7s. 6d. (leather).
- Women's Calf Kid, lace or buttoned, Boots, 6s. (leather).

## DRESS GOODS.

- Black or Blue, all Wool Serge, 1s. per yard.
- Plain Costume Cloths, all colors, 1s. 6d. per yard.
- Blankets, pure Wool, 8s. 6d. per pair.
- Umbrellas—Gents', 2s. 6d.; Ladies', 1s. 9d.
- Gents' Mackintoshes, 17s. 6d. each, all sizes.

For Suits and Overcoats give chest over Vest Measure and length inside leg; also your height and weight.

Money returned for all goods not approved.

J. W. GOTT, 2 & 4 Union-street, Bradford.

## Works by the late R. G. Ingersoll.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| THE HOUSE OF DEATH. Funeral Orations and Addresses. 1s.      | WHAT IS RELIGION? 2d.   |
| MISTAKES OF MOSES. 1s.                                       | IS SUICIDE A SIN? 2d.   |
| THE DEVIL. 6d.   | LAST WORDS ON SUICIDE. 2d.  |
| SUPERSTITION. 6d.  | GOD AND THE STATE. 2d.  |
| SHAKESPEARE. 6d.   | FAITH AND FACT. Reply to Dr. Field. 2d.   |
| THE GODS. 6d.  | GOD AND MAN. Second reply to Dr. Field. 2d.   |
| THE HOLY BIBLE. 6d.  | THE DYING CREED. 2d.  |
| REPLY TO GLADSTONE. With an Introduction by G. W. Foote. 4d. | THE LIMITS OF TOLERATION. A Discussion with the Hon. F. D. Coudert and Gov. S. L. Woodford. 2d. |
| ROME OR REASON? A Reply to Cardinal Manning. 4d.             | HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH. 2d.   |
| CRIMES AGAINST CRIMINALS. 3d.                                | ART AND MORALITY. 2d.   |
| ORATION ON WALT WHITMAN. 3d.                                 | DO I BLASPHEME? 2d.   |
| ORATION ON VOLTAIRE. 3d.                                     | SOCIAL SALVATION. 2d.   |
| ABRAHAM LINCOLN. 3d.   | MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE. 2d.   |
| PAIN THE PIONEER. 2d.  | SKULLS. 2d.   |
| HUMANITY'S DEBT TO THOMAS PAINE. 2d.                         | THE GREAT MISTAKE. 1d.  |
| ERNEST RENAN AND JESUS CHRIST. 2d.                           | LIVE TOPICS. 1d.  |
| THREE PHILANTHROPISTS. 2d.                                   | MYTH AND MIRACLE. 1d.   |
| LOVE THE REDEEMER. 2d.                                       | REAL BLASPHEMY. 1d.   |
|  | REPAIRING THE IDOLS. 1d.  |
|  | CHRIST AND MIRACLES. 1d.  |
|  | CREEDS AND SPIRITUALITY. 1d.  |

London: The Freethought Publishing Company, Limited, 1 Stationers' Hall Court, E.C.

The Safest and Most Effectual Cure for Inflammation of the Eyes is

## Thwaites' Celandine Lotion.

Cures inflammation in a few hours. Neglected or badly doctored cases. 3 or 4 days is sufficient time to cure any case. For Sore and Inflamed Eyelids. Nothing to equal the Lotion for Dimness of Sight. Will remove Skin or Film that sometimes grows on the Eye. As the eye is one of the most sensitive organs of the body, it needs the most careful treatment.

Cullpeper says in his Herbal Book that if the virtues of Celandine were generally known it would spoil the spectacle-makers' trade. 1s. 1/2d. per bottle, with directions; by post 14 stamps.

G. THWAITES, Herbalist, 2 Church-row, Stockton-on-Tees.

In stout paper covers, 1s.; cloth, 2s.

# THE BOOK OF GOD

In the Light of the Higher Criticism.

With Special Reference to DEAN FARRAR'S *New Apology*.

By G. W. FOOTE.

*Contents:*—Introduction—The Bible Canon—The Bible and Science—Miracles and Witchcraft—The Bible and Free-thought—Morals and Manners—Political and Social Progress—Inspiration—The Testimony of Jesus—The Bible and the Church of England—An Oriental Book—Fictitious Supremacy.

"Mr. Foote is a good writer—as good as there is anywhere. He possesses an excellent literary style, and what he has to say on any subject is sure to be interesting and improving. His criticism of Dean Farrar's answers fully justifies the purpose for which it was written."—*Truthseeker* (New York).

"A volume we strongly recommend.....Ought to be in the hands of every earnest and sincere inquirer."—*Reynolds's Newspaper*.

"I have read with great pleasure your *Book of God*. You have shown with perfect clearness the absurdity of Dean Farrar's position. I congratulate you on your book. It will do great good, because it is filled with the best of sense expressed with force and beauty."—*Col. R. G. Ingersoll*.

London: The Freethought Publishing Company, Limited, 1 Stationers' Hall Court, E.C.

## A New Edition

OF

## INGERSOLL'S

# "MISTAKES OF MOSES."

Handsomely printed on good paper and bound in stiff paper covers.

Price One Shilling.

Also an Edition de Luxe

Printed on Superfine Paper and Elegantly Bound in Cloth.

Price Half-a-Crown.

London: The Freethought Publishing Company, Limited, 1 Stationers' Hall Court, E.C.

Price Threepence.

## The Secular Almanack for 1901,

Edited by G. W. FOOTE,

And issued by the National Secular Society.

Containing a Calendar, Full Information about Freethought Societies at Home and Abroad, and Special Articles by G. W. Foote, C. Watts, C. Cohen, A. B. Moss, W. Heaford, "Chilperic," and "Mimmermus," etc., etc.

London: The Freethought Publishing Co., Ltd., 1 Stationers' Hall Court, E.C.

NOW READY,

## Photographs of Mr. G. W. FOOTE,

President N. S. S., Editor of *Freethinker*.

These are excellent portraits, and the proceeds of the sales (by the kindness of Mr. Geo. Cross, Photographer, Southport) will be handed to the Twentieth Century Fund. Cabinets 1s., postage 1d.

Larger size, 12 by 10, when mounted, 2s. 6d., postage 2d. Order from Miss Vance, 1 Stationers' Hall Court, Ludgate Hill, E.C.

# THE BIBLE HANDBOOK

FOR

## FREETHINKERS AND INQUIRING CHRISTIANS.

EDITED BY

G. W. FOOTE and W. P. BALL.

A NEW EDITION, REVISED, AND HANDSOMELY PRINTED.

### CONTENTS :

Part I.—Bible Contradictions.      Part II.—Bible Absurdities.      Part III.—Bible Atrocities.  
Part IV.—Bible Immoralities, Indecencies, Obscenities, Broken Promises, and Unfulfilled Prophecies

*Cheap Edition, in paper covers, 1s. 6d.; Best Edition, bound in cloth, 2s. 6d.*

"This is a volume which we strongly commend to all interested in the study of the Judaic-Christian Scriptures. It is edited by G. W. Foote and W. P. Ball, and published by the Freethought Publishing Company, 1 Stationers' Hall Court, London, E.C., price 1s. 6d. Indeed, we cannot conceive any Christian as having a faith worth regarding unless he has studied this remarkable volume. Teachers in Sunday and elementary schools will find it of special value as an aid to the exposition of the Christian religion from a thoughtful and critical standpoint. It is a perfect army of facts and comparisons. Since 1888 it has been the standard volume of the subject with which it deals, and its popularity is emphasised by the fact that the public have demanded a new edition."—*Reynolds's Newspaper.*

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING Co., LTD., 1 STATIONERS' HALL COURT, LONDON, E.C.

## BIBLE ROMANCES.

By G. W. FOOTE.

### CONTENTS :

The Creation Story.	The Tower of Babel.	Balaam's Ass.	A Virgin Mother.
Eve and the Apple.	Lot's Wife.	God in a Box.	The Resurrection.
Cain and Abel.	The Ten Plagues.	Jonah and the Whale.	The Crucifixion.
Noah's Flood.	The Wandering Jews.	Bible Animals.	John's Nightmare.

THE SECOND (REVISED) EDITION COMPLETE.

160 Pages.

Bound in Cloth.

Price Two Shillings.

*Free by Post at the Published Price.*

"The neat little volume before us, which ought to be read by everyone desirous of the truth in such matters. Mr. Foote's style is always bright, and the topics dealt with are of a nature to awaken interest even in the dullest mind."—*Reynolds's Newspaper.*

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING Co., LTD., 1 STATIONERS' HALL COURT, LONDON, E.C.

## REPLY TO GLADSTONE.

BY

COLONEL INGERSOLL.

A New Edition.

Handsomely Printed.

This is one of Ingersoll's masterpieces. The encounter with Gladstone drew forth all his powers. In logic, wit, illustration, and controversial dexterity, this pamphlet is almost, if not quite, unrivalled. It also contains some passages of superb poetry. Freethinkers should read it frequently. It will furnish them with hints and points in their friendly discussions with Christians. They should likewise lend it to their orthodox friends whenever they have an opportunity.

PRICE FOURPENCE.

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING Co., LTD., 1 STATIONERS' HALL COURT, LONDON, E.C.