

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXIII.—No. 22

SUNDAY, MAY 31, 1903

PRICE TWOPENCE

*Death stands above me, whispering low
I know not what into my ear :
Of his strange language all I know
Is, there is not a word of fear.*

—LANDOR.

The Church and the Education Act.

SOME hasty observers have concluded that Mr. Balfour's object in passing the Education Act, 1902, was to smash the Board-school system and place the child under the power of the priest. I regard that as a very superficial view of the case, and I shall suggest a much simpler explanation of the recent action of the Conservative Government. To put the point concisely, I think Mr. Balfour's policy was prompted by a double necessity—(1) of satisfying the demand of his Church of England supporters for State aid towards their denominational schools; and (2) of providing for the easy severance of the Church-school system from State connections. I am aware of the paradoxical nature of this second necessity, and I will endeavor to show its significance.

The first point, of course, is clear enough. For years past the Church of England has pressed for a recognition of its claims on the gratitude of Tory administrations. Various governments have done their best to meet the very natural expectations of the Church. Every reflecting person must have seen, for a long time, that the Conservatives were logically bound to assist the schools of a Church which has, on the whole, so loyally stood by the cause of property and the upper classes. It is foolish of the Nonconformists to protest that, at the last General Election, the country gave the Conservatives no mandate for the aid of Church schools. The mandate has been perennial since the State touched the question of the schools at all, just as there is a perennial Tory obligation to help landowners and the naval and military vested interests.

Now as to the second point. On political and religious grounds, there was no acute reason for interfering with the Board school system. On the whole, School Boards have served the purposes of orthodoxy. They have paid an irrational amount of homage to the Bible, and thus co-operated with the anti-scientific bias of the Church of England. And they have not shown any strong tendency towards democracy. As an illustration, I may refer to the small excitement caused on the Leicester School Board when I took the side of two young teachers who declined to join in the Coronation festivities last year. Except myself, the whole Board, as well as the local Liberal press, stoutly upheld the honor of the Royal Family, and sneered down my Republican opinions. No doubt the attitude of the Leicester Board was quite typical of the sentiments of the School Boards generally.

It was notorious that the Church schools were in difficulties financially, and their reputation suffered because of their inability to provide as good teaching-power and as efficient apparatus as were furnished by the Board schools. Mr. Balfour would not dare to extend the amount of Government grants to the "voluntary" schools. He must relieve the Church schools somehow or other. There was but one

resource left, and that was to throw the Anglican schools upon the ratepayers of the boroughs and counties. As we have seen, that act has stilled the bitter cry of the Church. Toryism has paid off one of its most pressing debts.

What will follow? I venture to forecast a very interesting evolution. To begin with, the Church will do all it can to win the good graces of the ratepayers. It is to the manifest interest of the Church to place its members on the municipal councils, and to preserve friendly relation with those civic leaders who will not enter its formal communion. Everywhere the local democracies will be nursed by the astute directors of Church policy.

On the other hand, the Nonconformists, who are already provoked into threats of non-payment of rates, will become more and more discontented with the system to which they once consented. They will regret that they or their fathers agreed to the inclusion of "religious" instruction in State-aided schools. Sooner or later they will adopt the principle that all State-aided education must rest on a secular basis. At the same time they will probably come round to the admission (as has already happened with the School Boards of Leicester and Bradford) that moral instruction can be effectively given on secular, and even non-Biblical, principles.

The Church will then cry out again to the Conservative government, but it will be too late. If the provincial councils and the London County Council of the future resolve to secularise the schools, their wishes will be irresistible. The blame will fall on them, not on the Tory politicians; and that is the end which Mr. Balfour most likely contemplates. The Church schools will then divide into two sections, one portion becoming undistinguishable from the "provided" schools (or, as we now call them, Board schools), and the other portion being maintained on a religious basis entirely by the efforts of the Anglican and other denominational bodies. The Tory Government and the Church are content with the first stage of this evolution. We Secularists will have cause to be contented with the last stage.

F. J. GOULD.

The Emerson Centenary.—II.

EMERSON naturally shared Carlyle's view of the importance of great men, although he differed from Carlyle as to the proper sphere of great men's activities. Carlyle believed in the actual government of the world by "heroes." Emerson believed that the less government there was the better. He looked upon political action, at the very best, as a clumsy, belated way of remedying the faults of education. Carlyle believed in force. Emerson believed in influence. Every institution, he said, was the shadow of some great man; all history resolved itself very easily into the biography of a few stout and earnest persons. Napoleon was called by his men *Cent Mille* (Hundred Thousand). "Add honesty to him," said Emerson, "and they might have called him Hundred Million."

What is a great man? Carlyle never troubled to give a definition. A great man, with him, was any man he chose to call so; and, with the same

arbitrariness, he exalted his great man by belittling everyone around him. Emerson was more considerate. He defined his meaning. "I count him a great man," he said, "who inhabits a higher sphere of thought, into which other men rise with labor and difficulty." This is an admirable definition, and it justifies Emerson's view as against that of (say) Mr. Herbert Spencer. The difference between great and little men is not simply quantitative. Perhaps we should say that quantitative differences in brain become qualitative differences in faculty. A hundred small mathematicians could not have written Newton's *Principia*. A hundred small biologists could not have written Darwin's *Origin of Species*. A hundred small poets could not have written *Hamlet*. The human race co-operates up to a point; it produces the average condition of things in which salient persons of a certain altitude are possible; it accumulates knowledge, fashions language, and prepares tools and raw material of various kinds; but the man of genius has to do all the rest for himself. He is as indispensable as the social environment in which he operates. History proves this, common experience proves it, and the world will continue to believe it in spite of all Mr. Spencer's opposition. The world will, indeed, be apt to tell him that he is a living contradiction of his own doctrine, and that a thousand smaller minds could not have clubbed their wits together and produced his Synthetic Philosophy.

Emerson's view of great men was in every respect sounder than Carlyle's. He was an invincible ethicist. The appeal to morals was to him inevitable. He appreciated Napoleon better than Carlyle did; yet he saw even more clearly than Carlyle the moral flaw that ruined the Colossus. Valid power and usefulness to mankind are never to be separated. "He is great," said Emerson, "who confers the most benefits." And the one base thing in the universe, he added finely, is to receive favors and render none.

It was inevitable that Emerson should be a democrat, as it was inevitable that Carlyle should be an autocrat. The American sage could not help perceiving the radical evil of English society. "The aristocracy, incorporated by law and education," he said, "degrades life for the unprivileged classes." Emerson believed in the fluid equality of his own nation. He hated castes and exclusions. Yet his homage to the moral law kept him at the opposite pole to the demagogue. He denied the superficial theory that one man is as good as another. He refused to pander to the multitude. He declined to accept the judgment of mere numbers. He laughed at the voice of the people being the voice of God. "Mankind," he said, "divides itself into two classes—benefactors and malefactors. The second class is vast, the first a handful." He ventured to say that ignorant, sensual populations were like maggots and fleas—the more the worse.

Leave this hypocritical prating about the masses. Masses are rude, lame, unmade, pernicious in their demands and influence, and need not to be flattered, but to be schooled. I wish not to concede anything to them, but to tame, drill, divide, and break them up, and draw individuals out of them. The worst of charity is that the lives you are asked to preserve are not worth preserving. Masses! the calamity is the masses. I do not wish any masses at all, but honest men only, lovely, sweet, accomplished women only, and no shovel-handed narrow-brained, gin-drinking million stockingers or lazzaroni at all. If government knew how, I should like to see it check, not multiply, the population. When it reaches to its true action, every man that is born will be hailed as essential. Away with this hurrah of masses, and let us have the considerate vote of single men spoken on their honor and their conscience.

This was brave speaking in a democratic country. It was a moral appeal, because it was an appeal to the eternal nature of things. Never let the minority be abashed or discouraged. Wise and good men will always be in a minority. Neither let them accept the popular arithmetic of setting off a number on this side against an equal number on that. "Suppose," Emerson says grimly, "the three hundred

heroes at Thermopylæ had paired off with three hundred Persians: would it have been the same to Greece, and to history?"

Emerson always insisted on the supreme value of courage. This is vulgarly said to be a common virtue, but the immense esteem in which it is held proves its rarity. Moreover, as Emerson shrewdly said, the "high price of courage indicates the general timidity."

"Animal resistance, the instinct of the male animal when cornered, is no doubt common; but the pure article, courage with eyes, courage with conduct, self-possession at the cannon's mouth, cheerfulness in lonely adherence to the right, is the endowment of elevated characters."

The world instinctively feels the truth of this. Hence it is that "Any man who puts his life in peril in a cause which is esteemed becomes the darling of all men."

Never strike sail to a fear; always do the thing you are afraid to do; self-reliance is the bed-rock on which all other virtues are founded. Such is Emerson's teaching. And at the close of one of his later essays he enjoins it on opposite schools of believers.

"If you have no faith in beneficent power above you, but see only an adamant fate coiling its folds about nature and man, then reflect that the best use of fate is to teach us courage, if only because baseness cannot change the appointed event. If you accept your thoughts as inspirations of a Supreme Intelligence, obey them when they prescribe difficult duties, because they come only so long as they are used; or, if your scepticism reaches to the last verge, and you have no confidence in any foreign mind, then be brave, because there is one good opinion which must always be of consequence to you, namely, your own."

Emerson did not simply teach courage; he practised it. He was not by nature a man of action, except for living his own life in his own way—which he did with triumphant serenity. He was a born thinker and critic, and he was perfectly true to his own genius. From first to last he displayed a steady courage, which it is not an exaggeration to call heroic. Some of his earlier utterances may be read now without a tremor; but at first they were startling, and even shocking. He pointed a ruthless finger at the essential weakness of Christianity from a philosophical standpoint. Christianity is at bottom the deification of Jesus Christ. Emerson repudiated this, and poured scorn upon the Churches for embracing it. Historical Christianity was to him a great moral heresy. "It has dwelt," he said, "it dwells, with noxious exaggeration about the person of Jesus. The soul knows no persons." He expressed himself elsewhere on this point with still greater emphasis:—

"By the irresistible maturing of the general mind, the Christian traditions have lost their hold. The dogma of the mystic offices of Christ being dropped, and he standing on his genius as a moral teacher, 'tis impossible to maintain the old emphasis of his personality; and it recedes, as all persons must, before the sublimity of the moral law."

Recollect that this was written nearly sixty years ago; recollect how many sceptics have paid fantastic homage to the personality of Christ; recollect how John Stuart Mill dropped eventually into this pitfall; and you will then appreciate the insight and rectitude of Emerson.

The truth is that a dethroned god cannot become a great man. His elevation to heaven made him impossible to earth. A discrowned king cannot become a leading citizen. He must live in retirement. St. Helena is the only refuge for fallen Napoleon. He cannot keep a grocer's shop, beg the votes of the citizens, and aspire to a seat in the Senate. Neither can Christ enter into competition with Aristotle, Plato, Confucius, and the later moralists. His place is in the Pantheon. It is one of Comte's merits that he saw this. He gave Paul a place in the Positivist Calendar, but none to Christ; because the Calendar was for men, and not for gods.

Emerson did not go quite so far as that. He accepted Jesus as one of the world's teachers—and only one. But he argued, as Matthew Arnold did

afterwards, that the Christian Church had always misunderstood its alleged Founder.

The idioms of his language, and the figures of his rhetoric, have usurped the place of his truth; and churches are not built on his principles, but on his tropes. Christianity became a Mythos, as the poetic teaching of Greece and of Egypt, before.

It will thus be seen that Emerson stood beyond the pale of Christianity. To claim him as a Christian is larcenous. He did not wear that label, and it must not be attached to his memory. Whatever deity he believed in—and it was a shadowy one—he refused to let any person stand between him and God. He would have told Jesus to get out of the way. The only revelation he admitted was personal and rational. There was no authority to which he would bow. Only through the law of perfect freedom could he learn anything. "Truly speaking," he said, "it is not instruction, but provocation, that I can receive from another soul."

G. W. FOOTE.

(To be concluded.)

Religion and Public Morals.

THERE are two ways of attacking Freethought. One is to prove that the position taken up by those who reject religious beliefs is unsound, that they have neglected to consider some important piece of evidence, or that they have drawn erroneous conclusions from the data collected. The answer to this attack is comparatively simple. One may safely challenge the religious world to point either to the relevant evidence neglected, or to the unsoundness of the reasoning employed. Hitherto I think I may safely venture to say no very successful effort has been made in this direction. Those who have tried it on fairly and conscientiously have usually succeeded in making more heretics than converts, and of late this method has dropped very much into the background.

The other method is concerned with the consequences, social and moral, that are likely to follow the spread of heretical ideas. This is a much more difficult form of attack to meet for the reason that the future, until it arrives, is any and every man's property, and because the forecast that most people accept concerning it is usually determined more by temperament than by reason. And the defence becomes more difficult still when, as in the example now before me, there is not even a straightforward assertion that Freethought will lead to these evil consequences, but in its place a jumble, a deliberate one, I believe, of lamentations concerning the growth of drunkenness, gambling, vice, and *unbelief*. It is inevitable that the effect on the minds of many readers of such a mixture should be an association of Freethought with immorality, particularly when there is already a disposition in that direction. No method could be more dishonest or meaner than this, and yet it is the one most often employed by the religious preacher. Those who talk so glibly concerning the fight for theology being over, would not do ill to bear in mind this aspect of affairs, and to count it as one of the many proofs that much has yet to be done before the struggle can be fairly said to be decided, and in the right way.

The example to which I have referred is found in a speech delivered by the Rev. W. Hutton at the recent meeting of the Presbyterian Synod at Regent-square Church. That church elects a committee for the purpose of watching over the "State of Religion and Public Morals," and the order in which the two things are placed is significant. The first place is given to religion, and, as the committee is appointed by a church, there is at least a straight business air about the arrangement. For, after all, what a sound public morality means to a clergyman is a sound religious conviction of the right sort for himself and his organisation; only very few of them are straightforward enough to say so.

Mr. Hutton moved the adoption of the committee's report, and he took occasion to lament the growth of

unbelief among the public at large. "There can be no doubt," he remarked, "that the faith of a great many in reference to the integrity of Scripture had been very much disturbed by the inconsiderate manner in which some of the scholars of the Church have prosecuted their critical researches." The admission is pleasing, although the "inconsiderate" in the sentence shows how unwelcome the fact is. What Mr. Hutton would regard as a *considerate* study is seen in his plaintive observation that it would have been "as well to make it plain that the result of these researches do not interfere with the majestic unity and inspired authority of Scripture any more than the inequalities of mountain and valley on the surface of the earth interfere with its sphericity."

To put the matter in a nutshell, what Mr. Hutton wishes, and his Church also, is that critics of the Bible, all the while that they are demonstrating its composite, unhistorical, and generally dubious character, should continue to express their belief in a unity which has been shattered and in an inspiration which has been destroyed. Well, there are very many in the churches who do this, and who will continue to do this, so long as religion offers lucrative employment to intellectual mediocrities. But what has criticism to do with this? All that any *honest* critic is concerned with is to make public, and so far place within reach of all, the results of his criticism. Whether this interferes with the "majestic unity" or anything else belonging to the Bible is not his concern. This may be a very important matter for those whose position depends upon keeping the people in the dark, but I do not know that it seriously concerns anyone else. As a matter of fact critics have erred, if at all, in the direction of being *too* gentle in their presentation of critical studies. I have a very strong suspicion that if some of these gentlemen said all they *thought*, and were warranted in thinking, concerning the Bible, Mr. Hutton and his class would be still more seriously disturbed.

Mr. Hutton goes on to remark that "the same thing applies to the new science as well as to the new scholarship. The great achievements of modern science have been increasingly proclaiming the universality of law, and there are many who in this way are tempted to think there is nothing but law, and so they are really led not only to disregard scripture and Christianity, but even theism, to take up the ground of undisguised atheism or agnosticism." This is, of course, very depressing, to Mr. Hutton, and I can honestly sympathise with his distress, just as I should sympathise with a horse dealer lamenting the growth of motoring, though without admitting his right to bring his grievance before the public as a national calamity.

But, from this starting point, the weakening of the belief in Christianity, Mr. Hutton constructs, without saying it in so many words, a scale of social degeneration. Biblical criticism and scientific teaching lead to disbelief in religion; this "permeating society through the Press" has the effect of lowering people's attachment to Church life; this, in turn, exposes one to the corrupting influence of "worldliness," and this culminates in intemperance, gambling, and other vices. And, finally, all the local churches report that the main cause of people not attending church more regularly is the fact that they "often live such very indifferent lives."

All this would have been far more convincing had Mr. Hutton condescended to show in what way any two of these stages were connected. Is it possible, for instance, for anyone to show that a belief in the results of iconoclastic Biblical criticism or the teachings of science induce a spirit of "worldliness"—worldliness, that is, as Mr. Hutton uses the word in the sense of sensualism or selfishness? I think I may safely venture to say that, taken on the whole, the lives of those who have worked for the advancement of science or for the popularising of anti-Christian knowledge have displayed far more real self-sacrifice than has ever been shown by the religious world. The self-sacrifice of a religious believer is always

more or less in the nature of an investment. The stimulus he works under is an external and accidental one. The anti-religionist or scientist has almost invariably worked in the teeth of public opinion; he has looked forward to no reward in a future life, and has always had enough common sense not to expect it in this—save in the sense of the reward that comes from a sense of duty done. Yet it is the religionist who prates about his self-sacrifice or his “unworldliness”—one who generally, as Spinoza said, only holds his lower passions in check here in order to be able to gratify them more effectually hereafter.

Mr. Hutton believes that the neglect of church life leads to all the vices he enumerates—not directly, perhaps, but ultimately. The statement might have an air of reason if he were talking of a population that the Churches had only just come into contact with. But he seems to forget that we are dealing with a people who have been under the influence of Christianity for fifteen centuries, and that during a large portion of that period the influence of one Church or another was supreme—so much so that men were put to death or imprisoned for either criticising the Bible or teaching science. The Churches cannot plead that there was any lack of power; no other organisations ever possessed half as much. They cannot plead that there was any lack of opportunity. Fifteen centuries is a fairly lengthy period; and organisations that found opportunities to direct men's thoughts in matters of doctrine could, had they been so inclined, have found opportunities to direct them in matters of conduct. Yet here we are at the opening of the twentieth century, with the better social habits sitting so loosely upon us that the Presbyterian Synod has to issue a report crying out against the extent to which drunkenness, gambling, and vice infect the people.

What are we to make of this? It seems to me the conclusion is inevitable that either the Christian Churches have not tried to make public life humanly healthy, or that they are miserably inadequate to the task. It would be too sweeping to adopt the first. It is not true that the Churches have never tried, although it would be quite true to say their efforts were subordinate to those of keeping people religious. And all history shows that a fervent belief in religious doctrines may exist with tolerably lax conduct otherwise. Charles Peace believed in Christian doctrines as fervently as Mr. Hutton, but found them no check upon his burglarous instincts. The perpetrators of the Kischineff massacres would hardly be quite so brutal had they had less religion in them. In the days when the temperance movement was practically confined to heretics, soundness in Church doctrines did not prevent people drinking themselves and their friends under the table as a proof of their superior quality. The Mohammedan Church, with all its faults, has kept its people sober. Mr. Hutton's Church can hardly be said to have made Scotland, the land of its greatest triumphs, a sober country.

The real truth, apart from the historic subordination of morals to religion, is that Christianity is wholly incapable of making a people moral. It has never realised in its organisations, and there is nothing to the effect in its doctrines, that morality, a sound mind in a sound body, is not a question of belief, but largely a question of factors that lie quite outside the region of belief. Food, climate, education, heredity, these are the factors that ultimately determine conduct, not religious belief. If the Churches have any real desire to raise the tone of public morals, let them devote *all* their energies for the next twenty years to the better settlement of the land question, the housing question, better education, and let them give the real and only check to intemperance by giving an opportunity of living a life with a little more variety in it, and killing a low passion by kindling a higher one in its stead.

But this the Churches have not done, and will not do. Their interests are too closely bound up with the maintenance of things as they are. What they will do is, when public opinion is focussed upon any

purely social subject, to talk about it, report upon it, to receive large subsidies from the rich, and demoralise the poor by charities which are attached to their churches as presents are attached to a grocer's pound of tea, and to burke the settlement of social questions by wasting time and energy upon questions that, as they concern our life beyond the grave, can well wait for discussion until after we are buried.

After all, in spite of Mr. Hutton's chain, it is only the weakening of theology that can furnish the occasion for social betterment. The last century was a period during which, on the whole, public morality underwent a vast change for the better. It was also a period during which the growth of unbelief was of the most marked description. Some of the leading representatives in science, literature, and sociology were either avowed unbelievers or deeply tinged with unbelief. And the two things are *not* unconnected. It was Buckle who said that scepticism was not the result, but the condition, of progress; and there was more wisdom in that single sentence than in the Presbyterian Synod's whole proceedings.

C. COHEN.

The Responsibility of the Holy Ghost.

How amazingly humble and condescending some people are! For many months the religious newspapers have been lavishing fulsome praise on the Rev. R. J. Campbell, M.A., the new minister of the City Temple. Verbatim reports of all his prayers, sermons, and speeches have been regularly appearing, and we have been surfeited with details about his numerous movements. That he is a man of parts and power is undeniable. The charm of his personality is irresistible. His large, lustrous eyes, are fountains of all-conquering magnetism. He is also a good scholar, and has a wide acquaintance with the best literature. His gift of extemporaneous speech is truly wonderful. He has infinite self-possession, and the sight of a crowd stimulates all his faculties. But one does not feel that intellectually he is a giant. The matter of his discourses does not strike one as possessing superior excellence. As sermons go, scores of equally as good—and perhaps better—ones are preached in London every Sunday. As Mr. Stead tells us in the last *Review of Reviews*, the secret of his popularity lies almost exclusively in his personal fascination. He hypnotises his hearers and they surrender their minds and wills to him. Those who manage to resist his hypnotic power, find him the possessor of no other extraordinary powers. It is his winsomness, his rich mesmeric gift, that draws the people after him.

The other evening Mr. Campbell was the guest of his old congregation at Union Church, Brighton, where he was presented with numerous addresses. In returning thanks, he said that “when people tried to account for what they were pleased to call his power, he wished they would allow *some little credit to the Holy Ghost.*” How eminently flattered the Holy Ghost must have felt if he heard that magnanimous statement. Here was a beautiful example of humility or the very acme of conceit. Mr. Campbell maintains that, many years ago, a special, direct revelation of the Gospel was made to his mind and heart, and that ever since the Holy Ghost and he have been working in partnership; and now Mr. Campbell, wearing the laurels of his miraculous prosperity, gratefully offers the Divine Partner some little share of the credit.

This reminds me of an incident in the life of another minister of the Gospel who for many years was noted for his glaring eccentricities. He had a great reputation, gained chiefly by making strange, daring, and laughable remarks in the pulpit. One Sunday he was conducting anniversary services in a City church, where his discourses were unusually rich in such pungent, extravagant observations. Suddenly he paused, and, after a second or two, excitedly said: “Why did the Holy Ghost send me

here to say these things to you? Because he knew I could say them better than anybody else." This man of God did not give the Holy Ghost the credit of having suggested the well-peppered home-thrusts to him, but merely with the sagacity to recognise the man who was competent to formulate them, and then to send them to do their work. Great is the responsibility of the Holy Ghost. But all hearers of sermons are not quite so gullible as many preachers seem to imagine. Many of them know the difference between claptrap and common sense, between pietistic rhapsodies and well-balanced judgments.

ANTI-HUMBUG.

Religious Jumpers Gaoled.

THE members of the Pentecostal union, or "jumpers," as they are called, were arrested while they were parading the streets. Their right to appear on the streets and carry banners to attract crowds will be tested in police-court to-day. If fined they say they will carry the case up to the higher courts.

Banners like those used in political campaigns were carried. There was also much yelling and jumping. One man carried a base drum. When he was tired of beating it another man would relieve him. According to the members their desire was to attract a large crowd, and the policeman say 500 people followed them, blocking the streets. Their noise and demonstrations are also said to have frightened horses, and several runaways were narrowly averted, the police say.

The jumpers took their arrest quietly, and made no resistance when placed in the patrol wagon. Cries of "Glory to God!" "Hallelujah!" and "Praise the Lord!" could be heard coming from the wagon. At the gaol the men and women were separated, and the women were placed in the women's quarters, while the men were allowed the freedom of the corridors. Solid iron doors were between them, but they joined in a meeting, all singing the same songs. The men jumped and yelled, and the cries of the women could be heard from the interior department.

"They are still jumping, praise the Lord!" one of the men would say, as he maintained a listening attitude. Then all the men would jump and yell.

Miss Huffman, who is in charge of the "outside meeting," as they call it, was reading her Bible, with the other women sitting on the floor around her, when a caller was admitted.

"Our religion is the oldest religion in the world," she said, when asked why she was in gaol. "They brought us here for jumping, and for no other reason," she continued. "But we cannot help jumping, for God tells us to do it, and then we jump as high as we can and sing his praise as loudly as possible. That's part of our religion. Some people think it is all done for effect, but I tell you when you have the spirit of God in your soul you just can't help but jump."

"See that young lady over there," she said, pointing to one of the members who was softly patting her hands and tapping the floor with her foot. "Get up, sister, and show the gentleman how you can jump when the spirit of God tells you to."

The "sister" referred to sprang to her feet, while the others called "Hallelujah!" Then she commenced to jump and clap her hands and yell "Glory to God!" She kept it up "until the spirit left her," and then sat down again, while another started the jumping.

—*Denver Republican* (Feb. 9).

Sunday Newspapers a Necessity.

It has been judicially decided in Philadelphia that newspapers, even Philadelphia newspapers, are necessities of life, and may therefore be legally sold on Sunday notwithstanding the eighteenth century blue law which forbids all kinds of worldly business on that day.

This undoubtedly settles the question for the entire Union. There is no place more scrupulous in its Sabbath observance than Philadelphia. Even boodle franchises are not sold there on Sundays if it can possibly be avoided, and no ward-man collects protection money on the first day of the week if he can get it on Saturday night. The city officials always stop stealing when the vaults close on Saturday afternoon, and spend the time until the re-opening on Monday in meditating upon what they can steal during the coming week.

When even Philadelphia, therefore, decides that the sale of Sunday newspapers is a necessity, there is nothing more to be said. No American community can get along in isolation from the world for one-seventh of its time. The heart of humanity does not stop beating on Sunday morning, and

even if it did, there are Saturday's activities to be recorded. A Monday newspaper can never give an adequate impression of the events of Saturday. If the thread of current history be broken, it can never be satisfactorily mended.

It happens also that on Sunday the vast majority of people have the most leisure for reading—and this is why the *Sunday World* has grown so great.—*New York World*.

Pope and Kaiser.

THE position of the Vatican is likely to be the subject of very important discussions in the near future. On the Pope's side there is every need of a bold counter-stroke against the merciless retribution which is overtaking the Church in France, for this involves not only the dignity, but also the revenues, of the Holy See. Under these circumstances the Cardinals, who control Papal policy, have been making their bargain with the Kaiser. According to these dreams, the successor of Leo XIII. is to be Cardinal Gotto, who will renew the mediæval partnership between Pope and Emperor. By this arrangement the Pope gains a powerful advocate on behalf of his claim to be represented at The Hague, in which desire he has always had the support of Germany. He would thereby secure one more step in the path towards temporal power, and in the meantime towards establishing Nuncios at Washington and London, which concession would, of course, carry with it the possibility of similar recognition on the part of all our Colonies. Germany would be amply recompensed by the authorisation to protect Roman Catholics all over the world, since this would enable her to intervene in quarters where otherwise she would have no *locus standi*. Such a rôle can be no longer sustained by France, and it is the great bait which Rome has to offer her allies. Within his dominions the Kaiser will be helped, by his rapprochement with Rome, to strengthen his hold over the Southern Kingdoms of his Empire, in which his authority is by no means so great as we sometimes imagine. Moreover, in the event of Austria breaking up, the Kaiser could only succeed to a share of the spoil by carrying with him the Southern States and by conciliating the Roman Catholics, who would then have become a majority of his subjects. By that time it is probable that the alliance with Italy would have been attenuated out of existence, in which case the good relations between Potsdam and the Vatican would be regarded with equanimity by the Quirinal.

—*Daily News*.

Israel.

HEAR, O Israel! Jehovah, the Lord our God is one,
But we, Jehovah, his people, are dual, and so undone.

Slaves in eternal Egypts, baking their strawless bricks,
At ease in successive Zions, prating their politics;

Rotting in sunlit Roumania, pigging in Russian pale,
Driving in Park, Bois, and Prater, clinging to fashion's tail;

Reeling before every rowdy, sore with a hundred stings,
Clothed in fine linen and purple, loved at the courts of kings;

Faithful friends to our foemen, slaves to a scornful clique,
The only Christians in Europe, turning the other cheek;

Priests of the household altar, blessing the bread and wine,
Lords of the hells of Gomorrah, licensed keepers of swine;

Coughing o'er clattering treadles, saintly and underpaid,
Ousting the rough from Whitechapel—by learning the
hooligan's trade;

Pious, fanatical zealots, throttled by Talmud-coil,
Impious, lecherous sceptics, cynical stalkers of spoil;

Wedded 'neath Hebrew awning, buried 'neath Hebrew sod,
Between not a dream of duty, never a glimpse of God;

Risking our lives for our countries, loving our nation's flags,
Hounded therefrom in repayment, hugging our bloody rags;

Blarneying, shivering, crawling, taking all colors and none,
Lying a fox in a covert, leaping an ape in the sun.

Tantalus-Proteus of People, security comes from within,
Where is the lion of Judah? Wearing an ass's skin.

Hear, O Israel! Jehovah, the Lord our God is one,
But we, Jehovah, his people, are dual, and so undone.

—*I. Zangwill*.

Habits of reverence, if carried into religion, cause superstition; if carried into politics, cause despotism.—*Buckle's "History of Civilisation."*

Acid Drops.

"Labor's Claim to Sunday Rest" was advocated at a recent public meeting which the Christian Social Union convened in the Holborn Town Hall. The chair was taken by that heavily-worked and underpaid gentleman, the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was naturally supported by several Labor representatives. It is not quite clear, though, whether they pitied the Archbishop or the Archbishop pitied them; it may even be that the compassion was mutual. According to the *Westminster Gazette*, the fact was that the "Church rallied to the cause of Labor." But some of us have a shrewd suspicion that it is the Church that stands to gain most from such associations, and that it would be truer to say that "Labor rallied to the cause of the Church."

One might well ask, first of all, what particular interest, unless it be an ecclesiastical one, the Archbishop of Canterbury can have in Sunday rest. Sunday is the great day of clerical labor. All the priests, parsons, and preachers are then in full swing; sometimes they do their whole week's business between that one day's breakfast and supper. With what honesty, then, can they discourse about the day of rest to their fellow citizens? Surely a little practice ought to go before such a lot of precept. Let the men of God rest on Sunday first; then they will have a right to appeal to men in other trades and professions to do the same.

The Archbishop of Canterbury's speech on this occasion was neither illuminating nor helpful. He simply reproduced all the platitudes of the question. The only definite statement he made was that the principle of the seventh day of rest was one of the main supports of national life. On this point we agree with him. But we deny that the seventh day of rest is in any way due to the Archbishop's Church or the Archbishop's religion. The Jews borrowed it from Babylon, and the Christians borrowed it from the Pagans. The very name of "Sunday"—that is, the Sun's day—indicates a Pagan and not a Christian origin.

Long before Christianity it was discovered that continuity and monotony of toil were prejudicial to the health of the workers; and now, after the lapse of thousands of years, a Christian Archbishop trots out the idea as if it were a comparatively recent discovery. We are not disputing the *idea*. It is perfectly sound. A periodic day of rest is one of the main supports of national life. But a difficulty arises in a complex civilisation. Even the Archbishop admits that "the good accomplished to the many justifies the employment of the few on the Lord's Day." How else could he defend the opening of churches and chapels? But he maintains that those who are employed on Sunday should have another seventh day of rest. Agreed! Ordinary people see this clearly enough. They do not need an Archbishop to point it out. The real difficulty is how to obtain the necessary rest for those who are employed on Sunday; and on this point the Archbishop had nothing of any importance to say.

Let us now turn to the Labor representatives—including Mr. Will Crooks and Mr. G. N. Barnes. What reason had they for assisting the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Christian Social Union? Why did they get up and state their opinion that men ought not to work seven days a week? Is there any general belief that they should? Or is there any general tendency on the part of ordinary employers to compel them to? Is it not a fact that the great bulk of the artisans and laborers in this country do not work even six days a week? Do not most of them work five days and a half?—to say nothing of Saint Monday. In many of the minor trades, of course, and in the case of shop assistants, there is still room for a good deal of improvement in the matter of the hours of labor; but the question of *Sunday* labor chiefly affects railway, car, and 'bus employees who are engaged in taking the Sunday resters about from where they happen to be to where they want to be. And the way to deal with their case is very simple. Railway and Tramway companies are law-created monopolies, and should all be compelled to carry on their business under civilised conditions, including a definite day's rest every week for every one of their employees.

Will the Labor representatives—especially Messrs. Crooks and Barnes—kindly explain why it is necessary to call in the aid of the clergy in this matter? We should have thought Trade Union and Parliamentary action a much better policy.

The Rev. Hugh Price Hughes did not accumulate as much property as the Rev. Dr. Joseph Parker. Perhaps it will be said that he had less time to do it in. Dr. Parker left some

£25,000. Mr. Hughes left a great deal less. We are unable to make out from the newspaper announcements whether it was £2,584 4s. 9d. or nearly three times as much.

The Rev. R. J. Campbell, Dr. Parker's successor at the City Temple, doesn't mean to breathe too much London air. He has pitched his tent at Enfield. We don't blame him. Every man is justified in keeping out of heaven as long as possible.

Will England survive it? The newspapers report the grave intelligence that the Rev. Mark Guy Pearse is leaving England shortly for a foreign tour and does not expect to return this year. Let us hope for the best.

The Bishop of London is at it again. Addressing a public meeting at Fulham the other night, he referred to Lord Kelvin's recent assertion that science was not antagonistic to religion, and said that nothing had given him greater satisfaction than that assertion. Fancy, now! Here is a man who declares that his religion came straight from God; that God actually brought it on earth in person, and left it there with divine attestations; and this same man is wonderfully cheered up by hearing that one scientist believes his religion may be true. What a wonderful trust in the Almighty! One might almost imagine the Bishop of London resigning his position—together with his palace and his £10,000 a year—if Lord Kelvin had not inspired him with fresh confidence.

Our metropolitan episcopus went on to say that he remembered one occasion when he stood on a tub in Victoria Park, and was told he must be a man of very feeble intellect to believe in Christianity. Shocking! But many a true word is spoken in jest.

On another occasion, at the opening of a Mission Church in the East End, the Bishop was shocked to overhear a man in the outskirts of the crowd observe: "Look at them prostituting their intellects!" This was a compliment in its way. It is not every clergyman that has intellect to prostitute. We don't know that the Bishop of London has too much.

Lord Salisbury and the late Mr. Gladstone were not fools, the Bishop said, yet they were Christians. How comforting! Fancy finding two Christians who are not fools! It is enough to set Christianity up again for another hundred years.

Finally, the Bishop welcomed Lord Kelvin as "a strong advocate on the right side." That means the Bishop's side. The side of Fulham Palace and £190 a week. Dr. Ingram would need a lot of intellect, and a lot of courage, to find that the *wrong* side.

The Bishop of London has discovered an exquisite reason for trying to convert the Jews to Christianity. Addressing the annual meeting of the East London Fund for the Jews, he said of the children of Israel that he "had noticed in them three particular traits—sobriety, thrift, and great love for their children." In these respects they were, apparently, superior to their Gentile neighbors. One would think this a very good reason for letting them remain as they are. Oh no, says the Bishop of London; quite the contrary; the Jews are such good people that it is a terrible pity they are not Christians; a change of creed is the one thing they want to be nearly perfect. Thus the Bishop urges his friends to go on converting good Jews into bad Christians; for, if they become Christians, it is ten to one they will drink more, and spend more, and love their children less. They will say to the Christians, as Shylock did, "If we resemble you in all else, we will resemble you in that."

It seems impossible to get away from the Bishop of London this week. He keeps turning up somewhere or other. His last appearance was at the annual gathering of the students of Queen's College (for girls) in Harley-street, and his address appears to have been fairly well calculated for a respectable female assembly. His lordship began by referring to "a matter of serious aspect which had come under his notice recently." A number of girls—we suppose he meant young women—of from twenty-four to twenty-five years of age had been coming to him and telling him in confidence that they had lost all their faith. Oh, those girls! Why did they go to the Bishop? Why did they tell *him* what they had lost? Did they want him to help them to find it? Anyhow, the Bishop thinks this a difficult task; for he said that "when girls and young women lose their faith they did so in a more completely irretrievable way than was the case with young men." Well, we can quite believe the Bishop on this point. When women do become Freethinkers they are

generally thorough-going, and one seldom hears of their returning to superstition. Men do sometimes; women very rarely. The only case we remember is that of Mrs. Besant.

Bishop Ingram proceeded to assure the ladies that it was much easier to believe in "the great truth of Christianity" now than it was twenty-five years ago. When he was at college a pious young man had to swim through a sea of doubts. But it was different in these days, when Lord Kelvin, the "Prince of Scientists," said that science (rightly understood) was not a hindrance but a vast help to religion (rightly understood). If you understand science so that it agrees with religion, and religion so that it agrees with science, you find them wonderfully harmonious. Yes, it all depends on the understanding.

Note, by the way, the growth of this flattering legend about Lord Kelvin. At first he was "a Prince of Science," now he is "the Prince of Scientists." Such is the deification of Lord Kelvin in a week or two. Yet some people cannot understand how Jesus of Nazareth got deified in a hundred years.

In order to show how little religion had to dread from science, the Bishop of London recommended the study of astronomy. This is the very farthest from common experience, and perhaps for that reason it is considered the least dangerous. But is it so? In what way does astronomy help religion? The size of the subject—its dimensions, so to speak, in space and time—may appeal to our bump of wonder. We may stand in awe before the immensity of the universe. And if we stop there the trick is done. But if we look more closely into the matter we find that the phenomena of astronomy are all under the simplest mechanical laws; the result being, as Comte said, that the heavens no longer declare the glory of God, but the glory of Hipparchus, of Kepler, and of Newton.

It may be perfectly true that the Bishop of London does not (as he says) know of any great astronomer who was not a believer in God; but this only shows the limited character of his information. His lordship fancies, perhaps, that all the great astronomers have been Englishmen—or Scotchmen—or even Irishmen. Some of the greatest of them, however, have belonged to "infidel" France—not to go any further afield. There was La Place, for instance, who had "no need for the hypothesis of a God." There was Lalande, who was prouder of being an Atheist than of being an astronomer. There was Delambre, over whose grave Cuvier delivered an oration. There was Lagrange, whose chief work is considered one of the masterpieces of the human intellect. All these great astronomers and mathematicians were unbelievers. And the list could be added to—only we cannot afford the space, and we do not care to undertake the education of the Bishop of London any further gratuitously.

It is much to be regretted that many of those who discourse on the decline of religious belief do not carefully examine the accuracy of their statements before rushing into print. This remark is not aimed at religionists proper, to whom counsel would be of little or no avail, but to those who claim to stand outside all the religious creeds. The following sentence from a book by Mr. Herbert Rix, of the Croydon Ethical Fellowship, will illustrate our meaning. Mr. Rix says: "Everywhere I see religion falling into neglect, set aside in a spirit of despair by fathers and mothers, treated with indifference or contempt by youths and maidens, spat upon and cursed by a degraded populace, treated with vague sarcasm by the polite and cultured."

What Mr. Rix means is that religion is falling into neglect. This he says in the opening of the sentence quoted, and all that is added afterwards is a more or less misleading rhetoric. We do not find fathers and mothers setting religion on one side "in a spirit of despair." The picture of people who reject religion in the spirit of one signing one's own death warrant is a figment of the parsonic imagination, and is not met with in real life. For anyone to put religion on one side as false, and face the world in a spirit of despair, is a psychological impossibility. Nor do we find religion "spat upon and cursed by a degraded populace," for as a matter of fact a degraded populace seldom troubles about intellectual matters, and when it does is far oftener found believing in religious doctrines than rejecting them. The whole passage is calculated to bolster up the religious fiction that the rejection of religion darkens and degrades life; and while one expects this kind of thing from the pulpit, those who stand forward as the purely ethical guides of the people might at least show themselves superior to such senseless extravagances.

According to Herr Zellar, of Stuttgart, there are 1,544,516,000 people in the world. Only 534,940,000 profess any form of Christianity. How many of these are Christians? The Stuttgart statistician cannot say. The Lord only knows, as the saying is; and perhaps he is ashamed to tell.

Under the heading of "The Acts of the Apostles" our French contemporary, *La Raison*, prints a long list of priests and monks condemned during the past two years for various offences, generally of a sexual, and sometimes of an unmentionable, character.

Not long ago we were conversing with a man who was nominally a Roman Catholic, but really nothing of the sort. His wife was not at home, and we remarked that it looked as though he was not interested in Easter. The man replied: "Well, no, I am not. The truth is, my wife does the religion for the family." There you have it! The women do the religion for the family, and it is safe to say that if they did not most families would go without any.—*Boston Investigator*.

According to a religious weekly, Professor Morse, during the time he was experimenting with the telegraph, prayed for more light whenever he found himself in a difficulty. Of course the light came; had it been otherwise we should not have had the story retailed. The Professor is then reported as saying that when honors came to him, "I never felt I deserved them. I had made a valuable application of electricity, not because I was superior to other men, but solely because God, who meant it for mankind, must reveal it to someone, and was pleased to reveal it to me." We do not know how true the story is, but if it is authentic it can hardly raise one's estimate of Professor Morse's mental ability. God, says Professor Morse, meant the telegraph for mankind. Well, if that is so, why wait all these thousands of years before letting them have it? If it is good to us it would have been equally good to our predecessors. Or perhaps the "must reveal it" explains the matter. God held the secret as long as he could, and, when he could hold it no longer, blurted it out to Professor Morse. The picture of God Almighty blurring out his secrets to American electricians after millenniums of secrecy is amusing, as the idea of praying through a difficulty in physics is ridiculous. If there is anything in the theory, it means that the strongest prayers make the best scientific discoveries, and this does not quite square with the facts. It is a great pity that Professor Morse, while he had got God in such a communicative mood, did not ask for a solution of some of the other problems that are perplexing electricians.

The Torrey-Alexander firm of soul-savers have been operating in Belfast. The *Northern Whig* gives a report of Dr. Torrey's discourse on "Did Jesus Christ Rise from the Dead?" It is astonishing that such old-fashioned stuff, uttered with an insolent air of infallibility, can find a public nowadays. Dr. Torrey seems to be ignorant of the better sort even of Christian writings. It would be well to give him a little critical training before sending him back to America.

The *Stockport Advertiser* notes it as "a curious thing" that the Rev. Canon Maloney, of St. Joseph's Roman Catholic, died just at the very time that the congregation were praying for his recovery. When the prayers were ended the Canon breathed his last.

The most impudent thing in connection with the Lord Kelvin controversy comes from the mild and humble oracle of the City Temple. The Rev. R. J. Campbell explains his position in the *British Weekly*. He doubts whether Lord Kelvin is quite right about the grounds of his faith. Science may confirm, it cannot affirm the existence of God in the Christian sense. The knowledge of God is intuitional before it is inferential. So says Mr. Campbell, and up to this point he treads a well-known beaten track. But now comes the bland impertinence. "It is a revelation," Mr. Campbell observes, "granted to a certain quality of heart rather than to certain order of mind. It is Lord Kelvin's possession of this quality of heart which has given him his faith."

Now the last clause of this statement is not necessarily accurate. Lord Kelvin's heart may have as little as his head to do with his faith. He probably derived his faith, like most other men, from his early education. But be that as it may, there is an unsufferable insolence in the first part of this statement. What it amounts to is this, that those who share Mr. Campbell's religion have "a certain quality of heart" that is lacking in those who do not share it. Which is simply saying that the *best* men are on Mr. Campbell's

side, and the *worst* (perhaps) against him. The oracle of the City Temple half admits that he might make a mess of argument, but he feels perfect confidence in the "I am holier than thou" attitude. In short, he is a controversial Pharisee.

Stated nakedly, Mr. Campbell's position is not only impudent, but absurd. Mr. Gladstone called John Stuart Mill the saint of rationalism. What "quality of heart" was it he lacked that he could not be sure about God like Mr. Campbell? In what respect is Lord Kelvin's "heart" better than Darwin's? The great biologist was a man of wonderful tenderness and benevolence. How was it that God did not introduce himself to such a beautiful personality? It is possible that Mr. Campbell really thinks himself a better man than (say) Mr. John Morley? We might go on asking such questions for a week, but the foregoing are sufficient to show the ridiculous posturing of this puffed-up preacher.

Mr. Campbell replies in the *British Weekly* to a correspondent who has a few shillings to spare and wants to invest in a volume of Ruskin. Mr. Campbell recommends *Sesame and Lilies*. Ruskin students will understand something of Mr. Campbell from this recommendation.

In answering another correspondent who is unhappy from lack of purpose and concentration in life, Mr. Campbell refers to Coleridge as one who "just missed greatness" through this infirmity. What nonsense is this! Coleridge missed greatness, did he? Then who ever achieved it? Why, he was born great, and couldn't help being so, if he tried. Those who talk of Coleridge's meagre output have never measured it. He had to write a great deal for his bread. But he also wrote the *Ancient Mariner*, and *Christabel*, and the *Ode to France*, and *Love*, and he is amongst the immortals.

That burning and shining Nonconformist, the Rev. F. B. Meyer, nearly wept at a recent meeting of the Women's Protestant Union at Exeter Hall. He said that he must resist till he died the teaching of Romanism and High Anglicanism in the public elementary schools at the public expense. We suppose the teaching of Meyerism is the only proper thing under such conditions. The lachrymose speaker went on to say that in a village he knew a Nonconformist minister found his child being taught the Ave Maria, for which he had to pay. Ay, there's the rub! If he had got it for nothing it wouldn't have been so bad. In another village the children were taught that everyone who went to chapel would go to hell. This was greeted with cries of "Shame! shame!" Well, perhaps it was a shame. But it was no greater shame than teaching children that everyone who did *not* go to chapel (or church) would go to hell. Mr. Meyer ought to know that this is practically taught in hundreds of public schools.

The London Free Churches, with the aid of some Liberals, Radicals, and Labor men, have had their demonstration in Hyde Park. The weather was superb, and there was naturally a big crowd. Fabulous numbers have been mentioned; but the real figure, according to the report of the *Daily News* enumerators, was 140,000. This is a great multitude, of course; but, after all, more than 6,000,000 inhabitants of Greater London were not present.

Essentially it was a Chapel demonstration. Dissenting tabernacles emptied themselves into Hyde Park. Dissenting preachers headed their congregations. Dr. Clifford walked in the middle of a bodyguard of young men—vowed, we suppose, to fight for him to the death if Churchmen attacked him. Preachers swarmed on the platforms, as Dissenters swarmed around them. "All hail the power of Jesu's name," and other hymns were sung. As one Social Democrat said, who was enticed into going, it was "like a blooming prayer-meeting."

The *Daily News* was jubilant. It wept tears of joy over the alliance between the Free Churches and Labor. These two united would save London, and then England, and then perhaps the world. Oh the days to come! Oh the sights we shall see! Oh the time when Dr. Clifford and Mr. Steadman will sit together (like Pilate and Herod) while the hash of poor Secular Education is settled for ever and ever.

Speaking quite seriously, we say that the Labor men thus involved ought to be ashamed of themselves. Their brethren in France, Germany, or Italy, would never be caught in such

a trap. Children should be protected against *all* kinds of priestcraft, and Dr. Clifford should be prevented from stuffing them with his religion just as much as Archbishop Davidson should be prevented from stuffing them with his religion. That some of the Labor men do not or will not see this, only shows that they are sadly blind or wretchedly dishonest.

The Dissenters of Newcastle-on-Tyne have started a District Passive Resistance League. In their public Manifesto they say: "The State ought not to compromise any of its subjects, or wound their consciences, by compelling them to pay for the propagation of opinions they abhor." Good! Very good! All the Passive Resistance League has to do now is to agitate for the total exclusion of religious teaching from the public schools. Dissenters abhor Church opinions, and ought not to be compelled to pay for their propagation. Freethinkers also abhor Nonconformist opinions, and ought not to be compelled to pay for their propagation. The thing is as clear as daylight.

Philip Purcell, forty-nine, a clerk in holy orders, living at Sinclair-road, Kensington, was arguing with a constable outside Chancery-lane station. Alfred James Collins, of Duncan-buildings, Gray's Inn-road, happened to be passing at the time, and stopped to hear what the argument was about. Suddenly the man of God turned upon the interested spectator and struck him on the back with a walking-stick. This he repeated several times, following his victim along the street. The next day he was charged at Bow-street with being drunk and disorderly. His explanation was that he had been dining, not wisely but too well; and that he supposed he had beaten the prosecutor's back by way of amusement. Mr. Marsham, the magistrate, added to his amusement by fining him forty shillings—or fourteen days.

Some time ago we criticised some religious utterances in a natural history column edited by E. Kay Robinson in the *Manchester Evening Chronicle*. This writer has just attempted a reply. It is rather a poor one, as we shall show presently. What we will deal with first is the writer's advice to the editor of the *Freethinker* to "read Darwin's own letters." The editor's pamphlet, *Darwin on God*, proves that he did this many years ago. He went carefully through everything Darwin had written, and everything published about him by his family. Mr. Robinson's advice, therefore, is gratuitous. Perhaps if he read the pamphlet we refer to he would learn something himself.

Mr. Robinson speaks of "a journal called the *Freethinker*." What affectation! Religious people do not often read the *Freethinker*, but there are very few of them who never heard of it.

We have called Mr. Robinson's reply to our criticism a poor one. He tries to explain how the existence of a wise and good God is compatible with a world of strife and suffering. He says that the clue to the mystery lies in the "simple fact that every living being strikes its own average, so to speak, of happiness." He asserts that "the average beggar has as much happiness and unhappiness, neither more nor less, than the average King." This is his argument—and this is his grammar. Well, we shall believe it when we find kings trying beggary now and then for a change. Meanwhile we consider it to be nonsense—and not very honest at that.

Dr. Johnson once observed that the arguments in favor of poverty being no evil proved that it was a very real evil. Nobody, he remarked, ever labors to convince you that you can live very happily on a plentiful fortune. We commend this to Mr. Robinson's attention. When he has thought it over he may perceive that it throws some light on his own argument about misery.

Mr. Holyoake, we believe, sends us a letter of his which appeared in the *Daily News*, replying to "B.," who had quoted from the old *Oracle of Reason* a passage in which Mr. Holyoake had called himself an Atheist, although he had told the *Daily News* interviewer "I was no Atheist." This letter appeared a considerable time after "B.'s," and we overlooked it. Mr. Holyoake's explanation is that he should have said, or the interviewer should have made him say, "I was no Atheist *then*." He was not an Atheist when the *Oracle* started, but he appears to have become one soon afterwards, and the "then" refers to the intermediate period. We suppose this straightens matters. But there was no need to fall foul of poor "B." for not "reading between the lines." It is easy enough to do that when you know what is implied. Mr. Holyoake knew it; poor "B." didn't.

Mr. Foote's Lecturing Engagements.

(All Engagements suspended for the present.)

To Correspondents.

C. COHEN'S LECTURING ENGAGEMENTS.—Address, 241 High-road, Leyton.

THERE was a wretched misprint in last week's *Freethinker* motto, which should have read as follows:—"He who will not reason, is a bigot; he who cannot, is a fool; and he who dares not, is a slave." The strong *dares* got printed as the feeble *does*. We beg Sir William Drummond's pardon. Though dead, he has the rights of an author—and we would respect them.

A. E. PAYNE.—We cannot answer such queries by post. You ask us whether we can prove there is no God. It all depends on what you mean. Define "God," and we will see. You ask us whether you, as a Christian, are not on the safe side. A Mohammedan, a Brahman, a Buddhist, or a Jew could ask the same question with the same assurance. You assume that, if any religion is true, it is yours; but it may be one of the others. Our side—since you are anxious about it—is the side of reason and humanity; and if this is not the safe side it ought to be.

T. ROBERTSON (Glasgow Branch) sends a list of subscriptions to the Cohen Presentation, and hopes to send another shortly. Local "saints" who don't like the trouble of remitting can hand their subscriptions to him or to Mr. Baxter.

SCOTCH FREETHINKER.—Shall be pleased to see you at South Shields. Glad to hear you think that all Freethinkers should support the Cohen Presentation. Thanks for your subscription. By the way, cheques, etc., should be made payable to G. W. Foote. It is not intended to pass over the individual cheques, etc., to the Treasurer. He will receive amounts in the lump from time to time. That is easier for him, and far simpler for us, who have too much to do already.

T. HUTCHINSON.—We have noticed E. Kay Robinson's observations in a Manchester paper. They seem to be amplified in the *Northern Weekly Leader* you send us. We invite this gentleman to give us the reference for one of his assertions. Where does Darwin say that his doctrine "necessarily presupposes the existence of that 'Architect' of the Universe, whom religion calls God"? With regard to yourself, if you obtain our pamphlet, *Darwin on God*, price sixpence, you will find in it all the information you are seeking.

JAMES NEATE.—See paragraph.

F. HILLIER.—Pleased to hear the Kingsland Branch enrolled three new members on Sunday.

THE COHEN PRESENTATION.—Acknowledgments: F. S. £5, Scotch *Freethinker* £1 10s., M. Christopher 10s., A. G. Lye 2s., J. Roberts 10s. 6d. Per T. Robertson (Glasgow): Glasgow Branch £5, T. Robertson £2, Mr. and Mrs. J. F. Turnbull 5s., Mr. Watt 5s., J. Thomson 5s., A. McCron 5s., S. H. 5s., Mr. Cameron 2s., Mr. Strathearn 2s. 6d., Dick 1s., Milne 1s.: total £8 11s. 6d.—Full total £16 4s.

C. D. STEPHENS.—We take as much care as possible, but work has to be done, and more than we feel quite fit for. Sorry for the cause of the black border on your envelope.

J. LORD writes: "A copy of the *Freethinker* was put into my hands by a friend. I read it with great pleasure, and shall be glad in future to procure a copy through a local agent." This should encourage our friends to introduce this journal to their acquaintances. We regret we are unable to tell this correspondent who is the publisher of Edgar Saltus's *Philosophy of Disenchantment*. We fancy it is only published in America.

G. CROOKSON.—Thanks for the paper. Dr. Clifford is simply pandering to his own mob.

M. CHRISTOPHER (Wolverhampton).—Glad to hear you are going to South Shields.

J. G. STUART.—Papers are welcome. See paragraphs. The *Pioneer* shall be sent as requested. Really, the newsagents seem to serve the *Pioneer* worse than the *Freethinker*. It is incomprehensible. In reply to your query as to Mr. Foote, he is improving gradually; not so rapidly as he might if, instead of keeping his nose to the grindstone, he acted on his doctor's advice to "go away."

A. E. GOUGH.—The pamphlet answers your questions. Your Christian friend is a nincompoop.

J. ROBERTS hopes to send another subscription to the Cohen Presentation before the fund closes.

WALTER HUNT.—What you have to do is to ask your Christian opponent, who says the New Testament books were all written by A.D. 56, for his evidence.

W. P. BALL.—Thanks again for cuttings.

D. M. PARK.—Glad you are so pleased with the Dresden Edition of Ingersoll. You could only get a complete edition of James Thomson's *Satires and Profanities* second-hand now. The first half-crown edition has long been out of print. Sorry we cannot help you personally.

A. G. LYE.—Thanks for your sensible and manly letter.

HACKNEY SAINT.—A fresh edition of our *Prisoner for Blasphemy* is one of the things we have in view.

D. S. CURRIE.—Defoe was a Dissenter, but there is a smack of jocose heresy in his *History of the Devil*.

F. S., sending cheque, trusts there will be a liberal response to our appeal on behalf of the Cohen Presentation. He also sends good wishes for Mr. Foote's health.

A. BURTON.—The announcement in the paper you send us as to the National Secular Society and a sum of £800 is not true and was meant to be impertinent.

PAPERS RECEIVED.—The Northern Whig—Boston Investigator—Ashton's Northern Weekly—Two Worlds—Public Opinion (New York)—Morning Advertiser—Progressive Thinker—Lu Raison—Torch of Reason.—Crescent—Searchlight—Blue Grass Blade—Freidenker—Manchester Evening Chronicle—Reynolds's Newspaper—Sheffield Independent—Newtownards Chronicle—Worcester County Express.

THE National Secular Society's office is at 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C., where all letters should be addressed to Miss Vance.

THE SECULAR SOCIETY, LIMITED, office is at 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

LETTERS for the Editor of the *Freethinker* should be addressed to 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

LECTURE NOTICES must reach 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C., by first post Tuesday, or they will not be inserted.

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

ORDERS for literature should be sent to the Freethought Publishing Company, Limited, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C., and not to the Editor.

PERSONS remitting for literature by stamps are specially requested to send *halfpenny stamps*, which are most useful in the Freethought Publishing Company's business.

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

The Cohen Presentation.

SOME of Mr. Cohen's friends in south-west Lancashire started the idea of making him a presentation. After a certain publicity had been given to the matter it was remitted to the Executive of the National Secular Society. At the Executive's request I undertook to make a public appeal in the *Freethinker*, only stipulating that a Treasurer for the Fund should be appointed. This gentleman is Mr. Victor Roger, 114 Kennington-road, London, S.E.

After the lengthy explanation which I gave last week, it is only necessary to repeat that the object of this presentation is to show our appreciation of Mr. Cohen's past and our hope for his future; and to assure him, in a practical way, that we recognise the virtue of his devotion to an unpopular and unprofitable movement.

I beg to express a personal hope that this appeal will meet with a generous response. Mr. Cohen is a Jew, but I have found him not so mercenary as some Gentiles. He has always been ready to work; he has been glad to get wages, but he has not waited for them; and he has never assumed, as some have done, that I was a Providence responsible for his prosperity. These are points in his favor, besides those with which the Freethought party is already acquainted.

This appeal should be promptly as well as generously responded to. It ought not to drag through many numbers of the *Freethinker*. Those who mean to subscribe should do so without unnecessary delay.

I did not expect a flood of subscriptions for acknowledgment this week. Many readers do not see the *Freethinker* till Sunday, and nothing can appear in these columns which arrives after Tuesday morning. This is a very brief interval for letters and remittances. I look to next week, therefore, as the real test. In the meanwhile I may observe that subscriptions should be sent to me for acknowledgment before being paid over to the Treasurer.

G. W. FOOTE.

Sugar Plums.

May 31, the date of this week's *Freethinker*, is Whit-Sunday, and on this day the National Secular Society's Annual Conference takes place. This year it is to be held at South Shields. The fine Assembly Hall has been secured for the evening public meeting, and the Conference will sit, morning and afternoon, in the minor hall of the same building, which is in connection with the Royal Hotel. The Hotel entrance is in the main thoroughfare, Ocean-road; the Assembly Room entrance is in Stanhope-street. Delegates and visitors should make their way there on arriving at South Shields. It is within two or three minutes' walk of the station.

The morning sitting of the Conference will begin at 10.30 punctually, and all who mean to attend should make an effort to be in their places by then. The President will bring with him the old hammer used by Charles Bradlaugh, and before him by Thomas Watson and Richard Carlile. It is enough to give one a thrill to look at that little hammer and reflect that it was handled by the heroic Freethinker who spent nine years and seven months in English gaols.

Friends who come from Newcastle-on-Tyne and other places to the Conference will please note that a dinner will be provided at the Royal Hotel at 1 o'clock, the tickets being 2s. 6d. each. There will also be a shilling tea at 5 o'clock. This meets the difficulty so often experienced in obtaining proper refreshment on Sunday.

Delegates and visitors who desire tickets for the lunch or tea on Sunday, or both, should try to communicate beforehand with the local secretary, Mr. E. Chapman, 32 James Mather-terrace, South Shields.

Announcements will be made during the Conference sittings, and perhaps at the evening public meeting, of the Monday trips arranged for delegates and visitors. It is not easy to arrange these things beforehand. So much depends on the weather and on the number of those who are able to stay over Sunday.

The following letter speaks for itself:—

THE EDUCATION STRUGGLE.
To the Editor of the "Daily News."

Sir,—Will you allow me to ask two pertinent questions in the midst of all this discord and bitterness?

First, what would there be left to quarrel about if religion were removed from the nation's schools?

Second, why do Nonconformists uphold the teaching of religion in State schools while they denounce the teaching of religion in State churches?

Many thousands of people in England—far more than is generally supposed—would like these questions fairly and squarely answered. Perhaps some cool-headed apostle of "unsectarian (Christian) education" will oblige.—Yours, etc.,

May 22, 1903.

G. W. FOOTE.

The *Daily News* did not insert the above letter. It finds room whenever Mr. Holyoake sends it a eulogy of some Nonconformist preacher, but it cannot find room for a dozen lines on a vastly important public question from the President of the National Secular Society. The truth is that the *Daily News* is not a Liberal newspaper; it is a Nonconformist newspaper; its Liberalism is subsidiary and to some extent accidental. Moreover, it probably saw that Mr. Foote's letter would have pricked the great bubble it was floating.

Mr. Cohen lectured to a large audience at Kingsland Green on Sunday morning, and enjoyed the opportunity of replying to an interrupter who wanted to know why the Secularists did not take part in the Hyde Park demonstration. In the afternoon Mr. Cohen had another large audience in Victoria Park, and a collection was taken up for the Penrhy quarrymen.

Mr. Gould's article has what is sometimes called the place of honor in this week's *Freethinker*, because it deals with a public question of great and immediate interest, on which the writer has special claims to be heard.

Mr. Foote intended to finish this week his notice of the Emerson Centenary. But he found it impossible to do so, partly from want of space, and partly from respect to the subject. Emerson is an important name in the history of progressive thought, and there can be no harm in devoting three articles to him instead of two. The final article will appear in our next issue.

The fifth article of "Abracadabra's" new series on Moses and the Pentateuch has unfortunately—through pressure on our space—to stand over till next week.

The June number of the *Pioneer* has been published very early in order to meet what seems to be the general wish of the trade. Copies were on sale on Saturday, May 23. There ought to be no sort of difficulty, therefore, in subscribers obtaining it before June 1 from newsagents in all parts of the kingdom. We hope the friends of the *Pioneer* will continue to promote its circulation amongst their acquaintances, and in other possible ways. The June number is a good one, and contains rather more Freethought than previous issues. On the literary side there is a review of Mr. George Gissing's *Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft*, which should interest a good many readers. There is also an Ingersoll article now printed for the first time in England.

Mrs. Crawford, the able and well-informed Paris correspondent of the *Daily News*, says that if the present French Government goes out, there "will probably be a Clémenceau Ministry pledged to abrogate the Concordat"—that is, to disestablish religion altogether, including the Catholic Church. In that case, M. Buisson would probably be Minister of Public Instruction. He is the greatest French authority on primary education, and is dead against the Religious Orders being allowed to teach. M. Buisson is a fellow-worker with M. Victor Charbonnel on *La Raison*, the bright and often "blasphemous" organ of the International Freethought movement. Mrs. Crawford says that *La Raison* is warmly supported by M. Clémenceau.

M. Victor Charbonnel is referred to by the *Westminster Gazette* as the gentleman who "organises the riots in the French churches." We invite our contemporary to indicate its authority for this statement. Even a French Freethinker has some right to fair play and decent treatment.

The *Haltwhistle Echo* prints an excellent letter by "Fairplay" on the Education Bill. It puts the Secular position against both the Church and the Nonconformist positions most admirably. We wish Freethinkers all over the country would try to get similar letters in their local newspapers.

The *Worcester County Express* gives a long report of the burial of Mr. William Smithyman (which we report in another column) under the heading of "A Secular Funeral." It refers to his great mechanical skill as an ironworker, and his active support of Charles Bradlaugh in the old stormy days.

"Max O'Rell" (Paul Blouët), who died at Paris on Sunday night, was known as a lecturer all over the English-speaking world. While not profound, he was reasonable, witty, and entertaining. It was easy to perceive that he was a Freethinker. In a letter to a friend in London, written only a few days before his death, he wrote: "I fear that I am doomed. The doctors give me only a few months, but I believe I shall last longer. At any rate, I shall try, for I'd rather wear a hat than a halo."

Editor Moore, of the *Blue Grass Blade*, Lexington, Kentucky, has been enjoying a trip to Egypt and Palestine. He says on returning home that he is more than ever opposed to the Bible and Christianity after seeing the places and the sort of people both originated from. He is going to write a book on his travels, and we hope he will favor us with a copy. We note that a financial appeal is being made on behalf of his paper, and we trust it will be liberally responded to.

The *Boston Investigator* reproduces G. Guardabosco's "A Catching Complaint" from our columns. We have read the verses with fresh appreciation in our contemporary's pages.

Some of the young Hebrews of East New York, a part of Brooklyn, have formed a Thomas Paine Literary Club. The membership is as yet small, but they have a neat little club-room on Watkins-avenue, and are energetic young heretics.—*Truthseeker* (New York).

Mr. Foote, though not officially as President of the National Secular Society, will have some pleasant news to communicate at the South Shields gathering with respect to the financial outlook of the movement in the immediate future. This will be reported subsequently in the *Freethinker*.

Babylon and the Bible.

"The stories of Creation, of Paradise, of the Early Patriarchs, and of the Deluge, all rest alike on a foundation of Babylonian material adopted by the Israelites."—PROFESSOR ZIMMERN, *The Babylonian and the Hebrew Genesis*, p. 60. 1901.

"At some unknown period, then, whether by inheritance from the Canaanites or by contact with Babylonia itself, we may assume that the Hebrews acquired the Babylonian legends which we find incorporated in their national traditions."—L. W. KING, *Babylonian Religion*, p. 120. 1899.

"Moses, or the compiler of the Book of Genesis, whoever he may have been, manifests a familiar acquaintance with the religious epics of Babylonia, which go back to the twenty-third century B.C., to a date, i.e., about 800 years earlier than the reputed time of Moses. By being worked into these early Hebrew documents, Babylonian ideas were ensured persistence and obtained a world-wide currency."—REV. A. SMYTHE PALMER, *Babylonian Influence on the Bible*, pp. 3, 4. 1897.

IN the early days of Assyrian discovery, when Layard brought to light the ruins of Nineveh, buried and lost for ages, and Sir Henry Rawlinson read the name of Sennacherib on the Assyrian marbles, we were told that the Bible had been vindicated, and the sceptic silenced. Great was the enthusiasm engendered by these discoveries; expeditions were sent out to investigate and discover more ruins and recover more historical records. The Palestine Exploration Fund was started about forty years ago, for the express purpose of finding proofs in confirmation of the events recorded in the Bible. The Americans were quite as eager. The *Athenaeum*, reviewing a book on the American expedition to Nippur, tells us that for several years past a number of American gentlemen "were finding the money necessary for the prosecution of excavations in Babylonia, with the view of discovering contemporaneous evidence of historical events which are described in the book of Genesis."

Many discoveries have been made, but not of the quality the pious subscribers bargained for. Instead of proving the historical truth of the Bible narratives—which scientists had already shown to be in flat contradiction with astronomy, geology, and the sister sciences—these discoveries have deprived them of their last retreat, namely, our ignorance of the history of antiquity.

It is now known that instead of the world being created 4000 years B.C., great and highly civilised nations were in existence, and had existed for thousands of years, before that date.† That the writer of Genesis had copies before him of the Babylonian legends of the Creation, the Deluge, and it is highly probable, of the Garden of Eden and the Fall, all of which legends he incorporated in his work, and what has passed for ages as the inspired Word of God, now turns out to be the plagiarised work of man. And lastly, that far from the Hebrews forming a mighty and independent nation, contending on an equal footing with the mighty nations of antiquity, we find them a mere insignificant tribe of barbarians without science, art, or culture. Their country formed a cushion between the two mighty empires of Egypt and Assyria, to one or the other of which the Hebrews were always vassals. And while we have found an immense amount of sculptures, monuments, and records, along with many magnificent palaces and temples, telling of a high civilisation in Egypt and Assyria, the Hebrew remains brought to light are, in comparison, quite insignificant; even a cursory examination of the British Museum is sufficient to convince the most orthodox believer upon this point.

Now when the discoveries of the geologists and astronomers had demonstrated the falsity of the science of the Bible, a school of apologists arose who, by a series of patent adjustments and much conjuring with words, attempted the impossible task

* *Athenaeum*, March 12, 1898.

† Professor Sayce, in an article on Professor Hilprecht's discoveries at Nippur, cites him as dating "the founding of the Temple of Bel and the first settlements in Nippur somewhere between 6000 and 7000 B.C.; possibly even earlier," goes on to say that "For the beginnings of Babylonian writing we have still to search among the relics of centuries that lie far behind the foundation of the Temple of Nippur."—*Contemporary Review*, January, 1897.

of making the Bible agree with science. This school was well named by Professor Huxley "those modern representatives of Sisyphus, the reconcilers of Genesis with science." Mr. Gladstone was the greatest exponent of this school, and it is safe to say—after the terrible castigation administered by Professor Huxley to his attempted reconciliation—that he will be the last man of equal eminence to devote his energies to such a hopeless task.

In like manner, when the discoveries in the historical records of the past were found to invalidate the "good old book," a similar school of "adjusters" appeared, numbering among them high dignitaries of the church. These were known as the "Higher Critics." But so difficult was the task found to be, and so stubborn the facts to be adjusted, that it could only be accomplished by admitting that the Bible contained much matter of a mythological character. When the orthodox saw men, high in the Church, like Ryle, Driver, and Cheyne, playing ninepins with the Hebrew idols, a shout of alarm was raised; it was declared that the Bible was being destroyed by its own priests; that the foes of the Church were of its own household. Something had to be done, or no more money would be forthcoming for biblical exploration. At this juncture a statement was circulated by the religious press which caused much satisfaction in religious circles; it was to the effect that one of the highest authorities upon the ancient monuments and records—one who had himself done much to reduce the inspired narratives to the level of profane literature—was himself pre-a work, in which the "Higher Critics" would be put to flight once for all, and the Bible Humpty-Dumpty—repaired equal to new—restored to his former pedestal, from which he had been thrown by the levers of the "Higher Critics."

The Christian world awaited on the tip-toe of expectancy the arrival of this lion in the critics' den. In the words of Professor Andrew White, "The book was looked for with eager expectation by the supporters of the traditional view of Scripture; but, when it appeared, the exultation of the traditionalists was speedily changed to dismay." We cannot do better than give Professor White's summary of the book in his own words:—

"A few of the statements of this champion of orthodoxy may be noted. He allowed that the week of seven days and the Sabbath rest are of Babylonian origin—indeed, that the very word 'Sabbath' is Babylonian; that there are two narratives of Creation on the Babylonian tablets, wonderfully like the two leading Hebrew narratives in Genesis, and that the latter were undoubtedly drawn from the former; that the 'Garden of Eden' and its mystical tree were known to the inhabitants of Chaldea in pre-Semitic days; that the beliefs that woman was created out of man, and that man by sin fell from a state of innocence, are drawn from very ancient Chaldean-Babylonian texts; that Assyriology confirms the belief that the book of Genesis is a compilation; that portions of it are by no means so old as the time of Moses; that the expression in our sacred book, 'The Lord smelled a sweet savor' at the sacrifice made by Noah, is 'identical with that of the Babylonian poet'; that 'it is impossible to believe that the language of the latter was not known to the writer'; and that the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife was drawn in part from the old Egyptian tale of *The Two Brothers*. Finally, after a multitude of other concessions, Professor Sayce allowed that the book of Jonah, so far from being the work of the prophet himself, cannot have been written until the Assyrian was a thing of the past; that the book of Daniel contains serious mistakes; that the so-called historical chapters of that book so conflict with the monuments that the author cannot have been a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus; that 'the story of Belshazzar's fall is not historical; that the Belshazzar referred to in it as king, and as the son of Nebuchadnezzar was not the son of Nebuchadnezzar, and was never king; that 'King Darius the Mede,' who plays so great a part in the story, never existed; and that the book associates persons and events really many years apart, and that it must have been written at a period far later than the time assigned in it for its own origin.

* *Science and Hebrew Tradition*, p. 157, Macmillan, 1901.

"As to the book of Ezra, he tells us that we are confronted by a chronological inconsistency which no amount of ingenuity can explain away. He also acknowledges that the book of Esther 'contains many exaggerations and improbabilities, and is simply founded upon one of those same historical tales of which the Persian chronicles seem to have been full.' Great was the dissatisfaction of the traditionalists with their expected champion; well might they repeat the words of Balak to Balaam: 'I called thee to curse mine enemies, and, behold, thou hast altogether blessed them.'"^{*}

But all these admissions only represent the facts that can no longer be ignored or explained away; on all other points, where he thinks nothing has been discovered either to confirm or contradict the Bible, the traditional view is upheld, as in the historical character of the exodus from Egypt and the conquest of Canaan. Canon Driver and Canon Cheyne both contributed articles combating the conservative parts of the book, Canon Driver pointing out, that in his attempts to reconcile the Bible account of the conquest of Canaan with the historical records, he flatly contradicts the account of the conquest given in the book of Joshua;[†] and Canon Cheyne, dealing with the patriarchs, emphatically declares "that Isaac, Jacob, Israel, and Joseph are tribal names, and that their legends embody to some extent tribal reminiscences, is among the most secure results of criticism, and no compassion for 'weak brethren' can at this time of day justify its suppression."[‡]

So much for Professor Sayce's vindication, and up to the time of writing, we have not heard that he has attempted any reply to his critics. Before concluding with Professor Sayce we wish to draw attention to another matter with which the Professor was connected. His book was published by the "Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge." This society also published Maspero's great work, *Histoire Ancienne de Peuples de l'Orient Classique* in 1896. The work was edited by Professor Sayce and translated by Mr. McClure. A writer in the *Athenæum* for January 2, 1897, writes "to call the attention of English readers to the manner in which Professor Maspero's text has, in certain passages, been surreptitiously tampered with in the translation." Professor Maspero belongs to the modern advanced critical school represented by Reuss and Wellhausen, and in the French edition he adopts their conclusions "without the smallest ambiguity, and frequently in his notes refers to the works of these and other critics with approval. Such an endorsement on the part of a distinguished archæologist of the conclusions of modern criticism could, of course, not be admitted by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Accordingly, without giving his readers the smallest hint of the fact, the translator, Mr. McClure, alters in his translation the text of the passages in question, so as to make Professor Maspero appear throughout as an orthodox traditionalist. It is surprising that the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge should have sanctioned this piece of literary bad faith, and that either Professor Sayce, the editor, or Mr. McClure, the translator, should have lent his hand to it. If the Society undertook to present Professor Maspero's work to the English public, it is clear that the only straightforward course for them to adopt was either to present it faithfully in every particular, or to

prefix a note (which, however, I do not find), stating unambiguously that Professor Maspero, in the original work, treated the Old Testament from a critical standpoint, and often expressed sympathy with critics and their work, but that, as they felt sure that their readers would be justly shocked by such views, they had authorised the translator to do his best to eliminate them."

This pious transaction shows the lengths to which the orthodox will go in perverting the truth. To see the matter in its true light we must reverse the case and imagine a Freethinker translating a pious work, and altering the sentiments so that the author appeared to be an Atheist. What a storm of indignation would be aroused in that case!

Ecclesiastical historians assure us that pious frauds were not inoperative in the first ages of Christianity, and many writers have doubted—with good reason—whether Christianity would have survived without the aid of it; but what did very well for the ignorant and uncritical early Christian, will not do for the modern critical and analytical spirit of to-day, and such a fraud stands small chance of passing undetected, and when detected it covers the instigators with well-deserved odium, as in the present case.

We have seen that the S. P. C. K. have been somewhat unfortunate in their attempts to save the tottering ark of Bible authority. But undeterred by these misadventures they have plucked up courage and engaged Mr. Theophilus G. Pinches to write a work entitled *The Old Testament In the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*. The work has lately been published. What the Old Testament looks like in this light we must reserve for a future article

W. MANN.

Sarah's Smile.

AN ESSAY IN THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

HAVING read my week's *Freethinker*, and no fresh book being at hand, nor any of my old ones at the moment suiting my appetite, or the lack of it, I sat mooning, when, suddenly, "He lies like Genesis!" floated into my memory. It is a pithy phrase, applied by one character to another, in Haldane McFall's *Jezebel Pettifer*, but why it should just now have recurred to my mind, I cannot tell. However, it set me on a train of thought, and I wondered if Genesis *did* lie so superlatively and at large. I had not read that book for years, though at school most of the sixth form boys knew it fairly well—at least, so far as its stories of an azure or a deeper blue tint went. One of those stories was that of Sarah, who, on a certain occasion, is reported to have smiled and said: "Can I have pleasure, and my lord is old?" I thought of this story awhile, and then took down my copy of the book containing it.

Having read the story, I next read the whole of Genesis, and the thought came to me that either that story was an interpolation or a mass of its context was spurious. And I'll tell you why I thought so. Abraham, when he got his wife's maid with child—his wife condoning his act—was 90 years of age. At the time Sarah was laughing at the idea of having a child by Abraham, he was but 99 and she herself about the same age. Now, why should Sarah have smiled? Let us try to find it out. Abraham was born—the year of the world according to Genesis—in 1947. In the year 2037 he got Hagar, his wife's serving-maid, with child. Now Abraham's family were terrors to those urgent heirs who wait for dead men's shoes. His father, Terah, lived to be 205, and was 70 when his wife bore Abraham to him. His paternal grandfather, Nahor, lived to be 148 years, apparently being cut off in his prime. But Abraham's great-grandfather, Serag, lived to be 240 years, and his (Abraham's) great-great-grandfather, Rou, lived to be 230, and his great-great-great-grandfather, Peleg, lived to be 230. These were on the paternal side; of the ages of his maternal grandfathers and paternal grandmothers we can find no record in Genesis, but we think that the evidence already given of family longevity is sufficient to show that at ninety-nine Abraham was really in the full flush of his manhood, and that it is most unlikely that Sarah should, at so early an age, be laughing at Abraham's impotence. Indeed, his father, Terah, was still living; a hearty old fellow, no doubt, of only 166, when

^{*} Professor A. D. White, *The Warfare of Science*, vol. ii., pp. 372-4. Ed. 1896. The book was entitled *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, by Professor Sayce.

[†] *Contemporary Review*, March, 1894, p. 419.

[‡] "Professor Sayce on the Higher Criticism," *Nineteenth Century*, April, 1894. Canon Cheyne, further, caustically remarks: "I only wish he had utilised his cuneiform lore as well on the subject of Jonah and his 'whale,' instead of quoting from a recent absurd tractate by that good geographer but weak mythologist and theologian, Dr. Clay Trumbull. I wish, too, that throughout the book he had given more evidence of a critical study of the Hebrew text. But for all that I think that, if Professor Sayce would recast and correct his book for scholars, and cut himself entirely loose from the committee of his Church Society, he might help forward the cause of a more completely furnished criticism of the Old Testament and a more thorough explanation of the recesses of Biblical antiquity." Coming from a Canon, this is a poor testimonial to the "Church Society."

Sarah smiled. Nor was Abraham's natural expectation of a long life based merely on the long lives of his more immediate ancestors; it is clear those more immediate ancestors had shown a certain decadence in their vitality; but why should not a sanguine man like Abraham look around him and conclude that he might reckon on a good chance of reaching, say, 350 years of age without risking the charge of being unduly optimistic?

Who were Abraham's contemporaries forty-five years before the year of Sarah's smile (in the Genesiac year 2007)? To begin with, Noah was still hearty, in spite of his tipping and damaged morals, and on the best of terms with Abraham, his grandson, at about a dozen removes, at the time Abraham was a child of twenty. It is true Noah was getting on into years, being at that time some 920 years old, but this age was such as to encourage Abraham to expect to easily overpass his father's short life of but 205 years, and to look on ninety-nine as a mere spring-time in the life of a really stout descendant of Noah. Serag (in the year of Sarah's smile, was aged some 220 years); Eber (some 309 years of age); Salah (some 350 years of age); Arphaxad (being then some 400 years of age); Shem, Ham, and Japhet (being each about 470 years old)—were all chums of Abraham. Having then, no doubt, as a boy made one at children's parties at Noah's house—for by the time the captain of the ark was 930 it may be assumed that he had become respectable, and had put off for good his old addiction to the vine and venery, and was setting a good example on the strength of a ruined digestion and general sexual debility—and having as a youth hobnobbed with Serag, Eber, Arphaxad, Shem, Ham, and Japhet, whose combined ages made up not much less than a total of 3,000 years, can it be doubted that Abraham was, at ninety-nine, quite a vigorous fellow? Personally friendly with relatives, four of whom were well over 400 years old, why should he think himself a dotard at ninety-nine, and why should Sarah smile at the thought of having pleasure with her lord? The fact is, he could not well so think of himself, surrounded as he had been through life with relatives ranging from 950 years old down to a mere 175 or so. Consequently I consider the story of Sarah's smile open to grave doubt, and to be a possible interpolation by some relative owing a grudge to Abraham's memory and fame, for "one's worst foes are those of one's own family."

On the other hand, if we are to try to be impartial, we must admit that Abraham preserves a strange reticence in speaking of his living relatives. Most people would be proud of a living kinsman like Noah, whose 950 years and varied experiences by flood and field and other places must have made him quite the most notable of Abraham's early friends. Then Shem, Ham, and Japhet, who were but each 100 years old when they formed, under Noah, the male crew of the Ark were, when Abraham first knew them, getting on for 400 years old. We find after the drunken episode with his sons little mention of Noah, and his life appears to have been spent for some 300 years as that of a retired sea captain; but after a busy life of 650 years, perhaps we may grant that in the evening of his days he was entitled to spend his last 300 years on half-pay and in doing nothing, and he apparently had no literary capacity, for no autobiography did he leave behind for our delectation. This fine old ancient mariner surely possessed the materials for an entrancing story, yet, alas, like so many other ancient mariners since his time, what with cursing, and drinking, and being loose in his affections, he so filled his bill, that he had to be content with living, and to forego writing.

On the whole, however, I conclude that it is reasonable to suppose that Abraham, having known Noah when he (Noah) was 950, was little likely to consider himself old at 99, and that Sarah, who also was friendly with Noah and his 400-year-old lads, had no good reason for her smile; and furthermore that the smile story is apocryphal and an interpolation, and that it is finally discredited by the subsequent fact that Abraham *did* beget children upon his second wife Keturah, whom he did not marry until after he was 127 years old. By her he had six children, and if he died at the early age of 175 years it may perhaps be attributed partly to the number of concubines he had before and after Sarah's death, and on whom he begot an apparently large, but certainly anonymous, family. Notwithstanding his varied and extensive marital and extra-marital experiences, no daughter appears to have been born to any of either his concubines or his wives! Doubtless, after Sarah's death, he often longed for the return of the days when he used to trade her off on the Pharaohs and the Abimilechs for his sister, and received in return for his complaisance "sheep and oxen and he-asses, and men-servants and maid-servants, and she-asses and camels." But the merry days when he lived on the immoral earnings of his wife were gone with Sarah, and at 175 Abraham went to a premature grave amid the wailing of his many concubines and the contempt of Hagar.

SIRIUS.

Obituary.

WE regret to record the death of Mr. Wightman Cooper, of St. Paul's-road, Canonbury, the founder of the London Trading Bank, Coleman-street, E.C. There is a fairly long obituary notice in the *Islington Gazette*, which says that "the deceased gentleman had long been associated with Islington in business, politics, and parochial administration," and that in spite of his "extreme views" he was "pleasant company for all." Mr. Cooper was a frequent attendant at the old Hall of Science, and a Director of the Hall Company there after Charles Bradlaugh's death. He was a sturdy Freethinker, an advanced politician, an active citizen, and an honest man. We believe he was in his sixty-fifth year.

Funeral of Mr. Smithyman.

OWING to the *Freethinker* press day being Wednesday, only a brief notice of the death of Mr. William Smithyman was possible in our last issue. Mr. Smithyman had been for some years a member of the Birmingham Branch of the N. S. S., and in his earlier life closely associated with many reform movements, in addition to being a fairly large shareholder in the old Freethought Publishing Company. Two years ago he found himself afflicted with cancer in the mouth, which resulted in his death at Clent, Worcestershire, on May 17, at the age of seventy-five. At his request, Mr. C. Cohen attended and delivered an address over the grave. Messrs. Partridge, Pitt, Ridgway, and others attended on behalf of the Birmingham Branch, and there were a number of strangers present who watched the proceedings and listened to the address with apparent interest.

Failure of hearing had kept Mr. Smithyson from attending meetings of late years, but his final instructions showed that his sympathies were as keen on the side of Freethought as in the days of his early manhood. The Birmingham Branch has lost a good member, and Freethought a good friend.

The Preacher who Caught On.

He preached about the pleasure
That there is in doing good;
He held the Scriptures sacred,
And he did the best he could;
He consoled the weeping widow,
And he dried the orphan's tear,
He made his sermons scholarly,
But few turned out to hear.

He preached about the danger
That there is in doing wrong,
He held that being righteous
Goes for more than being strong;
He preached that man should follow
The Lord's teachings day by day,
And presently he noticed
That the people stayed away.

He bought a magic lantern,
And some slides to fit the same,
And announced that he thereafter
Would be right up with the game;
He studied slang instead of
Poring over ancient lore,
And the crowds ere long began to have
To line up at the door.

He ceased to warn his hearers
That they ought to change their ways
He ceased to preach the Gospel,
And he studied to amaze—
He says they're coming easy,
He's cocky as can be—
They've given him a finer house
And raised his salary.

—*Chicago Record-Herald.*

IT WASN'T THE HEN.—At an elementary examination in English which was lately held at a school not so very far from this city, two sentences were given out to be corrected. The first sentence was to be corrected as to its subject matter, and the second as to its syntax. These were the sentences: "The hen has three legs." "Who done it?" When the papers were handed in it was found that one of the pupils had apparently regarded the sentences as connected in some subtle manner, for his answer was; "The hen didn't done it; God done it."

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 postcard.

LONDON.

SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Masonic Hall, Camberwell New-road): 7, Dr. Washington Sullivan, "Zola's Last Work, *Truth*."

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N.S.S. (Victoria Park, near the fountain): 3.15, Mr. Davies.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N.S.S.: Station-road, 11.30, G. Green: Brockwell Park, 3.15 and 6.30, E. B. Rose.

EAST LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Mile End Waste): 11.30, J. Fagan, "Belief and Unbelief."

FINSBURY BRANCH N. S. S. (Clerkenwell-green): 11.30, A Lecture.

KINGSLAND BRANCH N. S. S. (corner of Ridley-road, Dalston): R. P. Edwards.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Hyde Park, near Marble Arch): 11.30, A Lecture; Hammersmith Broadway, 7.30, A Lecture.

COUNTRY.

CHATHAM SECULAR SOCIETY (Queen's-road, New Brompton): 7.15, Evening Concert, Illustrated by Dissolving Views.

LIVERPOOL (Alexandra Hall, Islington-square): No lectures during June, July, and August. Committee meets Wednesday, June 3rd, 8 p.m., to make arrangements for outdoor propaganda.

SOUTH SHIELDS (Royal Assembly Hall, Stanhope-street, Mile End-road): 10.30 and 2.30, Annual Conference N.S.S. 6.30, Public Meeting.

NOW READY.

A NEW AND CHEAPER EDITION
OF

Christianity and Progress

A REPLY TO THE LATE

RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE

BY

G. W. FOOTE

PRICE ONE PENNY

The Freethought Publishing Co., Ltd., 2 Newcastle-street,
Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

NOW READY.**TWO SECULAR BURIAL SERVICES**

A New Edition of the Form of Service to be read at the
Burial of Freethinkers)

PRICE ONE PENNY

The Freethought Publishing Co., Ltd., 2 Newcastle-street,
Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

NOW READY.**Letters of a Chinaman**

(AH SIN)

TO ENGLISH READERS

ON

CHINESE AND CHRISTIAN SUPERSTITIONS

AND THE

MISCHIEF OF MISSIONARIES.

Price One Penny.

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.,
2 NEWCASTLE STREET, FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

**FLOWERS OF
FREETHOUGHT.**

By **G. W. FOOTE.**

First Series, cloth 2s. 6d.

Second Series, cloth 2s. 6d.

Contains scores of entertaining and informing Essays and
Articles on a great variety of Freethought topics.

The Freethought Publishing Co., Ltd., London.

**What a Freethinker
can do for you!**

A Gent's Lounge Suit, Ready Made any color, latest
cut, well trimmed and finished, any size for **21/-**.

A Good Sunday Suit, made to your own special
measure from Pure Wool material, **30/-**, worth
45/-. Self-measurement form and Patterns,
post free.

A Lady's Full Dress Length (7 yds.) in any color of
material, warranted Pure Wool, for **13 6**. Pat-
terns post free to any address.

One pair of Gent's very smart hard-wearing Boots for
Sunday wear, black or tan, any size, **10 6**.

One pair Ladies' Boots, Laced or Buttoned, in Kid or
Glace, finest goods, for **8 6**.

A Clearing Line in Ladies' Mackintoshes, 50 to 56 in.
long, several colours, **9/-** each. We have sold
hundreds of these at 21/- each.

Gent's Mackintoshes **18/-** each, worth double, all
colors and all sizes.

70 Odd Trousers Lengths Pure Wool Scotch Tweeds,
5/- each.

Odd Trousers in all colors and sizes, 4 pairs for **21/-**.
Splendid value.

Gent's Overcoats, left from last winter season's goods,
clearing at **10/-** each, worth from 25/ to 45/- each.

Fine Black Cashmere for Dresses, **1/3** per yd., 42 in.
Fine Black or Navy Serge ,, **1 3** [wide.

Remnants for Girls' Dresses, **21/-** bundle contains
30 yds.

*Gott's Famous Freeclothing Tea is sold to over 2,000 families
every week. 2/6 per lb. When you have had 25 lb. weight
you get a New Suit free of all cost.*

J. W. GOTT, 4 UNION-STREET, BRADFORD.

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.SS.**

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-Malthusianism 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 con-
cerned 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.

THE SAFEST AND MOST EFFECTUAL CURE FOR
INFLAMMATION OF THE EYES.

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. 1½d. per bottle, with directions; by post 1½
stamps.

**G. THWAITES,
HERBALIST, 2 CHURCH ROW, STOCKTON-ON-TEES.**

The Twentieth Century Edition
OF
THE AGE OF REASON.

By THOMAS PAINE.

WITH A BIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION & ANNOTATIONS

By G. W. FOOTE.

And a Beautiful Portrait of Paine.

ISSUED BY THE SECULAR SOCIETY, LIMITED.

Printed on Good Paper, and Published at the

MARVELLOUSLY LOW PRICE OF SIXPENCE.

Postage of Single Copies, 2d.

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING CO., LTD., 2 NEWCASTLE ST., FARRINGDON ST., E.C.

Pamphlets by C. COHEN.

- An Outline of Evolutionary Ethics - 6d.
Foreign Missions: Their Dangers and Delusions. Full of Facts and Figures. A Complete Exposure of the Missionary Movement - 9d.
What is the Use of Prayer - 2d.
Evolution and Christianity - 2d.
Pain and Providence - 1d.
The Decay of Belief - 1d.

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.,
2 NEWCASTLE-STREET, FARRINGDON-STREET, LONDON, E.C.

New and Cheaper Editions

OF WORKS BY

COLONEL INGERSOLL.

- What Must We Do To Be Saved? - 2d.
Defence of Freethought - 4d.
Five Hours' Address to the Jury at the Trial for Blasphemy of C. B. Reynolds.
Why Am I an Agnostic? - 2d.
What Is Religion? - 2d.
HIS LAST LECTURE.
Take a Road of Your Own - 1d.
A Wooden God - 1d.

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.,
2, Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

A NEW LIST OF BOOKS FOR SALE.

COMTE'S Positive Philosophy, translated by Harriet Martineau, three vols., cr. 8vo., 7s. 6d. (pub. 15s.); FOSTER (Jno.), On Popular Ignorance, cr. 8vo., 1s. 9d. (pub. 3s. 6d.); NORMAN GALE: A Country Muse, two vols., cr. 8vo., 5s. (pub. 10s.); HALES (A. G.), Campaign Pictures of the South African War, cr. 8vo., 3s. (pub. 6s.); MCCARTHY (J.), The Story of Gladstone's Life, cr. 8vo., 3s. 6d. (pub. 7s. 6d.); MACKERN (H. F.), Sidelights on the March, post 8vo., 3s. (pub. 6s.); Lucretius in the Metre of Omar Khayyam, by W. H. MALLOCK, 8vo., 4s. (pub. 10s. net); Seaside Watering Places: A Description of 250 Holiday Resorts, cr. 8vo., 1s. 6d.; MARTINEAU (Harriet), History of England, 1800-15, cr. 8vo., 2s.; ELZE, Shakespeare, a Biography, cr. 8vo. 2s. 6d. (pub. 5s.); LOVER, Legends and Stories of Ireland, two vols., 8vo., 5s. 6d. (pub. 12s.)—All cloth, good condition, Cash with order.

BOOKS WANTED.

Voltaire's Candide, Wheeler's Dictionary of Freethinkers, Charles Southwell's Autobiography, Old Debates, Mackenzie's Brimston Ballads, Jas. Thomson's Works,
GEO. KEENE, 10 Salisbury Road, Leyton, Essex.

COMMON SENSE.

BY

THOMAS PAINE.

It is in this pamphlet that the expression "Free and Independent States of America" first appears, and it was the arguments Paine here used that influenced the colonists to rebel, and led to the establishment of the present government. *This is a complete edition of Paine's great work.*

Paper Covers. Price 8d. Postage 1d.

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.
2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

A Grand Purchase on Easy Terms!

THE "DRESDEN" EDITION OF

Colonel Ingersoll's Works

IN

TWELVE HANDSOME VOLUMES,

Beautifully Printed and elegantly Bound, with numerous Photogravures, Etchings, etc.; the literary matter covering more than 7,000 pages, and most of the contents being new to English readers;

Is offered on the

MONTHLY PAYMENT SYSTEM.

This Edition is sold for \$80 (about £8) in America, but by special arrangement the FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY is able to supply it in this country for

£5 10s., or cash £5,

Payable in Monthly Instalments of 10s.

The whole twelve Volumes will be forwarded, Carriage Paid, on receipt of the first instalment of 10s.

Write for Prospectus.

All communications to be addressed to
THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.,
2 NEWCASTLE-STREET, FARRINGDON-STREET, LONDON, E.C.

ASSISTANT.—£1 10s. a week, with a pleasantly-situated house and garden in a country village, are offered in exchange for the services of a capable and trustworthy assistant. A married man, who has not a large family, preferred. Must strongly approve of Neo-Malthusianism, and be a good writer. Good references indispensable. Apply, in first instance, to "Neo-Malthusian," c/o Freethinker, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

THE NEW PAPER

The Pioneer

A POPULAR PROPAGANDIST ORGAN
OF
ADVANCED IDEAS.

THE MAY NUMBER CONTAINS:

The Emerson Centenary
The Preston Election
John and Johnathan
Our Class Government
Carnegie's Soft Place
Royal Blasphemy
Conservatism and Progress

London Hospitals
Black Bigotry
The Nigger's Bed
The Pope's Ambition
Booth's Theology
The Education Battle
"Bad Language"

Lord Kelvin's Rashness
Unbelief of Believers
The City Temple Oracle
Ingersoll on Saints
Questions for Women
Mr. George Gissing's Opinions
A New Shakespearean

PRICE ONE PENNY.

THE PIONEER PRESS, 2 NEWCASTLE STREET, FARRINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

NOW READY

GOD SAVE THE KING

AND OTHER

CORONATION ARTICLES

BY

AN ENGLISH REPUBLICAN

(G. W. FOOTE)

THIRTY-TWO PAGES. PRICE TWOPENCE

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING CO., LTD., 2 NEWCASTLE ST., FARRINGDON ST., 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, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, 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 Chris'tian 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., 2 NEWCASTLE ST., FARRINGDON ST., E.C.