

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXIV.—No. 4

SUNDAY, JANUARY 24, 1904

PRICE TWOPENCE

Atheism and Vivisection.

A STRONG and general attempt was made to burke the protest against Miss Frances Power Cobbe's association of Atheism with Vivisection. The *Daily News* went so far as to decline the insertion of a letter from Mr. H. S. Salt, the honorary secretary of the Humanitarian League—a gentleman, a scholar, and a publicist of great ability, who never writes a line for the mere object of pay, but devotes himself absolutely to the highest of all causes, the cause of Humanity, and at one of those points where it is most liable to suffer from a paucity of friends and a plethora of misrepresentation. We could understand the suppression of a letter from the horrid editor of the *Freethinker*, who is looked upon as an Ishmael, or even a pariah, and who has no proper right to complain of the most outrageous treatment. But to serve Mr. Salt in that way was almost amazing; and would be quite so if one did not happen to know what *can* be done by the most ostentatious organs of the Christian Conscience.

Even now, after the inevitable publication of some of these protests, and the printing of Mr. Bernard Shaw's brilliant and provocative letter on the subject, there is still an affectation of ignorance that such a journal as the *Freethinker* exists, or that there is a National Secular Society, one of whose practical objects is the extension of the moral law to animals. Miss Cobbe's letter of explanation and defence in the new number of the *Abolitionist* carries this sort of ignorance almost to the length of imbecility; for she does not appear to have heard of such great Atheists as Shelley, Bentham, and Schopenhauer (not to mention others), whose protests against deliberate cruelty to animals, even in the name of vivisection, preceded hers for the simple chronological reason that they happened to live on this planet before her. Or does she wilfully close her eyes to such names in the list of Humanitarians only to satisfy herself, and more especially her readers, that rather more orthodox persons were the *first* in this particular field of reform?

Miss Cobbe's letter is, for the most part, a recital of the names of eminent "believers" from whom, during forty years, she received assistance in her crusade against Vivisection. No man or woman from the Atheist camp, she says, came forward to help her. But supposing this to be true up to the hilt, what does it prove? Miss Cobbe's society is really not the only one on the globe, or even in England; and, after all, England itself is only one country out of many in the civilised world. Moreover, Atheists have been such a tabooed and hated class of people that they often shrank from offering open service to causes which they had very much at heart. And, even if this were not so, are those likely to receive the co-operation of Atheists who are always libelling, slandering, or insulting them? Surely a lady who writes of Atheism as Miss Cobbe does could hardly expect Atheists to swarm around her for any purpose whatsoever. There are times and seasons when

the noblest causes cannot be served in concert by devotees of incompatible tempers. And it must be admitted that the incompatibility—where Atheists and "believers" are concerned—is rarely the fault of the Atheists. We suspect that Miss Cobbe is only willing to co-operate with Atheists on certain terms, and those terms are absolutely her own. For even now, after being compelled to recognise that there are "many English Atheists who loathe Vivisection," her frenzy of regret or exuberance of expectation takes the form of asking them to "prove their sympathy with our labors by giving their names and subscriptions to the British Union." *Our* labors, forsooth! And we daresay the lady means "*our* cause." But there are others. And an Atheist might help them, or support the Humanitarian League, if he objects to a Society with only one platform; in fact, he may loathe Vivisection, and show it, without rushing into the late extended arms of Miss Frances Power Cobbe.

There is another point of Miss Cobbe's letter which should be noticed. She declares that she did *not* intend her inflammatory letter to the *Daily News* to "identify the Atheistic creed with the support of Vivisection." We are prepared to accept the truth of this declaration; only in that case we are bound to say that she expressed herself very clumsily; for the statement she made was practically this, that the only person who could logically be a Vivisectionist was an Atheist.

Another point that should be noticed is Miss Cobbe's statement that "an enquiry into the theological views of scores of merciless vivisectioners in Germany, France, and Italy would show that 99 out of 100 of them are Atheists." Miss Cobbe may believe this, but her belief is not exactly equivalent to a demonstration. It is not even evidence. And why go so far afield? Why not conduct these "enquiries" a little nearer home? Are the merciless vivisectioners in England all Atheists, or Atheists to the extent of ninety per cent? Is Mr. Bayliss, the vivisectioner who prosecuted Mr. Stephen Coleridge for libel, an Atheist? Were the witnesses he brought into Court to support him Atheists? Judging by Miss Cobbe's own criterion they are certainly nothing of the sort, for they have not joined any Atheistic Society and paid their subscriptions.

A final point that should be noticed is this. Miss Cobbe pretends that the fact of English Atheists loathing vivisection is a very recent one. There were no such Atheists thirty years ago—simply because she did not come across them. But what she does not see, or choose to see, is not therefore to be wiped at once out of the category of existence. We have already noted that Shelley and Bentham were Atheists. We have yet to learn that Charles Bradlaugh was a friend of Vivisection. Colonel Ingersoll, who although not an Englishman, belonged to the English-speaking world, published the most eloquent denunciations of Vivisection as far back as 1880. But why prolong the tale? Miss Cobbe made a bad mistake, and she makes the worse mistake of withdrawing from it ungracefully. She calls herself a "heretic," but it is not in her temper, even if it be in her philosophy, to waste justice on those who are bigger "heretics" than herself.

G. W. FOOTE.

Herbert Spencer: The Man and His Work.

IV.

First Principles, as we have seen, consists in a statement of those general truths that are summarised in the Law of Evolution. The remainder of the Synthetic Philosophy is an application of the Law of Evolution to Biology, Psychology, Sociology, and Ethics—although Spencer has strangely overlooked the fact that ethics is, properly, a department of Sociology. It is obviously impossible in these columns to give a detailed outline of the special treatises on these subjects; one must be content with the barest of notices, with a little extra emphasis on one or two special features.

In reading both the *Biology* and the *Psychology*, one fact that ought not to be lost sight of is their historical position. Both works were written when the doctrine of Evolution was still being hotly contested, and before many of the discoveries and experiments with which present-day students of both sciences are now familiar. By bearing this fact in mind, one can better appreciate the intellectual power of the writer and the rich suggestiveness of the works. This last aspect of both works has, I believe, been better appreciated by Continental than by English workers. But beyond noting Spencer's insistence that all living things conform to the general laws of the redistribution of matter and motion, and that the classification of organic and inorganic are "subjective conceptions," and have no absolute demarcation in nature corresponding to them, we must content ourselves with noting two things.

The first is Spencer's treatment of the hypothesis of Special Creation. No prominent thinker ever made a more uncompromising and sweeping attack upon this pseudo-scientific theory than did Spencer. And his attack is the more remarkable because its appearance in the *Principles of Biology* was not the first. It originally formed part of an article in the *Westminster Review*, about 1855, some four years before the publication of the *Origin of Species*. In dealing with special creation Spencer does not leave the smallest foothold for its supporters. He points out that probability is against it being true; first, because it is a primitive belief, and primitive man, who was wrong on so many other subjects, was hardly likely to be right on this. Second, because the whole tendency of human development is to banish intelligence as a cosmic force, and to substitute the laws of matter and motion. Further, it is not even a thinkable proposition. No one can realise in thought what creation means. It is an illegitimate conception mistaken for a legitimate one only because it is seldom tested. There is no evidence for it. No one ever saw, and no one ever heard, of an act of creation taking place. We do not believe creation to be true of individuals; our knowledge on this head forbids it. And the assumption is that, were our knowledge of the genesis of species as complete as is our knowledge of the genesis of individuals, our conclusions would be the same in both cases. And, finally, there is the existence of diseases and parasites, which cannot be made to square with the Special Creation hypothesis.

It is therefore dismissed as worthless. Worthless by its intrinsic incoherence, by its derivation, by being without evidence, by failing to supply an intellectual need or a moral want. It counts for nothing in opposition to any other hypothesis. The supreme contempt of the closing passages is delicious.

The rapid, and now complete, conquest of the doctrine of Evolution gives Spencer's attack an almost exclusively historic significance. His discussion, however, of the laws of multiplication, which form the closing chapters of the *Principles of Biology*, is an able and interesting contribution to a supremely important subject. The law of population, as laid down by Malthus, pointed to one of two conclusions. Either the continuous and indefinite increase of

population would be kept down in the future, as in the past, by wars, disease, etc., or there must be some conscious effort to keep it from growing unduly large. It was, of course, impossible for Malthus, dealing with the problem when he did, to deal with it from the point of view of advanced biology; but there is no question that, when so dealt with, it does assume a different complexion.

A careful investigation of the process of multiplication in all its forms, brings Spencer to the conclusion that while the Survival of the Fittest brings about a higher degree of development, or individuation, Genesis, as is best seen in the lower forms of life, is a process of disintegration. The two vary in an inverse ratio. In the animal and plant-world at large, the lower the development, the greater the power of reproduction, and even with the individual, as Spencer notes, it is a general physiological truth that while the building up of the individual is going on rapidly, the reproductive organs remain inactive; the commencement of reproduction indicating a decline in growth. From an *a priori* point of view exactly the same conclusion may be reached. Every species, like every individual, aims at maintaining itself, and Natural Selection will obviously work by preserving that species the members of which are able to perpetuate themselves with the least expenditure of their energy as individuals. In other words, there will be a constant tendency to preserve a balance between the conservation of individual fitness, and the perpetuation of the species. And, consequently, the higher the stage of evolution with which we are dealing, the more perfect the individual, and the smaller the rate of multiplication.

The whole matter is thus summarised by Spencer:—

"The excess of fertility has itself rendered the process of civilisation inevitable; and the process of civilisation must inevitably diminish fertility, and at last destroy its excess. From the beginning pressure of population has been the proximate cause of progress. It produced the original diffusion of the race. It compelled men to abandon predatory habits and take to agriculture. It led to the clearing of the earth's surface. It forced men into the social state, made social organisation inevitable; and has developed the social sentiments.....And after having caused, as it ultimately must, the due peopling of the globe, and the raising of all its habitable parts into the highest state of culture—after having brought all the processes for the satisfaction of human wants to perfection—after having, at the same time, developed the intellect into complete fitness for social work—after having done all this, the pressure of population, as it gradually finishes its work, must gradually bring itself to an end."

There can be no question as to the importance of this contribution to the question of the multiplication of the species, although it does not by any means annihilate the problem as some sociologists have thought, and as Spencer himself seemed to think. Granting that his statement of the case is correct, that individuation and genesis are antagonistic processes, and that one will diminish as the other increases, the question of how far the process can be *consciously* controlled still remains. Natural Selection may bring about the cure of this along with other evils, but human forethought may also, as in other cases, hasten the slow natural process, or even devise some better and more expeditious plan.

On the Continent, rather more so than in England, the *Principles of Psychology* has met with the greatest admiration from competent critics. And the work merits it. The most casual reader must be struck with the great power of analysis displayed, and the striking simplicity and effectiveness of the illustrations selected. And one may also note in passing that it is the teachings of the *Principles of Psychology* that supply the corrective to many of Spencer's conclusions on practical sociology, that will have to be noticed later.

And it must again be remembered that we are writing of a work written, in part at least, just about fifty years ago. A time when mind in man was still taught as something distinct from mind in animals, and instinct and reason as two things distinct in kind. A time, too, when people often began, and ended, their study of mind by examining it under its most complex, instead of under its simplest conditions.

The evolutionary psychology changes all this. Spencer shows to demonstration that between the highest display of intelligence and the lowest there is no break, but a continuous evolution. More, given the simple nervous shock, which Spencer distinguishes as the raw material of mind, and we are able to follow step by step the development of intelligence up to its very highest forms. And again comes the warning that, just as the division between the organic and the inorganic is an artificial and not an actual line of demarcation, so between mental and bodily life there is no division save such as we create for our own convenience.

Without going into a further exposition of *The Principles of Psychology*, it will be interesting to note the application of the evolutionary psychology to two questions. The first is the long-standing quarrel between the experientialists and the intuitionists—the former asserting that all our knowledge is derived from experience, the latter that we possess ideas that are innate and independent of experience. So long as psychology consisted in a classification, or even an analysis of developed mental forms, the quarrel bid fair to be unending. What was needed to conclude the dispute, and merge both disputants in a deeper synthesis, was the conception of growth, of development. This came with the doctrine of evolution. Those pre-established mental relations and qualities with which each one starts life are transcendent to the experience of the individual, but not to that of the race. Behind each individual stretches a long racial history. We are all, as Oliver Wendell Holmes said, antiquities. Our mental and physical evolution began generations ago; and the life of any single individual represents, from one point of view, an epitome of that evolution. Both the experientialist and the intuitionist had therefore been taking a partial view of the truth, and both were reconciled in the wider synthesis of a more complete knowledge.

The second point is that of the test of truth. The answer given by Spencer to the question, What is the test of truth? is striking and conclusive, and again noticeable as having made its first appearance in the *Westminster Review* for 1853. This answer, in a sentence, is the *inconceivability of a negative*. One or two simple illustrations will help to make this clear. What is the ultimate ground of our belief that 2 plus 2 equals 4, that two straight lines cannot enclose a space, or that one object cannot be in two places at once? If the answers given to this question are carefully analysed, they will be found to amount to the simple one of, We cannot think of any other result than those indicated above. We believe that twice 2 equal 4, or that two straight lines cannot enclose a space, for the simple reason that we *must* believe it. We cannot think of any other result as probable or possible. It is the same with other fundamental truths, such as the persistence of force. We are bound to think of force as persisting, because when we try to realise the terms in consciousness we simply cannot think of force being destroyed.

Finally, this is again implied in the general doctrine of evolution. For, from another point of view, what the inconceivability of the negative means is this. The mind has all along been developed in correspondence with external phenomena. All our knowledge has been derived from experience, and all our thinking is in terms of experience. And, therefore, to say that we cannot conceive the opposite of a proposition is to say that nothing

in experience, individual or racial, gives the slightest warranty for such a statement.

Thus, once more, the deeper synthesis of evolution unites older conflicting views, while shedding new light upon present problems.

C. COHEN.

(To be continued.)

Christianity and Buddhism.

THERE is no longer the shadow of a doubt but that all the great religions of the world are most vitally connected and possess many attributes in common. Nor is any Christian teacher of to-day bold enough to assert, as many did fifty years ago, that Christianity alone is wholly true and noble, while all the other religions are superstitious and false. But the striking similarities that exist between most religions are suggestive, not merely of a common origin, but of the further fact that they have been, on a large scale, lenders to and borrowers from one another. As to the truth of this, there is scarcely any diversity of opinion among scholars. A great many Christians, however, have a deeply-rooted objection to the assertion that their religion has ever been a borrower, although they are inclined to boast of the amount of lending it has done. In the *Freethinker* for January 10 Mr. W. H. Howard Nash, in his criticism on my article entitled "Christmas," which had appeared two weeks previously, seemed to champion that objection, at least in so far as it relates to Christianity and Buddhism, and to claim that most of the great Oriental scholars are on his side. His confident reference to so many competent experts might lead the reader to conclude that it is Buddhism which has done practically all the borrowing. He evidently entertains a very poor opinion of Mr. Arthur Lillie's *Buddha and Buddhism*, as compared with the works of Max Müller, Sir Monier Williams, Rhys Davids, Oldenburg, and others; but I think that, on a closer examination of its merits, he will find that Mr. Lillie's book, though written in a simple, popular style is, on the whole, a fairly accurate production. Of course, Mr. Lillie does not write as a partisan of Christianity, as Max Müller, for example was in constant danger of doing, according to his own admission in letters to C. A. Elfein, which the latter printed at the close of his booklet, *Buddha, Krishna, and Christ*. To the honor of the late Oxford professor, it is a joy to state that, in spite of that temptation, he was honest enough to oppose the theory that Buddhism is indebted to Christianity for many of its doctrines.

Let me now take up the various points aired by Mr. Howard Nash in his interesting letter.

He informs us that so many Oriental authorities deny the numerical advantage which I claimed for Buddhism. But according to what standard is this point to be determined? What statistics are we to regard as reliable? Max Müller informs us (*Chips from a German Workshop*, i., p. 214) that the number of Buddhists is now probably about 450,000,000. What is the present number of Christians? I will take the estimate of the late Bishop Lightfoot, whose ripe scholarship and sound judgment no one would dream of denying. In the *Historical Essays* (pp. 79, 80), published, I think, after his death, he discusses the subject very calmly, and comes to the conclusion that the proportion of Christians to the population of the world, at the present time, is one in five; which means, supposing the world population to be 1,500,000,000, that the number of Christians is 300,000,000, according to which calculation Buddhism has a majority of 150,000,000, and not of 75,000,000 as I stated in my article entitled "Christmas." It is evident that Mr. Nash considers Professor Rhys Davids as a great authority on Buddhism, but is he aware that Dr. Davids puts the number of Buddhists much higher than Max Müller did? These are his words: "It is indeed a most striking

fact that the living Buddhists far outnumber the followers of the Roman Church, the Greek Church, and all other churches put together" (*Buddhism*, p. 3). According to statistical tables supplied in the same volume, the total number of Buddhists is 500,000,000, and the total number of Christians only 427,000,000. Thus Dr. Rhys Davids, "than whom no man knows more of Buddhism," is of the opinion that the Buddhists outnumber the Christians by seventy-three millions. Even accepting the Bishop of Ripon's estimate of the proportion of Christians to the world population (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. xxvii., p. 54), which is undoubtedly too high, at least as much too high as that of Dr. Lightfoot was too low, Christianity enjoys no numerical advantage over Buddhism.

Mr. Nash asks, "In what Buddhist Scriptures, anterior to the rise of Christianity, is the supernatural or virgin birth of Buddha to be found?" In my answer I again follow Dr. Davids. "Outside the Buddhist Church the ideas and beliefs of Brahmanical Hindus were being modified by Buddhism, while inside the Church Buddhism itself was being profoundly altered both by the reaction which must immediately have set in against the high standard of Gautama's morality, and by the growth of the legends which sprang up rapidly regarding his personal history. These latter changes are sufficiently evident from the books of the Pitakas themselves" (*Buddhism*, p. 179). Now, the three *Pitakas*, as the canonical books of the Indian Buddhists are called, were composed, probably, between 500 and 250 B.C., and reduced into writing about 88 or 90 B.C. These books formed the Orthodox Canon which was settled at the Council of Patna about the year 250 B.C. Dr. Davids says: "As no works would have been received into the canon which were not then believed to be very old, the *Pitakas* may be approximately placed in the fourth century B.C., and parts of them reach back very nearly, if not quite, to the time of Gautama himself. This canon, of which about seven-eighths are now edited in Pali, must always remain our most reliable authority" (*Buddhism*, pp. 10, 11). On this point M. Senart, another great Orientalist, is in substantial agreement with Dr. Davids. In another Buddhist scripture, known as the *Lalita Vistara*, which Dr. Davids places in the century before Christ, we find this distinct reference to the virginity of Buddha's mother: "By the consent of the king, the queen was permitted to lead the life of a virgin for thirty-two months." We know that the whole account of Gautama's birth is wholly mythical, having no foundation of fact on which to rest; but my contention is that the Buddhist myths and legends antedate those of the Four Gospels. Mary was about the last in a long succession of virgin-mothers, as Jesus was about the last in a long succession of Savior-Gods supernaturally born into humanity. Christians are agreed in pronouncing the virgin birth of Buddha, Dionysus, Demeter, and Horus purely mythical; but we would like to know on what ground they treat the virgin birth of Jesus as an exception. What proof is there of the genuine historicity of the latter that would not apply with as much or as little cogency to all the others? It is here that the Christian Evidences so utterly break down. And yet a clergyman in the Established Church, if he even doubts the virgin birth of Jesus, is forced to send to the Bishop the resignation of his living; and the Bishop subsequently forbids him to preach within the bounds of his diocese. And the Bishop does this while himself, not merely doubting, but positively denying the virgin birth of Buddha.

Mr. Nash wants to know through what historical channels such Buddhist myths passed into Christianity, and there is no difficulty in granting him his wish. He is doubtless aware that at the Council of Patna, held about the year 250 B.C., it was resolved to send innumerable missionaries into the different countries of the world. Among the countries visited by the missionaries was Yonaloka or Bactria, and everybody knows that at Bactria they would get into close touch with Western civilisation and the Greek

Religion. Among the doctrines taught would doubtless be the Legend of Buddha; and being men of vivid imagination the missionaries would dilate on the miraculous birth of their Master, and paint it in the most dazzling colors. Writing in the year 1888 M. Emile Burnouf, one of the most renowned of the French Oriental scholars, said: "In the last century these analogies between Christianity and Buddhism were set down to the Nestorians, but since then the science of Oriental chronology came into being, and proved that Buddha is many years anterior to Nestorius and Jesus. Thus the Nestorian theory had to be given up. But a thing may be posterior to another without proving derivation. So the problem remained unsolved until recently, when the pathway that Buddhism followed was traced step by step to Jerusalem." Jerusalem was, so to speak, only a step from Bactria, commerce and war having already opened a highway between the two countries. Bactria was the meeting-place of the East and the West, and whatever got established there became, of necessity, more or less the common property of the world. Of course, it is highly probable that the missionaries themselves may have carried the new religion into Persia, Egypt, Babylon, and Palestine, deeply leavening those great countries with Buddhist doctrines and fables. Were not the Essenes of the Jordan Valley a sect very akin to the Buddhist, and is it not clear that the Jesus of the Gospels was an adherent of that sect? Was not that connection the secret of his being baptised by John, who was the high priest of the Essenes? In that case, there is no difficulty whatever in accounting for the presence of so many Buddhist elements in primitive Christianity.

To discover the parallels between Buddhism and Christianity all one has to do is to compare the teachings of Jesus in the Four Gospels with the rock-Inscriptions of King Asoka and many of the sayings of the Buddha recorded in the three *Pitakas*. If the Sermon on the Mount were to drop out of the Gospels you could almost replace it word for word from the discourses of Gautama. The parallels are innumerable, and are to be found in Buddhist books of prior origin to any in the New Testament, which is a fact that cannot be explained away. Ethically the two religions are practically synonymous terms, as ethically the difference between Christianity and Judaism is but slight.

I now pass on to the question as to whether Buddha and Jesus are historical characters. The first point to be determined is what the names Buddha and Jesus really connote. I emphatically deny the historical reality of the Buddha of the unbelievable legends, and with the same unhesitating firmness I am bound to deny the historical reality of the Jesus of the Four Gospels. Whether or not a man called Gautama and another named Jesus ever lived is an entirely different question. Apart from the Four Gospels, which such great Christian scholars as Professor Schmiedel and Dr. Abbot pronounce almost wholly mythical, it would be extremely difficult, if not absolutely impossible, to prove that a man called Jesus flourished at the time set down for him; and the same difficulty would meet us, under similar limitations, in the case of Gautama. In my article entitled "Christmas" I did not deny the historical character of either Buddha or Jesus, but simply maintained that they both belong to the same category of equal divinity or of equal humanity. Christians maintain that Buddha was only a man; and my point was that neither could Jesus, "if he ever lived, which many scholars doubt," have been anything more than a man. To me this is a thoroughly sound and incontrovertible argument, which did its full part in making me a non-Christian.

I have said enough to define my own position in regard to the subjects under consideration. I shall devote a future article to a discussion of the arguments of the "many scholars" who doubt, if they do not deny, that Jesus ever lived. Meantime I thank Mr. Nash for his questions, and assure him that I have not answered them without due respect

to the difficulties and uncertainties involved. The criticism of religious origins is only in its infancy; but it is my honest conviction that it is being conducted on right lines, and is slowly arriving at the true conclusions, which will be final.

JOHN LLOYD.

JESUS.

AT the Central Hall, Manchester, a series of addresses have been delivered on the question, "Is Christianity True?" Evidently these addresses have been prompted by the formidable attack on Christianity in the *Clarion*. On December 13, 1903, the address was delivered by Mr. J. Lewis Paton, High Master of the Manchester Grammar School. In his address, with much more to the same effect, Mr. Paton spoke as follows—"He only knew one life in history, which he could commend to them, or which they could commend to their children as a perfect ensample of a righteous and godly life—he only knew one master of the art of right living. There was no gulf in that life between public profession and private practice." Mr. Paton did not tell the name of the master, but we know he meant Jesus, and he asserted, that everybody admitted the perfection of his character, even those who rejected him, such as John Stuart Mill. I never could understand how Mill, Renan, and others, gave such a certificate of character to Jesus, a certificate that has been used by the churches to bolster up superstition. It could not have been given in ignorance, and I am loth to think it was done as a sop to mollify the ire of theologians. The only other explanation is, that it was the effect of heredity, a remnant of old belief uneradicated. One thing is certain, that their testimony has been a godsend to theologians. But Mill, Renan and a few others, are not everybody. There have been, and there are now great and learned men who consider the character anything but perfect. There are some learned men who assert he is not an historical person, but a myth. An eminent man thinks that the life of Jesus is a fiction character, written to fulfil certain supposed prophecies about the expected Messiah. If Mr. Paton ever studied the Life of Jesus critically, as he would any scientific subject, he would have known these things; and, if he did know, it is difficult to understand how he could speak as he did about Jesus.

Was Jesus a perfect man, and a perfect ensample to all men in all relations and conditions? To get a correct answer to the inquiry, we must study the Gospels accepted by the churches, as a true biography of his life—namely, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. These are not the only Gospels existing. There were, at one time, about forty or forty-four Gospels in use, many of them remaining to-day, and called Apocryphal Gospels. Apparently, each of them had as much authority as the four selected from them.

It must be remembered, although a passage indicates that Jesus could write, no one claims that he wrote anything, let alone a history of his life. His life was not written for a generation or more after his death. No one that saw him or heard him, as far as we know, ever wrote anything about him, or anything he did or said. The Canonical Gospels only claim to be according to the names they bear, and not by them. As a matter of fact, it is not known who wrote them, when or where they were written.

It is, however, certain that they were written from traditional memory, and this explains how every one differs from the other. To suppose it possible to write the life and report the speeches of a public man generations after he was dead, and that at second-hand, is absurd. The thing is impossible; and even the churches would scout the idea of such a thing in the case of any ordinary man. It is accepted about Jesus because he has been made a God by the Christian Church, and for no other reason.

Jesus, as a God, I will not deal with, except to say

that he himself never claimed that he was God; and further that, if he were God, he could not be an ensample to men. A perfect man may be a model to man, but to make an Infinite Almighty God a pattern to man is absurd. We have to do with Jesus as a man, and as depicted to us in the Four Gospels.

I must also leave out the question of whether Jesus was an historical person or a myth, merely remarking that most of his life strongly resembles and suggests a myth, and that there is a great similarity between his life and the lives of other saviors, especially Christna and Buddha, which is very suggestive. I must assume that Jesus did exist as a man, and that his biography is contained in the Four Gospels, though I must admit, in passing, that the Jesus of John is a totally different man to the Jesus of Matthew, Mark, and Luke. But, as the churches accept both as one, I must do the same, in order to find out whether he was, in reality, the perfect ensample claimed for him.

Of the childhood, boyhood, and manhood of Jesus, there is very little account in the Four Gospels. One incident is told of him by Luke, and that does not reflect any credit upon him. When twelve years old, he went to Jerusalem with his parents. When the time came to return home, Jesus tarried behind, and his parents went a day's journey before they found he was not in the company. They had to return to Jerusalem to look for him. After three days they found him in the Temple amongst the doctors, and his mother said unto him, "Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us? And he said unto them, How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my father's business?" Is that a respectful or a loving answer to a sorrowful mother? Not a word of regret. Would any parent like a boy of theirs to act in the same way, and receive a similar answer? If not, how can Jesus, as a boy, be an ensample to boys or girls at the present time? In fact, the life of Jesus only covers about three years. Up to thirty years of age his life is a blank. We do not know what kind of a child he was, nor how he acted with other children. If he was at school, we do not know what kind of a scholar he was, what books he read, and subjects he loved to study. When learning to be a carpenter we know nothing of his character as an apprentice, nor of his skill as a workman. We know nothing about his general behavior, whether sociable, temperate, regular, industrious, and lovable, or not. How did he spend his time, his leisure time, his holidays and Sundays? No one knows. Who were his companions, males or females, or both? No one knows. Had he ever a sweetheart? No one knows. What was his personal appearance? Was he cleanly and tidy in person and garments? No one knows.

If anyone more than another need an ensample, it is the child, the boy and girl, the young man and young woman, and as nothing is known of Jesus till he was thirty years of age, I cannot see how he can be a model for any of them. He was not a husband, nor a father, and how could he be an ensample to them? Merchants, shopkeepers, masters, officials, landlords, rulers, and many others are very numerous in the bulk, and what is there in the life of Jesus to be a pattern for any of them, as he had no experience in any one of the callings. And as nothing is known of him as a worker and a man, from birth to thirty, workers and servants, who are the most numerous in all countries, can find nothing in him to be a pattern and guide to them as workers.

There is another aspect of the question that seems to be overlooked by all. More than half of the human race are females, and how can a man, however perfect, be a model in all things to them? In many things a man may be a pattern for a woman, and a woman to a man, but in all things a man can be a model to man only, and only a woman can be a perfect ensample to a woman. The Bible is a book by males for males, and the importance and rights of women are mostly overlooked.

I have already referred to the conduct of Jesus to his mother when a child twelve years of age, and his

conduct was no better when he became a public man. At a wedding feast in Cana, when his mother told him that the wine was getting done, he answered her with the most insulting question that any fiend could address to his mother, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" Is there a mother living who would like to be addressed in that manner in public company by a son? I trow not. At the same feast he is said to have turned water into wine, to supply the guests who were already well drunk, which is a very questionable act from a moral point of view, and it ceases to be a wonder that he was accused of being a wine bibber. There is nothing in all this worthy to be imitated by any sane man. His rudeness to his mother and his relations is further illustrated by another incident: His mother and brethren standing outside a great crowd called him, but he took no notice of them. Then the multitude, more considerate than he, told him his mother and brethren were there seeking him, and he answered them, "Who is my mother or my brethren? And looking on the crowd round about him, he said, Behold my mother and my brethren." In this treatment of a worthy mother and brethren, there is nothing to be admired or worthy to be imitated. His mother and brethren were evidently anxious about him and under the impression that he was insane. In the same chapter we read: "And when his friends heard of it they went out to lay hand on him, for they said, He is beside himself."

R. J. DERFEL.

(To be concluded.)

Acid Drops.

Mr. George Bernard Shaw, according to the organ of the Nonconformist Conscience, has been tempted to stand as a Progressive candidate for the London County Council; and, in addressing his inviters, is reported to have said that he believed the Education Act to be one of the finest measures ever passed. This was bad enough—for the Nonconformist Conscience. But there was something worse behind it. "As to the religious question," Mr. Shaw is stated to have declared, "I would say to the children, There are various religions. There is the Buddhist religion, and the Mohammedan religion, and the Confucian religion, and the Christian religion, whatever that may be. Now take your choice." A well-known Free Church minister was horrified at this. No doubt! It is horrible enough to any professional Christian. Giving children the facts, and allowing them a choice, is little short of blasphemy. It spoils the clerical game altogether.

We are pleased to see that the Fabian Society is without sympathy for this colossal humbug of "Passive Resistance." An article in the *Fabian News*, signed with the initials of the secretary, denounces the movement as a "reactionary and intolerant agitation," which "no one with the smallest sympathy with the aims and aspirations of labor.....could imagine.....had any concern for the workers, or was politically anything else than middle-class party Liberalism." We commend these words to those Socialists who have allowed themselves to be humbugged by the meaningless formulas of "tricky" political theologians like Dr. Clifford and Company.

Amongst the Bradford Passive Resisters is Mr. H. J. Priestman, J.P., Chairman of the Bradford Liberal party. This gentleman got up from the bench at the Bradford City Court the other day and commenced an harangue against "the law" in connection with the Education Act. He was soon reduced to order by the Stipendiary, but the Passive Resisters applauded him to the very echo. It did not occur to them or their orator that they were acting most indecently. There is a time and a place for everything; and certainly the magistrates' bench is not the place for denouncing a recent law passed by a great majority of the people's representatives. It may be a bad law, of course; that is a frailty to which all laws are liable. But the agitation against it should be carried on through the public platform and the public press, and finally through a Bill in the House of Commons. When magistrates get up as magistrates, and denounce laws that they have voted for or against as politicians, they are simply doing their best to bring about a state of anarchy. Which, by the way, is what Christians have always tried to do when they could not get their own way.

A number of Nonconformist "martyrs" at Bradford were done brown by their balances of rates having been paid by an "Anti-Martyrdom Association." What a shame! Churchmen subscribing to spoil a Nonconformist holiday! England is really as bad as Russia, if a man can't be a martyr when he wants to. In the name of freedom, where are we?

There is no essential connection with religion and politics. Oh dear no. But a Nonconformist soon finds out that there is something wrong if he dares to differ politically from the *Daily News*. The Rev. R. J. Campbell, of the City Temple, has actually declared his opinion that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain is not the same person as the Devil, and the *Daily News* lectures him severely in consequence. The reverend gentleman must be taught that the editor of that paper does all the political thinking that is necessary for any faithful Nonconformist.

According to the editor of the "Religious World" column in the *Daily News*, there is at least one firm believer in the efficacy of prayer in East London. The Rev. J. Watts Ditchfield, vicar of St. James the Less, Bethnal Green, has a way of telling the Lord when he wants a thing very badly, and it is sure to come along. A few years ago he had a day of special prayer, in order to raise the wind for a block of buildings for school and mission purposes, and within seventy-two hours the whole of the cost, amounting to £17,000, was contributed by an anonymous donor. (By the way, the donor in these stories is always anonymous.) Recently money was wanted for another purpose. Of course there was a fresh day of prayer, and the Lord was asked that "a door might be opened." Within a week a letter arrived "written on common notepaper" (fancy!) asking for information. The result was that the vicar went to see this "open door"—if we may so express it—and came back to London with the cost of a new institute in his pocket.

How charming are these illustrations of the great truth that faith can do all things, and that the Lord always answers the prayers of his servants! But how much more charming it would be if there were a little more logical consistency and honest sincerity in these matters. Here is a reverend gentleman who "has an old-fashioned belief in prayer." Here is a religious newspaper that celebrates the fact. And now let us look at another fact. In the very London where this reverend gentleman lives, and where this religious newspaper is published, men are sent to gaol like common felons for asking the Lord to cure their sick children, and leaving the matter entirely in his hands. What the parson half does, and is admired for half doing, the poor Peculiar People do wholly, and in consequence are treated as criminals. What in a parson is a virtue, in a non-professional Christian is a felony. And the cream of the joke is that neither the man of God nor the Christian newspaper says a word in defence of the poor Peculiar People, when Christian magistrates insult them, and Christian juries find them guilty, and Christian judges send them to prison.

The Corporation of the City of London has to pay £3,500 for a bit of ground to widen the public way in front of No. 33 Old Jewry. The ground belonged to St. Olave Church, and the price will presumably go to swell the income of the present incumbent and that of his successors. The Rev. Prebendary Ingram, the rector, has already a stipend of £1,408 a year, with a house rent free. Lucky man of God! Happy preacher of "blessed be ye poor"!

Blessed be ye poor! Yea, verily; for they will rest from their labors, and they have no money to follow them. But how about those who preach the kingdom of heaven to the poor, and pile up cash all the time for themselves? Amongst the "Latest Wills" in the *Daily Mail*—which wouldn't lie on this matter—we note within a few days of each other the following:—Rev. J. B. Woolscombe £15,250, Rev. C. N. Mann £9,756, Rev. J. Fuller £35,702, Rev. F. W. Poland £14,389, Rev. E. Bittleston £25,074, Rev. P. T. Swanu £19,349. That's how the men of God go off to glory. Fancy them, with such loads on their backs, trying to get through the eye of that needle! Such a wriggling match beats anything ever witnessed at annual sports on village greens.

The Central Association for Stopping the Sale of Intoxicating Liquor on Sunday (what a name!) sent "a large and influential deputation" to the Lord Mayor of London with a memorial, asking him to allow their next annual meeting to be held at the Mansion House. According to this memorial the Association was "unsectarian and non-political." But a glance at such names as those of the Bishops of London, Chichester, and St. Albans, and the Presidents of the Wesleyan Conference, Congregational

Union, and Baptist Union, will show the real value of this assertion. The object of these clerical gentlemen is sectarian. They want to make Sunday a clear day for their own profession. Otherwise they would call for the closing of public-houses on Saint Monday.

Dr. Henry, a Chicago temperance evangelist, preached at Christ Church, Westminster, last Sunday morning, by request of that eminent Free Churchman and Passive Resister, the Rev. F. B. Meyer. In the course of his sermon, as reported in Monday morning's *Daily News*, he delivered himself as follows. "Drink," he said, "was the kingdom of wrong relations, social disorder, squalor, poverty, insanity, moral anarchy, spiritual bewilderment, irreligion, infidelity." There you have the shameless impudence of the Christian preacher. At the end of the list of evils flowing from drink—and at the worst end, at the very top of the ascending climax—he places "infidelity." Thus the worst characters in the world are "infidels," and they are all *drunkards!* Yet the man who utters this infamous lie probably thinks himself a Christian gentleman—and we are not quite sure that he is not.

Now that this Dr. Henry has invited some plain-speaking he may as well have it. We beg to tell him, therefore, that no one but a mountebank would ever think of preaching teetotalism in the name of Jesus Christ. The Prophet of Nazareth was not a teetotaller himself, and did not keep company with teetotallers. He came eating and drinking, and was called a friend of wine-bibbers—amongst other sinners. He did not drink "Scotch" or "Irish" because it was not known at that time and in that part of the world, but he drank what was going and made the best of the tittle of his own country. Even at the very last meal he ever took with his twelve disciples, he drank wine, and gave it to them to drink. And the very first miracle he ever performed, according to the fourth Gospel, was turning a vast quantity of probably bad water into as much very good wine; wine, indeed, which won the praise of the apparently experienced toper who sat at the head of the table.

We wonder if Dr. Henry is a teetotaller in the same sense that Jesus Christ was a teetotaller? If he is so, it would probably amuse the congregation more to see him "teetotal" than to hear him talking about it—although that may be sufficiently amusing to a well-informed cynic.

In the current issue of the *Contemporary Review* the Rev. Dr. Fairbairn has an article on Herbert Spencer. Dr. Fairbairn deplores Spencer's "poor philosophical equipment and the consequent poverty of his contribution to real philosophy, whether of knowledge or of existence." We imagine that what Dr. Fairbairn means by "real philosophy" is that species of mental skyscraping that so often does duty for sound knowledge. The real task of philosophy, as Spencer insisted, is to present us with a unified statement of our present knowledge of the universe, framed in such a manner as to permit the inclusion of fresh knowledge as it arises. To this end Spencer did more than any other thinker of the nineteenth century. Dr. Fairbairn would doubtless have been better pleased had Spencer spent his energies in discussing a number of metaphysical conundrums, such as are dear to theologians, but we imagine that future generations will regard his freedom from this species of lunacy as one of Spencer's chief virtues.

Dr. Fairbairn also laments "the comparative blindness of the Man to the profoundest questions in the history of Man, and his disinclination, to call it by no harsher word, to see the great significance of the higher religious personalities in history." Again, what is here meant by "profoundest questions," is religious questions, which are "profound" only to a theologian, and we in turn lament the blindness of Dr. Fairbairn to the fact that Spencer simply explained these questions out of existence. Spencer showed that all religious beliefs have the same fundamental origin in primitive ignorance, and also showed, by inference, that all religious beliefs are doomed to disappear with the advance of knowledge. Dr. Fairbairn's method is to take religious beliefs in their modern form, ignore their anthropological history, and then dilate upon their profundity and complexity. As to Spencer ignoring the higher religious personalities, so far as these are historical realities, Dr. Fairbairn will find them amply covered by Spencer's teaching as to the relation of the great man to his environment. But, after all, what Dr. Fairbairn's complaint amounts to is that Spencer was neither a Christian nor a theologian. With which we quite concur.

The brilliant leader writer of the *Daily News*, by the way, notes that Spencer was at bottom a Mystic. He will no doubt discover presently that he believed in the Virgin

Birth and the Resurrection. Anything in this way seems possible to the organ of the Nonconformist conscience.

Zion City, the City founded by "Old Dowie," who is about to pay a visit to this country, has over 11,000 inhabitants, and the wealth of the place is estimated at about £5,000,000. All institutions are vested in Dowie, all money and property is in his name, and all leases are from him. The coming of Jesus is expected very shortly, but the leases run for 1,100 years—in case of accident. As "Christian Science" is one of the articles of faith, all doctors and drugs are prohibited in Zion City. But there is an exception in the case of "Dental parlours." We presume the reason is that a toothache that attends strictly to business is rather too powerful for even "Christian Science" to overcome. The Americans are counted a shrewd people, but it is the happy hunting-ground for religious impostors all the same.

Dowie has sprung a new proposition on his followers about as important as his claim to the mantle of Elijah. He told the congregation in Zion last week that the reason he issued leases in Zion City for 1,100 years was because within the next 100 years Christ will return to earth and that he will reign 1,000 years. Dowie said that he will return to earth with Christ, and he believed that their return to earth would be to that very spot where to-day he addressed the Zion people. At the end of Christ's reign of 1,000 years, Dowie said, the earth will smash up, and the bad people will be destroyed in hell-fire and the good will be called to their reward. He further declared that if, after he dies, Infidels should in any way get hold of Zion lands, he will himself return to earth and order them off the sacred grounds, as the title to the land will never pass from him. The Zionites had sufficient imbecility to support this new test of their faith in the higher fakirism without expressing doubt or even wonder.—*Truthseeker* (New York).

A play entitled *The Orphans* is to be presented in Baltimore on Sunday nights, admission 15 cents. This seems unlawful, and would be so except for the fact that the piece was written by a minister, and will be played in a church. There is one law for religious, and another for secular, shows.—*Trnthseeker* (New York).

A very hypocritical scoundrel has just been sentenced at the Old Bailey to eight years' penal servitude. Walter Stiff, a modeller, of Goswell-road, was found guilty of falsifying his books, committing perjury, and inducing others to commit perjury, in order to obtain fraudulent compensation from the London County Council. One of his instruments in this game was a young woman in his employment, whom he had seduced, and who was living with him as his mistress. In passing sentence upon him, the Recorder said that he "had been guilty of the grossest and most abominable hypocrisy. He had been an elder in a Christian church, and a teacher of the Bible, all the time that he was carrying on these frauds." These words appear to have upset the dear good pious *Daily News*, which cut out from its own report of this case the Recorder's reference to the prisoner's religious reputation.

Rev. H. M. Marsh Edwards, formerly vicar of West Bridgeford, Nottingham, has been found guilty, under the Clergy Discipline Act, of immorality with a nurse girl. Defendant was ordered to pay the whole costs of the proceedings, and a report was to be submitted to the Bishop as to the sentence to be passed upon him.

George Guérin, *alias* De Neuville, charged with frightfully ill-treating an orphan boy twelve years of age at Paris, was found by the police, on searching his domicile, to be the possessor of a number of religious pictures, scapularies, chaplets, and other articles of piety.

The Torrey-Alexander Mission commenced at Birmingham on Monday. Bingley Hall has been engaged, and as all the evangelical sects are working the boom for all it is worth we dare say Bingley Hall will be filled. The Torrey-Alexander firm expect to make the Brummagem folk forget "Joe" for a bit. They will probably, too, for it is one of the tricks of their trade, convert some undiscoverable "infidel." We don't expect, though, that they will seriously affect the strength of the Birmingham N. S. S. Branch, or keep people from attending Mr. Foote's lectures in the big Town Hall on March 27.

The Sunday School Unions and Associations of the world have adopted the American suggestion that the next convention shall be held at Jerusalem. A big German Atlantic Liner has been engaged for the sea part of the trip, starting from Marseilles early in April. Hundreds of Sunday school people are paying from £40 to £150 to join this excursion.

The Convention will assemble in a large tent, capable of holding a thousand persons, on "the site which General Gordon supposed to be that of the true Calvary." What a splendid opportunity it will be for begging J. C. to settle the vexed question of *where* he was crucified. All sorts of places are fancied, but not more than one of them can be the correct place. And perhaps *that* isn't. You never can tell, you know, at this time of day. So that the only way out of the difficulty seems to be a direct appeal to J. C.

"Several clergymen and ministers will be of the party." So says the Rev. C. Bonner, secretary of the Sunday School Union, who has charge of the English arrangements. And we are not at all sceptical. Clergymen and ministers know a good thing when they see it; and serving the Lord, and having a first-rate trip at the same time, is an admirable arrangement, which the clerical mind may be trusted to appreciate.

The following letter, which appeared in the *Church Times*, for January 15, speaks for itself, and quite bears out the substance of our last week's front-page article:—

"THE LATE GEORGE GISSING.

"SIR,—My attention has been drawn to a statement in your columns that George Gissing died 'in communion with the Church of England'; and I shall be obliged if you will give to this contradiction the same publicity which you accorded, without investigation, to the calumny. I was intimate with Gissing for thirty years, and had every opportunity of knowing his attitude towards all theological speculation and teaching. He not only accepted none of the dogmas formulated in the Creeds and Articles of the Church of England, but he considered it impossible that any Church's definition of the undefinable could have any significance for any intelligent man. During the whole of our long intimacy, I never knew him to waver from that point of view. What communications may have reached you from any one of those who visited Gissing during his illness, I do not know. But I do know that, during the days in which such an astonishing 'conversion' must have taken place, he was delirious and unconscious by turns, and I presume that you do not maintain that any change in his theological standpoint can reasonably be inferred from any words which he may have been induced to speak in a condition in which, according to the law of every civilised country, he would have been incompetent even to sign a codicil to his will. The attempt to draw such a deduction must seem dishonest to every fair-minded man, and I rely upon your courtesy to publish promptly and prominently this vindication of the memory of a straightforward and consistent thinker which you have, however unintentionally, aspersed.

"MORLEY ROBERTS."

The editor of the *Church Times* says he has communicated with the writer of the notice, and is awaiting his reply. We do not quite see what reply there can be. The plain fact is that there was some pretty tall lying going on, and we hope Mr. Roberts' correction will have the good fortune to counteract it. We have our doubts, though, and shall not be at all surprised if we find it quoted by religious writers and speakers as unimpeachable history.

There were hundreds of columns of absurdity written about the death of the late Queen Victoria, but the oracle of the City Temple has produced the masterpiece in this line. This is the way he delivered himself in a recent sermon:—"Not even that great life was indispensable, and even with the passing of the Queen religious life did not go and God did not abdicate. He is with us still." Now what on earth did the man expect? Did he expect that God Almighty would give up business and the universe fall to pieces because an old lady, who happened to be Queen of England, died? For downright sycophantic stupidity this is the best we have seen for a long time. And Mr. R. J. Campbell is hailed as one of our leading religious thinkers!

Here is another specimen from the same sermon. "Take the Christ out of existence, pluck him out of my experience, and I do not know what life would be for me." We believe there is a certain amount of reason in this declaration. What *would* life be for a man of Mr. Campbell's calibre if the pulpit was not available? Certainly there would be a great difference of income, to commence with. And we really cannot think of any walk of life, other than the ministry, in which Mr. Campbell would be hailed as a genius. The more one looks at it, the more one is convinced that life would be very different for Mr. Campbell, and for many other of his clerical brethren, were it not for "the Christ."

The *Record* is raising a protest and solemn warning against the number of monks and nuns who are invading this country as the result of the action of the French Government. It declares their presence to be a grave danger to the welfare of

the country, and its warning is endorsed by other religious papers. Now, we are far from regarding the presence of these monks and nuns as desirable acquisitions to the country; but what we are concerned in pointing out is this. These monks and nuns belong to one of the oldest Churches in Christendom—the historic Church, whatever Protestants may have to say to the contrary. And yet Christian writers solemnly warn us that the encouragement of these members of a Church that comprises half the Christian population is a danger to the national health!

We are willing to endorse the dictum. Bodies of men and women vowed to celibacy are a danger; but, then, Jesus himself was a celibate, and it is surely ridiculous to hold *him* up as a type of supreme excellence, and then turn round and say that men and women who imitate him ought to be kept out of the country. Yes, it is said, but these people work by all sorts of underhand methods for the welfare of the Church, and will sacrifice that of the State to this end. Agreed; but is there any vital distinction between the priests of the Roman Church and the priests of other Churches in this particular? Have not the Churches and Chapels always been ready to judge everything from the point of view of the prosperity of their respective gospel-shops? Are they not even, at present, successfully obstructing the perfecting of our educational system in the interests of Church and Chapel? And are they not also threatening to elect representatives to governing bodies, with sole regard to whether they place the interests of this or that Church in the forefront? The moral of the position is that Christianity, carried to its logical extreme, would destroy a civilisation; partly carried out, it retards civilisation; but always and everywhere it prevents men judging one another from the standpoint of the general welfare, and substitutes that of sectarian interests.

Rev. T. L. Withrington, of Keighley, the gentleman who had to take back a foolish falsehood about Charles Bradlaugh, has now started the yarn that the French Assembly "declared that henceforth God did not exist." Being asked by Mr. H. C. Shackleton for his evidence, he gives a quotation from Alison to the effect, not that the Assembly declared this, but that Chaumette said it to the Assembly; which is a very different thing. Mr. Withrington goes on to quote a picked lot of adjectives and adverbs from Carlyle about the evils and terrors of the Revolution: but it would have been much more to the point had he dealt with what Carlyle said on this "declaration of Atheism" business. Mr. Withrington seems to be a mere smatterer. If he had really read Carlyle, to say nothing of less accessible authors, he would have known that the Convention never decreed Atheism; but that, on the contrary, Robespierre induced it to decree God and Immortality, and to arrange for a public festival in honor of the Supreme Being, at which Robespierre himself set fire to a colossal image of Atheism constructed by the painter David. Mr. Withrington will apologise again, if he has any respect for truth and manliness.

We live in an age of Education, and the Salvation Army is awakening to the fact. General Booth announced the other day that while hitherto "cadets" have received four months' training only, this is now to be extended to ten. During this ten months each "cadet" will attend 700 classes, and be taught, among other things, "sound doctrine, the truth, history—religious and secular, how to raise their fallen sisters, their fallen brethren, how to get people to the penitent form, and how to resist temptation for themselves." And yet people say there is no royal road to learning! Of course there was the usual request for more money, although this time it was only for a modest £24,000.

God is no respecter of persons, nor of buildings—not even his own. During the recent thunderstorm, God's Hill Church was struck by lightning, about six miles from Ventnor. The pinnacles of the tower were torn down, the face of the clock was torn off, the holy font was split in two, windows were smashed, and the roof was practically ruined. "He doeth all things well."

Rev. R. E. Clegg, of Christ Church, Southsea, told his congregation how to reconcile the horrible catastrophe at the Iroquois Theatre, Chicago, with the most pious belief in the Providence of Almighty God. As far as we are able to understand him, he believes that God killed the six hundred people in that theatre, or allowed them to be killed (it is the same thing), in order to draw attention to the dangerous state of such buildings, and thus save other lives in future. We should see more force in this argument if the preacher's own wife and children had perished in the flames. As it is, he seems to us to be bearing other people's troubles like a Christian.

Mr. Foote's Lecturing Engagements.

Sunday, January 24, Secular Hall, New Church-road, Camberwell-road, London, S.E., at 7.30, "How God Governs the World." Special Lecture. Admission Free.

January 31, Manchester; February 7, Glasgow; 14, Queen's Hall, London; 21, Queen's Hall, London; 28, Coventry; March 13, Liverpool; 27, Birmingham.

To Correspondents.

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

NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY.—E. M. Vance, secretary, acknowledges a donation of £5 to this Society's funds from Major John C. Harris, R.E.

F. GOODWIN.—Glad to hear you were so pleased with the Annual Dinner.

W. P. BALL.—Once more thanks for cuttings.

W. H. BARRATT.—Pleased to hear that your friend has found our *Book of God, Crimes of Christianity, and Bible Handbook* helpful in bringing him to Freethought. Thanks for your and his good wishes.

MAJOR JOHN C. HARRIS, R.E., sends us a special subscription of £5 towards the Fund we are raising for advertising the *Freethinker*. As it is for this purpose only, he wishes it kept quite distinct from the general New Year's Gift to Freethought, and to do that most effectually we make a separate acknowledgement in this place.

N. D.—Pleased to have your kind and encouraging letter. There is no need to say more until you are quite free to defy the bigotry which at present surrounds you.

W. H. HARRAT.—Monro's "Lucretius" is now published, we believe, at 4s. 6d. This includes the translation only, which we presume is what you want.

G. F. H. McCLUSKEY.—You hope that the result of our New Year's Appeal will be "more than gratifying." We should like to hope so too. A good many Freethinkers, when they are asked to give to the cause, without any personal excitement, want stirring up with a sharper goad than we can command. We cannot work upon them with the hope of heaven, or the fear of hell—or even the off chance of either. Nor can we tempt them with the prospect of social advantage. So you see we are handicapped. We note your hope that it will not be necessary to drop the *Pioneer*, and the statement that you look forward to it every month.

W. H. BELL.—Glad to hear you formed such a high opinion of Mr. Lloyd when you heard him at Liverpool. We should like to see, as you suggest, a good N. S. S. Branch at Warrington, and should be pleased to hear from any local "saints" who would co-operate with you. We are fully aware of the truth of what you say about the difficulty of getting the *Freethinker*, and we wish we had the means to bring about a very different state of affairs. After all, it is mainly a question of money. Even bigotry can be defeated with that—if you have enough of it.

YORKSHIRE FRIEND.—We have done all we wanted to do, and said all that was necessary to be said. Weak natures are always anxious for the last word. We don't care a straw about it. We have calmly waived it, and let the other man have it, in nearly every public debate we ever entered—and smiled at the other man's little anxiety. In this case, also, the gentleman may fire away as long as he pleases. We have done.

F. DOUGHTY.—You will find all the references you require in our pamphlet, *John Morley as a Freethinker*, price twopence. Mr. Morley has not made any "direct attacks" on Christianity. They are all indirect—chiefly in his books on Voltaire (Deist) and Diderot (Atheist).

J. RAILTON.—Copies of *Pioneer* for free distribution sent. Thanks for your hope of a "liberal response" to our New Year's appeal.

FRANK SMITH.—It is liberal of you to increase your donation to £5 5s. altogether. We have allotted 10s. to the N. S. S. membership subscription. The balance goes in the general New Year's Gift list.

ALERT.—You are quite in error. The London "saints" do not leave all the contributing to the provincial ones. More of the New Year subscription has been contributed by Londoners than is proportionate to the population of the metropolis in comparison with that of All England. Nor is it quite true that Londoners get the lecturers, while provincials have to whistle for them. Mr. Cohen and Mr. John Lloyd have both had vacant Sundays lately, which the provincial "saints" did not jump at. The truth is that the lecturing in London—at least during the winter—depends chiefly on special efforts by Mr. Foote. And it stands to reason that he cannot make these efforts as easily in other cities—if only on account of the distance, and the absence of agents (like Miss Vance, for instance) to carry out the details of arrangements; for it is clearly impossible for one man, however zealous and active, to do everything himself. And, to tell the plain truth, Mr. Foote has done too much in former years, and is now (though only for a time, we hope) paying the penalty.

W. TIPPER, believing that the *Freethinker* is worth a lot more than twopence, sends a penny extra for every issue in 1904, and eightpence over to make a round sum. A good idea!

J. COMERFORD.—Thanks. We shall probably have to deal with Revivalist Torrey again presently.

F. GILRUTH.—Mr. Blatchford's *God and My Neighbor* is published at 2s. 6d. You could order it from our publishing office. Thanks for the pamphlets.

R. COX hopes the Freethinkers everywhere will respond to our present appeal, and thus "make a splendid total for this most excellent object."

L. WOOD.—Thanks for the extract from the Bolton *Weekly Journal*. The local "saints" sent us no news of the death of Mr. Thomas Halstead. Some years ago he made a will in which he desired us to attend his funeral, and bequeathed a small sum to the Secular movement. He was very old and feeble, and his domestic surroundings were terribly unsympathetic to his Freethought. We do not believe, therefore, without independent testimony, that he really died "trusting in the efficacy of the Gospel."

G. TAYLOR, Burns Cottage, Cwm, near Rhuddlan, says that "F. S." is a man after his own heart, and would be very proud to see him if he were ever passing that way.

J. ROBERTS.—Better late than never; a motto we hope a lot of the late ones will remember.

W. BINDON says:—"In company with several of your other readers I should like to thank you for your powerful article 'God at Chicago.' Since reading Mill, I do not remember reading the argument from evil stated so powerfully. Could you print your article in leaflet form for free circulation?"

H. SYMES.—The Wesley passage on Witchcraft appeared in his "Journal," but you would probably have to consult the complete edition. Wesley is being well "edited" by his modern followers.

S. IMBER.—It is a "chestnut."

ALL letters arriving by first post on Tuesday morning are dealt with. Those arriving later have to stand over till next week.

M. M. DANSON MARTINEZ.—We are always particularly glad to receive the congratulations of a lady. We quote the following, with much satisfaction, from your letter:—"I most thoroughly appreciate the different articles in each week's *Freethinker*, and I hope it may be much more widely circulated. It certainly is a wonderful paper for only twopence. Many thanks for your personal good wishes."

A. J. Y.—Acknowledged as you send it.

F. J. VOISEY.—The Annual Dinner could not be reported in last week's *Freethinker*, which was made up for the press before it took place. There has been delay with the report in previous years, because the Dinner always took place until this year on Monday.

J. YOUNG.—We regret with you, and for your sake as well as the Fund's, that your subscription has to be small. But the worst subscriptions are those which are so small as to be invisible. Thanks for the cutting.

MARTIN WEATHERBURN.—Delighted to receive your good letter. The sympathy and appreciation of a man of your type compensates for all the carpings and cavils of the base and foolish.

E. G. J. and F. A.—We are pleased, all the same.

J. S. JUNIOR.—We have forwarded your request to "Chilperic," who will probably write a brief reply.

THE National Secular Society's office is at 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

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.

SPECIAL.

I AM writing nearly all my this week's copy for the *Freethinker* from my bedroom, where I have been confined with a nasty cold. I was only in bed one day (Saturday), so my friends need not fear that I have broken down as I did in January of last year, when I was unable (for the first time in sixteen years) to be present at the Annual Dinner. Unfortunately, my old enemy, insomnia, comes on whenever it sees a chance, and it is plaguing me a bit now, but nothing like it did in the early weeks of last year, or

the still worse early weeks of my *année funeste* (to use Gambetta's expression) 1902.

I could not lecture at Camberwell on Sunday evening, and have to thank Mr. Cohen for taking my place. But I believe I shall be there this evening (Jan. 24).

While I am unable to write as I intended on my New Year's appeal to Freethinkers, I trust that they will find these few words from my bedroom more eloquent and inspiring than the longest article I could pen.

G. W. FOOTE.

Sugar Plums.

Mr. Foote's place at the Camberwell Secular Hall on Sunday evening was taken by Mr. Cohen, who delivered a rattling good lecture on "Secularism." Many strangers were present, and the hall looked comfortably filled—which is a great improvement on what has been going on there lately. The improved result was partly due, of course, to the special advertising that has been done by the Secular Society, Limited, which is conducting this missionary effort in South London. No doubt a still further improvement will be witnessed as the experiment proceeds. We hope in the course of a month or two to see the hall literally crowded. The South London "saints" will please note that the admission is free; in consequence of which they ought to find it much easier to bring along some of their less heterodox friends to these meetings.

We fully believe that Mr. Foote will be able to occupy the Secular Hall platform at Camberwell this evening (Jan. 24), when his subject will be "How God Governs the World." Should anything occur to keep him away—which, we repeat we do not think likely—those who attend may reckon on hearing a competent "supply."

London Freethinkers will recollect the new course of Sunday evening lectures at Queen's Hall on February 14, 21, 28, and March 6. Mr. Foote takes the first two evenings, and Mr. John Lloyd and Mr. C. Cohen the third and fourth. It will also be remembered that there is to be *free admission* to all seats, except fifty or so in front, which will be reserved (price one shilling) for elderly Freethinkers and ladies who cannot take part in any possible crush. Of course there will be a collection taken up at each meeting, and it is expected that all the "saints" who have been used to pay for their seats will act liberally.

The Board of Directors of the Secular Society, Limited, has decided to issue a sixpenny edition of Mr. Foote's *Bible Romances*. It will be well printed, and well got-up in every other way, and will bear a portrait of Mr. Foote on the cover—after the fashion of the Twentieth Century Edition of Paine's *Age of Reason*. Mr. Foote is giving this popular reprint the benefit of some revision, with a view to the new and larger public who are likely to read the work in its fresh form; and two chapters will be included, which are not in the present two-shilling edition, on "Bible Ghosts" and "The Bible Devil."

Mr. Foote's position as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Secular Society, Limited, lays him open to the charitable suspicions and misrepresentations of very righteous persons. He therefore revises this sixpenny edition of *Bible Romances*, and sees it through the press, gratuitously. That is to say, he makes no charge as author and editor. He leaves the matter entirely to the Board, expecting nothing whatever unless there is a clear profit on the sale, and trusting absolutely to their sense of fairness if a profit should be realised—which is, of course, very doubtful in such circumstances. For the book will run to some 150 pages (or more) of the same size as the *Secular Annual*; and a production of that size would have to be printed and sold in vast numbers to do much more than cover the cost of printing, paper, and binding.

There are some well-to-do Freethinkers who have expressed a very high opinion of *Bible Romances* as a propagandist work. It is written in a popular style, and some people think it is humorous, while there is no neglect of the discoveries and conclusions of scholarship. Now if any of these Freethinkers would like to assist the Secular

Society, Limited—which is not a commercial, profit-making society—in bringing out this sixpenny edition, we beg to invite them to do so, and to do it with the utmost dispatch. Whatever they contribute will be devoted by the Board to this particular publication; but will *not* be reckoned in the accounts of sale and production relating to Mr. Foote. In other words, all such contributions will be absolute gifts to the society—and not even incidentally to anyone else.

Mr. Foote has had type-written, and is revising for publication, a considerable number of the principal essays, papers, and longer articles that have proceeded from his pen during the past twenty-five years; of which a fuller announcement will be made in due course. Subsequently, Mr. Foote hopes to finish his promised little book on Shakespeare, about which he often receives enquiries.

The London Freethinkers' Annual Dinner, under the auspices of the N. S. S. Executive, was held at the Holborn Restaurant on Tuesday evening, January 12. Between ninety and a hundred "saints" assembled, and the number included a very gratifying proportion of ladies. In addition to an excellent music program that Miss Vance had arranged, there were the Chairman's Address by Mr. Foote, and speeches by Mr. John Lloyd, Mr. F. Davies, and Mr. Victor Roger, who handled the toast of "The Freethought Cause at Home and Abroad." Perhaps the principal proceeding was the Presentation to Mr. C. Cohen. The Chairman made an earnest little speech on behalf of the National Secular Society, and Mr. Cohen made a felicitous acknowledgment. We are sorry that we are unable to report both speeches, but the loss is partly made good by Mr. Cohen's letter appearing on another page of this week's *Freethinker*. Altogether the Dinner was universally pronounced to be a great success.

We again call the attention of our readers to the *Secular Annual* for 1904. The *Annual* is selling steadily, but a more rapid sale, which means a larger circle of readers, is still desirable. And we venture to say that no one will regret their outlay of sixpence upon this production. The contents of the *Annual* is both varied and interesting, suitable alike for Christian and sceptical readers. And it is also worth remembering that *all* profits from this production go to the funds of the National Secular Society. The work of the contributors is in every case free.

The New Year's Gift to Freethought.

THIRD LIST OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

E. G. James 2s. 6d., F. Austin 2s. 6d., W. Cromach 3s., M. Weatherburn 5s., J. Young 2s. 6d., S. H. H. 10s., M. M. Danson Martinez £1, F. J. Voisey 10s. 6d., A. J. Y. 2s. 6d., W. Bean 5s., Frank Smith (second donation) £3 14s., J. Railton 2s. 6d., W. Cody £1, R. S. (Dundee) 2s. 6d., H. C. Byshe 10s., Well Wisher 10s., G. F. H. McCluskey 5s., W. H. Barratt 2s. 6d., F. H. Hulbert 2s. 6d., J. B. 1s. 3d., N. D. 2s. 6d., F. Goodwin 2s., R. Carroll, 6s. 2d., W. H. Smith 2s. 6d., F. Deane (for N. S. S.) 5s., T. Dixon 2s. 6d., J. Roberts 5s., W. Tipper 5s., F. Gilruth 2s. 6d., R. Cox 5s.

Jerusalem, Old and New.

Didymus Dunkleton Doty Don John
Is a parson of high degree;
He holds forth of Sundays to marvelling crowds
Who wonder how vice can still be
When smitten so stoutly by Didymus Don—
Disciple of Calvin is he.
But sinners still laugh at his talk of the New
Jerusalem—ha-ha, te-he!
And biting their thumbs at the doughty Don John—
This parson of high degree—
They think of the streets of a village they know,
Where horses still sink to the knee,
Contrasting its muck with the pavement of gold
That's laid in the other citee.
They think of the sign that still swings, uneffaced
By winds from the salt, salt sea,
Which tells where he trafficked in tippie of yore—
Don Dunkleton Johnny, D.D.

Didymus Dunkleton Doty Don John
Still plays on his fiddle-D.D.
His lambkins still bleat in full psalmody sweet.
And the Devil still pitches the key.

—Dod Grile.

Haeckel's "Riddle of the Universe"

IN ITS BEARINGS ON CONTEMPORARY BIBLICAL AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH.

PROFESSOR ERNST HAECKEL, the renowned author of *The Riddle of the Universe*, is the leading exponent in our day of the monistic theory, and no unworthy representative of the pioneers of this doctrine in modern times—Spinoza and Goethe. If asked for a definition of the term "monism," I should reply, "The universe accounts for itself"—that is to say, God as *external* to the universe is an unnecessary postulate. Even a century ago (before Darwin postulated by his theory of selection had filled up the vacant spaces in the scientific thesis of Lamarck, (and had thereby dispensed with if not disproved a creative purpose in the order of things) the renowned Laplace, the originator of the nebular hypothesis, imagined he had found a way to giving the creator his congé. Continuing further the definition of "The Gospel according to Haeckel" we may summarise thus: Monism, which the great Goethe took to be "the truest and profoundest thought of all the ages," postulates that material operations account for all phenomena in the universe—that matter is indestructible, has always existed and will always exist, filling the universe, accounting for all things, and leaving no room for the introduction of a creative power; that not an atom of matter is ever lost, but only changes form in chemical processes, and that it is precisely in this intimate capacity for change (metamorphosis) that the secret of the origin of life and all other phenomena are to be sought, as well as the presumption of the existence of matter from eternity to eternity; that the cosmos presents one continuity of operation; that no gulf exists between the organic and inorganic worlds in the evolutionary process, still less any gap in the process of development between the lowest organic forms (monera) and the highest (man): that the affinities and antipathies of the organic world find parallel and analogy in the affinities and antipathies of the inorganic world (the "loves and hates of the elements") postulated by Anaximander in the ancient world, and by Goethe in the modern world (in his classical romance "Affinities.") How far this theory is borne out (1) *positively* by all the contributory facts resulting from the latest researches of science; and (2) *negatively*, by examination and refutation of the preposterous claims of theology, is well shown in the treatise of which it is our present endeavour to supply a brief summary.

As regards life itself, the earth is literally the mother, and the sun the sire, of all living things—one spirit breathes throughout nature—all has come into being by the operation of one law. Haeckel recognises no distinction between the natural and spiritual world,—that which we term "spirit" or "soul" has developed out of material conditions—mind has developed from matter (it is unthinkable that matter should develop from mind since it is contrary to all experience): this is the mechanical or pantheistic philosophy. Goethe and Spinoza among the moderns, Lucretius, Epicurus, Empedocles, Anaximander, and others among the ancients, have anticipated our scientists of to-day in the construction of materialism; the latter have elaborated, perfected, filled up gaps, rounded corners in the majestic structure.

Though the doctrine that man comes by descent from an ape-like ancestor had been theoretically proved up to the hilt, by Darwin, it remained for Eugen Dubois, a Dutchman, to complete the chain by the discovery in Java, in 1894, of the missing link *pithecanthropus erectus*. The instinct of the lower animals has, in the long process of development, become *reason* in man; and the difference, both mental and physical, between man and the lower animals is merely a difference of *degree* not of *kind*. It has been well said by Huxley that a greater

difference exists between the lowest order of man and the highest, than between the lowest order of man and the highest order of ape! In the vast structure of evolution there exist no gaps which cannot be filled by consistent hypothesis—science makes no appeal to faith without reason,—and in this respect there exists a wide difference between the creed of the scientist and that of the theologian; the latter having not merely no evidence to support it, but being irrational in itself.

SOUL DEVELOPMENT.

The soul development of man is merely of a higher kind than that which we find in the dog, the horse, or the elephant. In all these animals we perceive the first glimmerings of reason, and, if reverence be the original factor of religion, we certainly discover this attribute in the attitude of the dog towards his master. We find in the dog, also, the qualities of love, fidelity, and self-sacrifice, coupled with a strong sense of duty. Since we see in the attitude of man towards his neighbors and his gods the highest developments of these faculties, it is easy to conceive how they have been built up from the primal instincts, and perfected in the slow process of civilisation. Thus, conscience is a mere growth, and morals are not a fixed quantity. If anyone doubts this, he has only to compare the varying standards of conscience and morality obtaining among various peoples, reaching almost to vanishing point in the case of certain primitive tribes. Within the limit of this brief summary, however, it is impossible to give instances.

THE ANTHROPOMORPHIC CONCEPTION OF DEITY.

To reverse the words of the Bible, "man has made his gods according to his own image." In the endeavor to form a mental picture of Deity, man insensibly clothes him in the human form. Yet the homotheistic conception becomes the more ridiculous when we consider that only late in the life of created things man was developed (from the pithecoïd mammals). Haeckel describes this conception of the spiritual being as "a gaseous vertebrate." All forms of supernatural religion, whether we regard the crude conceptions of the savage, or the elaborate theology of the Romish Church, are essentially irrational, because anthropomorphic, and materialistic. The doctrines of the "real presence" and the "resurrection of the body" are essentially materialistic, as also the general conception of a future state of existence: in fact, man is so constituted that he can only think in terms of the *material* world. The Buddhistic religion alone approaches closely to pure monism or pantheism. The alleged revelations to man have always been made by *physical* means—(speech, bodily appearances, etc.). The rational thinker must reject the system *in toto*, but the chief strength of the Church consists in the ignorance of the majority, and in its power over the mind and suffrages of *ignorance in bulk*. The appeal to sentiment, which is the strongest factor in religion, has the greatest fascination for the female temperament; and woman, who rocks the cradle of infancy and educates the child, thus, through the influences of early training (plus heredity), moulds the thought of the world. It is hardly too strong an assertion that the majority of the human race are fools, ruled by knaves, and the only hope for the monistic religion of the future lies in secular education. In the opinion of Haeckel, the Romish Church is the chief enemy. From the time when Christianity became under Constantine the State religion of the Roman Empire (incorporating therein many of the pagan practices and ceremonies), until the Reformation, the whole world (under the heel of the Papacy) was, in the words of Frederick the Great, *insane*. The Christian Church (the Bride of Christ) has been the enemy of science and general enlightenment, the conservator of false ideals, and the propagator of inhuman doctrines, and is directly responsible for at least ten million violent deaths! Times have changed, and her attitude has changed with them; but the fight, as between religion and science, is to

the death—there can be no quarter given on either side.

THE EVIDENCE FOR REVEALED RELIGION.

If we study the Old Testament, we find therein a low order of morality, and God is a coarse, brutal type of tribal divinity, who delights in sacrifice and bloodshed (a "man of war")—the evident conception, in short, of minds in a semi-barbarous condition. Further, we now know that the stories of Creation, the Fall, the Deluge, etc., are Chaldean myths, and that even the Ten Commandments are of Babylonian origin. If we turn to the higher ethics of the New Testament, we must admit that the teaching of Jesus is not original, but merely a focussing of the best morality of the great teachers of earlier ages. We must also bear in mind that the New is alleged to be the fulfilment of the Old Testament, and that they both stand or fall together as Christian evidence.

THE EXTERNAL EVIDENCE.

If we seek elsewhere for the evidence of a benevolent and omnipotent personal Providence directing the affairs of this planet, we seek for it in vain. The laws of nature seem of iron, and inexorably cruel; or, as Huxley put it, "nature is neither moral nor immoral, but simply non-moral." The monistic theory, therefore, even on ethical lines, is the only solution, unless we admit that a fiend created the universe, or accept the old Persian doctrine of dual powers of good and evil dividing the world, and ever fighting for individual mastery; which is certainly, so far as it goes, the most logical (on the evidence before us) of all religious doctrines, but is rank heresy in the Christian theology. The drama of nature from the beginning has been the drama of bloodshed and survival of force; life preys upon life right through creation, and in a thousand other ways the theory of a *creative design* is controverted. We will mention here merely the aborted types, the atrophied organs, the examples or retrogression, the frightful waste of life in the production of types, and the survival of the fittest (*i.e.*, the physically strongest); while, on the other hand, the development of species has been physically accounted for by Darwin's great theory of Natural Selection (the crowning stone in the evolutionary structure). Earthquakes, tidal waves, plagues and general convulsions of nature, periodically decimate the hapless human race, and recurring famines sweep away whole provinces. Death in a thousand forms lies in wait for man; his days are short and full of sorrow; religious wars and wars of conquest have incessantly devastated the earth, and the number of conflicting creeds proves that there has never been any clear revelation of God's way to men.

The origin of evil (on the *a priori* assumption of an all-pure and omnipotent creator) is unthinkable, as also the idea that a ghost could create the material universe out of nothing, or that *man has a will which, in the ultimate analysis is not the will of his creator also!* But on the *monistic* basis of the physical origin and nature of all phenomena, and bearing in mind man's base animal origin, the problem becomes clear, or at least intelligible. On the assumption of the truth of revelation we are reduced to this alternative, that if God is omnipotent, he is not benevolent; but if he is benevolent he cannot be omnipotent! Haeckel observes: "The idea of design has wholly disappeared from the vast province of science."

COPERNICUS AND DARWIN.

As Copernicus in the substitution of the heliocentric for the geocentric theory, revolutionised our ideas of, and relation to the material universe, so Darwin (who has been called "the Copernicus of the organic world") by enlarging and completing the evolutionary theory of Lamarck and Goethe, has completely revolutionised our ideas, not merely of man's relation to the cosmos, but to a hitherto assumed personal creator. For, if evolution be true, then the idea of man's separate creation can no

longer be entertained. That being so, the biblical teaching of Creation and "the Fall" are exploded, and if there was no "Fall" there could have been no need for man's redemption. Science generally has taken the conceit out of man by reducing his planet to a mere satellite of the central sun (itself a mere speck in the universe of suns), and the teaching of evolution has reduced man from the dignity of a *specially created being*, to kinship with "the beasts that perish"; his soul is part of his *physical* organisation, and the difference both physically and psychically between him and the lower animals is merely one of *degree*, not of *kind*. "God" in the monistic conception, is not a being *external* to the material universe, but a moving power within the cosmos itself. It follows also that the doctrine of the soul's immortality must go, save only in so far as it is part of the "world soul." Goethe said a hundred years ago, "matter can never exist or act apart from spirit, neither can spirit apart from matter." At death, what the theologians call "soul," but what is really a complicated chemical combination of the nervous mass, passes over into other combinations by decomposition, to reappear in new forms of energy.

Within the space now left at my disposal it will be only possible to indicate the remaining points in the work under review.

THE MATERIAL UNIVERSE

is compounded of ether and mass atoms. The abyss of space knows no vacuum. Where matter is not, ether exists. Action-at-a-distance is mediated by ether (Newton never kened this when he formulated his famous law of gravitation; which, nevertheless, by virtue of this explanation, is no longer merely a fact, but an *intelligible* fact); distance thus becomes *no object* with this elastic fluid medium pervading all space, and acting on matter as part of matter. Ether in the monistic creed equals *creating-divinity*; the inert heavy mass equals *material of creation*: we think of the two-in-one as "the mobile"—the "in movement."

THE ETERNITY OF THE COSMOS.

While new cosmic bodies arise and develop out of rotating masses of nebula (at a temperature running into millions of degrees) in some parts of space, in other parts old extinct frigid suns come into collision, and are once more reduced by the heat generated into the condition of nebulae, and the "eternal drama commences afresh." To the objection that there must have been a *primary* supernatural impetus to this movement, the answer is that movement is an *innate* property of substance.

MAN'S PLACE IN CREATION

is that of the highest class of vertebrates (mammals). At some time far back in the evolutionary order, the ape and the man had a common ancestor. Bone for bone and muscle for muscle, his structure is identical with that of the highest order of apes. Haeckel says: "Man has no single faculty which is his exclusive prerogative. His whole psychic life differs from that of the nearest related mammals only in degree, and not in kind."

MIND AND CONSCIOUSNESS.

When consciousness (as the term is generally understood) began in the evolutionary process, it would be difficult to determine; but the period of the centralisation of the nervous system in the brain may be indicated as the beginning of consciousness. Under the monistic system "soul" or "mind" is part of the *physical* entity, and inseparable from it. Life, soul, mind, consciousness, are co-extensive. The word "soul" is merely a collective title for the sum-total of man's cerebral functions.

THE BEGINNINGS OF LIFE.

When our earth (thrown off with the other planets as fragments from the central sun) had cooled down sufficiently in the process of ages to admit of life,

then, by the operations of carbon, moisture, and sunlight, the first germ of life came into existence, to unite with other elements into plasma combinations of growth. With the first moneron began organic life and its most distinctive function, heredity. This applies to other planets also, capable of supporting life. In connection with this theory it may be mentioned that no other elements are found in organic bodies than those of the inorganic world.

EMBRYOLOGY THE CROWNING PROOF OF THE TRUTH OF EVOLUTION.

Inasmuch as the law of development from the primitive cell holds good throughout organic nature, it also holds good in embryology; the function of reproduction being accomplished by the fusion of the male and female germ cells into one. Thus the preformation theory in embryology has been disproved on the same basis as the old creative theory of distinct species. Man, during the nine months of gestation, passes through the various stages of evolution through which organic life has passed in the countless ages that have elapsed since the beginnings of life on this planet; till he finally evolves into the human foetus!

Such is the solution of "the Riddle of the Universe" offered by science, and only lately perfected; which Goethe nevertheless, the world's acutest intellect, (poet, philosopher, and man of science), had already solved by intuition almost a century ago.

THE END OF ALL THINGS.

From the Sun we came; to the Sun we shall return. In the last days of our solar system the earth, the moon, and the other planets will circle round the dying sun in narrowing orbits and with ever-decreasing velocities. Finally they will fall or be drawn into the central orb, and all will melt in the "fervent heat" engendered by the collision; but out of the amorphous mass new worlds will spring into being—a new solar system will perchance be formed! This is the majestic philosophy of monism; of the universe as "will and intelligence"; of the indestructibility of matter and the persistence of force, operating from eternity to eternity.

IMPARTIAL CRITIC.

Correspondence.

THE PRESENTATION TO MR. COHEN.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—When I learned, through Miss Vance, of the desire of my friends in Liverpool and Glasgow to present me with a mark of their appreciation of my thirteen years' work in the National Secular Society, I could not but feel gratified, whatever the result. When one is working in a cause like ours, he will, if he is sensible, hope for but two things—the spread of our principles, and the respect of his fellow-workers. There are innumerable proofs of the former, and the manner in which the proposal was taken up by the Society's Executive, and the general response to it throughout the country, has certainly given me an assurance of the latter.

This is not a subject on which I care to say much more than a simple "Thank you," but I feel that I ought to express publicly my appreciation of the testimonial offered, and to heartily thank all those who have been instrumental in bringing it to so successful an issue. One's work will be performed the more cheerfully for the feeling that the Free-thought party, poor and straggling though it be, is ready to appreciate those who labor in its behalf; nor, I hope, will this feeling be confined to myself.

For the rest, I will only add that, if my past has succeeded in winning the respect of the Free-thought party in Great Britain, it will be no fault of mine if my work in the future does anything to diminish its regard.

C. COHEN.

THE VACCINATION TYRANNY.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Writing in the *Leicester Mercury* of November 27, a correspondent says that an order was issued by the Midland Railway Company that the staff in the refreshment department at Derby should be revaccinated or, otherwise, dismissed.

Rather than lose their situations, the majority submitted under protest, one being a man nearly sixty years of age, with forty years' service. Some, however, declined and were dismissed. Amongst the latter was Mr. Henry Hardy, the father of six children; an intelligent, conscientious man, having seven years' good character with the company. He was discharged on March 22, 1903, and has since earned a precarious livelihood by cleaning windows. In another case a strong healthy young woman, Teresa Allsopp, submitted to re-vaccination under protest at Bedford, an inspector from St. Pancras having informed her that she would either have to be re-vaccinated or leave. As a result of the blood-poisoning operation, glandular swellings appeared in the armpit, followed by sores on the vaccinated arm, which gradually spread until they covered the limb from elbow to fingers. For seventeen months Miss Allsopp suffered, losing her employment into the bargain, and receiving no compensation for the serious injury to her health. The Vaccination Act, 1898, recognises the conscientious objector. The Midland Railway Company and other employers of labour who compel those who work for them to be revaccinated, are, therefore, clearly overriding the law, and acting in an indefensible and tyrannical manner. The sooner the working classes realise the existence of a secret vaccination propagandist society which seeks to deprive them of the ownership of their own bodies, by compelling them to choose between loss of employment with possible starvation for themselves and families, and undergoing an acute specific disease (in some instances analogous to syphilis), the better. To get rid of the monstrous tyranny which threatens the liberty, health, and even the lives of the people, and defeat the machinations of the so-called Imperial Vaccination League, whose methods are cowardly and un-English, moral and financial support should be given to the National Anti-Vaccination League, 50, Parliament-street, S.W., where literature and other information can be obtained. The approaching bye-elections will afford excellent opportunities for inquiry whether candidates are willing to vote for the repeal of the obnoxious vaccination legislation. Thanking you for your kindness and impartiality.

JAS. R. WILLIAMSON.

"Dod Grile" Nuggets.

We are filled with unspeakable gratification to record the death of that double girl who has been in everybody's mouth for months. This shameless little double-ender, with two heads and one body—two cherries on a single stem as it were—has been for many moons afflicting our simple soul with an itching desire that she might die—the nasty pig! Two half-girls, joined squarely at the waist, and without any legs, are not a pleasant type of the coming woman. Had she lived, she would have been a bone of social, theological, and political contention, and we should never have heard the end—of which she had two alike. If she had lived to marry, some mischief-making scoundrel would have procured the indictment of her husband for bigamy. The preachers would have fought for her, and if converted separately, her Methodist end might have always been thrashing her Episcopal end, or *vice versa*. When she came to serve on a jury, nobody could have decided if there ought to be eleven others or only ten; and if she ever voted twice, the opposite party would have had her up for repeating; and if only once, she would have been read out of her own, for criminal apathy in the exercise of the highest duty, etc. We bless God for taking her away, though what he can want with her is as difficult a problem as herself or himself. She will have to wear two golden crowns, thus entailing a double expense; she won't be able to fly any, and, having no legs, she must be constantly watched to keep her from rolling out of heaven. She will just have to lie on a soft cloud in some out-of-the-way corner, and eternally toot two trumpets, without other exercise. If Gabriel is the sensible fellow we think him, he won't wake her at the Resurrection. Look at this infant in any light you please, and it is evident that she was a dead failure, and is yet. She did but one good thing, and that was to teach the Siamese twins how to die. After they shall have taken the hint, we hope to have no more foolish experiments in double folks born that way. Married couples are sufficiently unpleasing.

The Rev. Dr. Cunningham instructs his congregation that it is not enough to give to the Church what they can spare, but to give and keep giving until they feel it to be a burden and a sacrifice. These, brethren, are the inspired words of one who has a deep and abiding pecuniary interest in what he is talking about. Such a man cannot err, except by asking too little; and empires have risen and perished, islands have sprung from the sea, mountains have burnt their bowels out, and rivers have run dry since a man of God has committed an error.

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.

NORTH CAMBERWELL HALL (61 New Church Road, Camberwell): 7.30, G. W. Foote, "How God Governs the World."

EAST LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Brixley Vestry Hall, Bow-road, E.): 7, J. Oakesmith, M.A., Litt.D., "The Politics of Reynard the Fox."

FINSBURY PARK DEBATING SOCIETY (79 Grove-road, Holloway-road, N.): 7, Debate, "Morality in the Light of Science." Open discussion.

SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Masonic Hall, Camberwell New-road): 7, Professor Hudson, "The Critical Spirit."

WEST LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY (Kensington Town Hall, High-street): 11.15, G. Lornes Dickenson, "A Greek View of Life."

WOOD GREEN ETHICAL SOCIETY (Fairfax Hall, Portland-gardens, Haringay): 7, Charles Watts, "The R.P.A. and the Clergy: An Intellectual Revolt."

COUNTRY.

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Prince of Wales Assembly Rooms, Broad-street): H. Snell, 3, "The Other Side of Darwinism"; 7, "Shylock the Jew: A Shakespearean Character Study."

FAILSWORTH SECULAR SUNDAY SCHOOL (Pole-lane Failsworth): A Recital by Ryder Boys.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (110 Brunswick-street): 12 noon, Discussion Class; "The Prophet of Nazareth and His Teaching," Ignatius McNulty; 6.30, *Parmelia*, "The Wonders of Small Things in Plant Life." With lantern illustrations.

LEEDS (Covered Market, Vicar's Croft): 11, H. R. Youngman, "The Life of Thomas Paine"; Woodhouse Moor: 3, George Weir, "Miracles"; Town Hall Square: 7, A. Woolham, "Can Man Sin Against God?"

LIVERPOOL (Alexandra Hall, Islington-square): H. Percy Ward, 3, "The Law of Population"; 7, "Thomas Paine" (Memorial Lecture). Monday, at 8, Social Meeting. Tickets 6d.

MANCHESTER SECULAR HALL (Rusholme-road, All Saints'): 6.30, Mark J. Carlson, "Russian Life in and out of Siberia." Lantern views.

STOCKTON-ON-TEES (Market Place): Ernest Pack, 11, "Adam the Dust-Man"; 3, "God and the Devil"; 7, "Why I am a Secularist."

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.

Freethought Publishing Co., Ltd., 2 Newcastle-st., London, E.C.

THE BEST BOOK

ON NEO-MALTHUSIANISM IS, I BELIEVE,

TRUE MORALITY, or THE THEORY and PRACTICE OF NEO-MALTHUSIANISM.

By J. R. HOLMES, M.M.L., M.V.S., M.N.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's 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 concerned of the requisites at the lowest possible prices."

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

Orders should be sent to the author,

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

Charles Handley

(A LONDON FREETHINKER)

Is the Manager of my New Branch Establishment at 20 Heavitree-road, Plumstead, S.E.

London friends can deduct Return Fares from any purchases they make when visiting my London Branch.

A HEARTY WELCOME AND BARGAINS FOR EVERYBODY.

If you cannot call, send a postcard with name and address, and we will visit you with samples in any part of London.

BANKRUPT STOCK.

Purchased at less than half price. All this season's goods.

2,100 PAIRS OF TROUSERS

All colors and all sizes, from 28 to 40 inches round waist, and 27 inches to 32 inches inside leg. I am clearing them at

1 pair for	4s. 6d.
2 pairs for	8s. 10d.
4 pairs for	16s. 6d.
6 pairs for	24s. 0d.
12 pairs for	46s. 0d.

Carriage Paid.

Every Father should measure himself and Sons and go in for at least a dozen pairs.

You never saw such value before.

JUST FANCY! 4s. 6d. per pair for

HIGH CLASS TROUSERS.

DONT FORGET Our Sensation-Creating Parcel, 1 Pair Pure Wool Blankets, 1 Pair Large Bed Sheets, 1 Beautiful Quilt, 1 Bedroom Hearthrug, 1 Bed Cover, 1 Pair Fine Lace Curtains, 1 Pair Turkish Towels, 1 Long Pillow Case, 1 Pair Short Pillow Cases. 21s.

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

Now Ready.

Dietetic Hints for My Consultants

By SOPHIE LEPPELL.

The *Dietetic Hints* consists of nine leaflets, print and size of my pamphlets, printed on one side only on thick paper, lying in a folded case of thick paper, so that the leaflets can be taken out, and their contents compared for easy reference.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

1. General Health Rules and Directions. 1 p.
2. Vital Foods. 1 p.
3. Some Hints Concerning the Salty Elements on Specified Foods. 2 pp.
4. The Specific Value of Fatty, Sweet, and Starchy Foods. 1 p.
5. The Specific Value of Specified Vegetables. 2 pp.
6. Hints About the Excretory Organs. 2 pp.

Price 10s.

The Pioneer Press, 2 Newcastle-street, London, E.C.

NO FREETHINKER SHOULD BE WITHOUT THESE:—

Just Arrived from America.

Design Argument Fallacies. A Refutation of the argument that Nature exhibits marks of having been designed by an Intelligent Being. By the Editor of the *New York Truthseeker*. Price 8d., postage 1d.

Answers to Christian Questions and Arguments. By D. M. Bennett. Price 1s., postage 2d.

Sabbath Breaking. Giving the Origin of Sabbath Ideas. A book brimful of good reasons why the Sunday Laws should be repealed. By John Remsburg. Price 1s., Postage 2d.

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

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 COMPANY, LTD.,
2 NEWCASTLE STREET, FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

NOW READY

THE SECULAR ANNUAL

FOR 1904

CONTENTS:

DEATH AND WESTMINSTER ABBEY	By G. W. FOOTE
LINCOLN CATHEDRAL AND THE HAIRY AINUS ...	By F. J. GOULD
LUCRETIOUS	By C. COHEN
WOMEN'S RELIGION	By MARY LOVELL
THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES	By JOHN LLOYD
THE SINLESSNESS OF ATHEISM	By "CHILPERIC"
"MOSES WROTE OF ME"	By "ABRACADABRA"
National Secular Society: Official Information.	Other Freethought Organisations.
Newsagents Who Supply Freethought Literature	

PRICE SIXPENCE

THE PIONEER PRESS, 2 NEWCASTLE STREET, LONDON, 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 Christian religion from a thoughtful and critical standpoint. It is a perfect army of facts and comparisons. Since 1888 it has been the standard volume of the subject with which it deals, and its popularity is emphasised by the fact that the public have demanded a new edition."—*Reynolds's Newspaper.*

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

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.

Culleper 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 14 stamps.

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

Protection or Free Trade

By HENRY GEORGE.

Special Reprint. Authorised Shilling Edition. 360 Pages. Large Print.

Half Price, Sixpence. Postage 2½d.

The Pioneer Press, 2 Newcastle-st., Farringdon-st., 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.

FACTS WORTH KNOWING.

A Handsome Pamphlet of Eighty Pages, containing valuable matter from the pens of leading American Freethinkers, including COLONEL INGERSOLL, L. K. WASHBURNE, H. O. PENTECOST, LOUIS MUELLER, and J. E. ROBERTS (Church of This World). Sent over for free distribution in this Country. A slight charge made to cover expenses. ONE SHILLING PER HUNDRED COPIES; carriage Sixpence extra, One Shilling extra in the Provinces. Special Terms to N. S. S. Branches and other Societies.

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

The Pioneer

A POPULAR PROPAGANDIST ORGAN
OF
ADVANCED IDEAS.

CONTENTS FOR JANUARY:—

Death of Herbert Spencer
The Pride of Rome
Mr. Keir Hardie
The Chamberlain Crusade
Questions for Women
Ingersoll on Tolstoi
Death-Bed Repentance

Christmas and Peace
Mr. George Gissing
A Labor Daily
Browning and Shakespeare
The Dead Year
S'w'elp Me God
The Waste of War

Friendship with France
The Talking Emperor
Dreyfus Again
Impertinence or Ignorance?
The Fear of Hell
A Fashionable Church
Theology and Common Sense

PRICE ONE PENNY.

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

FROM CHRISTIAN PULPIT TO SECULAR PLATFORM

A MENTAL HISTORY
BY
JOHN LLOYD (ex-Presbyterian Minister)

Best Edition, in handsome cover, 6d.

Popular Edition, 2d.

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

A Further Consignment from America

NOT OTHERWISE OBTAINABLE

VOLTAIRE'S ROMANCES

"Voltaire was the greatest man of his country, and did more to free the human race than any other of the sons of men."

CHINESE CATECHISM. Dialogues between a disciple of Confucius and a Chinese Prince, before the Christian era. *Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.*

IGNORANT PHILOSOPHER, The. Containing portraits of René Descartes and Benedict Spinoza.—As entertaining as a French Comedy. *Paper covers 1s., postage, 2d.*

LETTERS ON THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. With comments on the writings of the most eminent authors who have been accused of attacking Christianity. *Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.*

MAN OF FORTY CROWNS. Dialogues on National Poverty; Adventures with a Carmelite, etc. *Illustrated. Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.*

MICROMEGAS. A Voyage to Planet Saturn. By a native of Sirius; and Twelve others. *Illustrated. Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.*

PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY. With portraits of The Empress Catherine and of Voltaire. *Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.*

POCKET THEOLOGY. Witty and Sarcastic Definitions of Theological Terms. *Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.*

THE SAGE AND THE ATHEIST. The Princess of Babylon. Adventures of a Young Englishman, etc. *Illustrated. Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.*

ZADIG: or, Fate. The White Bull; The Blind of One Eye, etc. *Illustrated. Paper covers 1s., postage 2d.*

When ordering, a second choice should be given, to prevent disappointment

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY EDITION OF THE AGE OF REASON

By THOMAS PAINE.

WITH A BIOGRAPHICAL INTRODUCTION AND ANNOTATIONS BY G. W. FOOTE

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.

Printed and Published by THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING Co., Limited, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C.