

# THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXIV.—No. 21

SUNDAY, MAY 22, 1904

PRICE TWOPENCE

*There is a dastardly race of pedants who, doing no good thing, either by the divine law or the laws of Nature, esteem themselves, and desire to be esteemed, religious and pleasing to the gods, saying that though it is well to do good and evil to do wrong, we can only be made acceptable to the gods, not on account of the good we may do or the evil we leave undone, but by hoping and believing according to the catechism.*—GIORDANO BRUNO.

## What Does Dr. Clifford Mean?

OUR leading article in last week's *Freethinker* was directed against Dr. Clifford, the principal leader of the Passive Resistance movement, whom we accused, in language borrowed from himself, of talking cant on the subject of religious education in the public schools. We contended that the Nonconformist policy which Dr. Clifford is fighting for is essentially as detestable as the Church policy which he is fighting against; and that, as far as all Non-Christians are concerned, it makes no difference whether the Christian teaching in the State schools be of one variety or another; since every form of religious teaching, in the name and at the expense of the whole body of the ratepayers, is a perfect outrage on the civil rights of all who dissent from it. This is the point at issue, and this is the principle at stake. Everything else is really beside the question. And our strongest objection to Dr. Clifford and his friends was that they could not or would not recognise this truth; being either hoodwinked by prejudice or blinded by self-interest, unless they were deliberately pretending not to see what they knew to be plain and obvious.

It did not occur to us that Dr. Clifford would attempt to vindicate himself. We have so frequently asked him questions, and he has so steadily ignored them, that we had given up all hope of his "facing the music." We were, therefore, rather pleasantly disappointed at receiving a letter from him, by way of reply to our last week's article. His letter is as follows:—

### THE EDUCATION QUESTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—I rejoice in your war against "cant" anywhere and everywhere—and not least—your fight against "cant" in myself.

But I should like to write one more letter, if only to indicate the inaccuracy of your statement about my action at the meeting of the Liberation Society. You say, "And at the recent meeting of the Liberation Society it was this very Dr. Clifford who smothered the protests against State religion in the public schools, and jockeyed the Conference into carrying a resolution in favor of Bible teaching; that is to say, in favor of just the quantity and quality of religious instruction which suits the Nonconformists' book."

The facts are these. The Resolution proposed, affirmed the opposition of the Society to "sectarian teaching" in schools provided by the people; it was then first indicated that we should substitute "religious" for "sectarian." That was discussed, and it was stated that no ten men agree as to the content of the word "religious." Then the word "Bible" was suggested: that was objected to, because most people, not even the "Moral Instruction League," do not object

to "selections from the Bible" being used. Then I suggested that the words "theological and ecclesiastical" instead of "sectarian," and they were accepted and adopted. That is the fact.

As for my own policy, I am now and have always been against any "ism" being taught to children at the expense of the State. I said last January in the *Christian World Pulpit*: "I am resolutely opposed to any man, a Mahometan or Methodist, a Ritualist or a Romanist, a Quaker or a Baptist, being made to suffer in the slightest degree for his religious opinions. In my fixed conviction those opinions are entirely outside the functions of the State. Parliament has nothing whatever to do with them. I am as strongly opposed to the establishment by Parliament of what is called 'undenominational teaching' as I am to Romanism; *i.e.*, I protest with all my might against teaching at the expense of the ratepayers a set of dogmatic theological opinions on which Christians generally are supposed to be agreed, as I protest against the teaching of any distinctively Roman or Anglican doctrine."

I cannot yet see any better course than Secular Education, with "Local Option" as to selected passages from the Bible, to be treated in an exclusively ethical and never in a theological or ecclesiastical way, *i.e.*, as Shakespeare and Milton ought to be treated.—Yours truly,  
JOHN CLIFFORD.

25 Sunderland-terrace, W., May 16, 1904.

After reading this letter carefully, as we hope our readers have done, we confess that we hardly know what to make of Dr. Clifford. It gives us no sort of pleasure to believe in human dishonesty; we would far rather regard Dr. Clifford as deceived than as deceiving; and we find ourselves wondering whether he may not be, after all, in the mental muddle of an awkward transition period; whether he may not, indeed, be feeling his way back to the great principle he had lost sight of. Such a process, of course, is likely to involve a good deal of blind stumbling that might easily look like sheer perversity.

In the hope that this may be the real explanation of Dr. Clifford's strange movements, we proceed to criticise his letter with what we trust is logic and good temper.

Dr. Clifford's account of what happened at the meeting of the Liberation Society seems quite accurate, but what he said justifies our comment, and we will show him how.

The original resolution was against "sectarian" teaching in the public schools. This simply meant that there should be Christian teaching with no denominational color; which would be "unsectarian" as far as Christians were concerned, but still "sectarian" as far as Non-Christians were concerned. So far, then, both what was opposed and what was proposed were open to the same objection. And this was recognised by a clear-sighted, honorable minority, who tried to substitute "religious" for "sectarian." Had they succeeded they would have secured a resolution, practically, in favor of secular education. But this was what the majority did not want. Consequently a discussion was started on the word "religious," which was said to be capable of several different meanings; as indeed it is, but not in the same connection. When the word "religious" is applied to a certain portion of the teaching in schools everybody knows precisely what it means. The word was even involved in the word "sectarian." For it was not sectarian arithmetic or sectarian geography that was objected to, but sectarian religion. The discussion on the word

"religious" was therefore a subterfuge. Yet those who started it received Dr. Clifford's powerful assistance. His suggestion of "theological and ecclesiastical" swept both "religious" and "sectarian" out of the way; although it left both "religious" and "sectarian" in practical possession of the field.

Now we will ask Dr. Clifford this question. What is the difference between "religious" and "theological"? Can he draw any distinction between them in conformity with common usage? Do they not mean precisely the same thing in this Education controversy? And if Dr. Clifford uses the word "religious" out of all relation to the word "theological" let him say so plainly, and let him drop one word or the other absolutely in the present discussion.

We can easily understand Dr. Clifford's anxiety to keep the Bible in the schools, but what does he mean by saying that it should be "treated in an exclusively ethical and never in a theological or ecclesiastical way?" On a former occasion Dr. Clifford sent us a London School Board syllabus of religious instruction, which he said he approved, and in which Jesus was referred to as "Our Lord." Is this using the Bible in an "ethical way?" Would he agree to call Shakespeare and Milton "Our Lord?" And, if not, could he give any other than a "theological" reason?

Shakespeare and Milton are human literature. Is the Bible exactly the same in Dr. Clifford's estimation? Does he believe that it was as literature that the Bible was placed in the schools? Was it not placed there as the Christian Scriptures? Can it be used there in any other way than as the Word of God while Christianity is the one great overwhelming religion of this country? Is it possible for a Roman Catholic, an Anglican, a Presbyterian, a Baptist, a Wesleyan, or a Congregational teacher to regard the Bible, even for half an hour a day, as simply a book of ethics? Can he shut out of his mind all thought of "death and the judgment to come"?

We venture to tell Dr. Clifford that if the Bible were simply regarded as literature no one would fight for its being placed or kept in the schools. Parties do not rise and fall in contests over literature. A general election will never turn on any question relating to Shakespeare or Milton. It is the religious—that is, the theological—passions of the people that are excited in this Education struggle. Dr. Clifford himself would never display such heat and vehemence, such zeal and industry, if this were not the case.

By placing and keeping the Bible in the schools the Nonconformists are placing and keeping their own denominationalism there. The Bible is their religion. They charge the Anglican Church with Romanising. They themselves are the true Protestants. And what is the Protestant religion? The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible.

The "Local Option" suggestion in Dr. Clifford's last paragraph is really amazing. The question is what is right. Dr. Clifford says that Secular Education is right. He would vote to make this the law. At the same time he would give every locality the right to break it. Secular Education, with Local Option for religious teaching, is (we repeat) like Total Abstinence with Local Option for drinking beer.

Dr. Clifford's words may be illustrated by the practice of his friends. The Merioneth Education Committee has excogitated a scheme of Biblical instruction, according to which the school is to be opened with the Lord's Prayer and a hymn, and closed with the Lord's Prayer and the Doxology. This is how the fine distinction between "religious" and "theological" works out when the Passive Resisters rule the roost.

We are glad that Dr. Clifford has given us an opportunity of ventilating his policy, and we shall be glad to insert any rejoinder he may wish to send us if our only desire is truth and justice.

G. W. FOOTE.

## Immortality.

In the *Freethinker* for May 1 and 8 I dealt with one of the articles in Mr. S. C. Schiller's book on *Humanism*. This volume concludes with three articles dealing with the question of immortality, and as Mr. Schiller is evidently not an orthodox believer, his treatment of the subject is the more worthy of notice. Of these three articles there are only two that I purpose noticing now—one dealing with the supposed desire for a future life, the other with its ethical value.

As it is well to discuss a question with the ground as clear as possible, I may notice at the outset one expression which assumes more than I, at all events, am prepared to grant. Mr. Schiller speaks of the belief in immortality as one "from which none are base enough to withhold their moral homage." Now, this is a surreptitious, although common, way of enlisting support by exciting prejudice. For one is puzzled to see what "moral homage" has to do with the question, or how this belief merits it. The ground question is, "Is it true?" Apart from this, there is no greater amount of moral homage due to a man for living a million years than for his living fifty or sixty. If human life deserves "moral homage," it demands it no matter how short or how great its duration. In truth, it is not the quantity but the quality of life that commands respect, and the assertion that the bare belief in a future demands "moral homage" is an appeal to prejudice, whether one is conscious of it or no.

The title of Mr. Schiller's first essay is "The Desire for Immortality," and it must be admitted that if one were to put the bald question, "Do you desire a future life?" to the average man in the street, the answer would, in the vast majority of cases, be in the affirmative. But a little reflection serves to show that the reply is far more an expression of stereotyped phraseology or teaching than of real conviction. To commence with, as Mr. Schiller notes, the average man thinks little about death, and as little, or even less, about immortality. Thousands of preachers are constantly harping upon both subjects, and yet ordinary people seem to trouble but little about them. They discuss them when in a speculative mood, but generally there is a "healthy indifference to death and its consequences." Those who are really impressed with death are branded as cranks or confined as lunatics.

One would also expect, bearing in mind the relation a life of sixty or seventy years this side of the grave bears to an eternity of life on the other, that the question of immortality would exert an overpowering influence on people. Yet one finds quite the reverse. The percentage of people that regulate their lives by a belief in a hereafter is infinitesimal. In church the belief in immortality is said to be of paramount importance; yet if any member of the House of Commons were to rise and assert that the consideration of this subject should take precedence of all others, he would be laughed into silence. There exists a society—the Society for Psychological Research—whose business it is to try and reduce the stories of persistent personality to a scientific character, and yet, according to Mr. Schiller, only about 1,500 people all the world over are interested enough to pay one guinea per year to help determine whether they are immortal or not.

We can agree with Mr. Schiller that "such a state of affairs would be a sheer impossibility if there really existed any desire for probing into the mystery of death. . . . If there exists a desire for a future life in any sense, it is not a desire for scientific knowledge thereof, but a feeling of a very peculiar character which well merits further analysis." Mr. Schiller's analysis discloses a number of subsidiary reasons for this condition of affairs, but they may all be reduced to one. This, to put it briefly, is that the thought of death as an ever-present reflection in the human mind, and the constant dwelling upon an after-life, are both of an anti-social character, and so

have been discouraged in the course of social evolution.

It is easy enough to realise that although death does occupy a fairly large place in literature, yet a race of people with whom this was an ever-present subject of contemplation would be a race so far enfeebled in the struggle for existence. It is not the knowledge of the certainty of death, but the conviction of the value of life, that is of importance, and of all forms of pessimism that which constantly dwells upon the inevitableness of death and the littleness of life is the most paralysing. It is a further fact that in the clash and contest of instincts, those which hinder effectiveness are in the long run suppressed, leaving as a possession to the species such as enable it to act vigorously and effectively. The net result of this has been that, while all religions have been striving to force upon men these fundamentally anti-social feelings, natural selection has been at the same time striving to keep them below the stage at which they would be injurious to the welfare of the species. And to this is due the curious position that, while there is a literary and religious tradition that immortality is of all beliefs the most important, yet as a matter of actual fact, leaving on one side certain artificial stimuli, there is hardly another subject on which people are less actively interested. The thought of death can never be suppressed, as it is an ever-present fact; but feelings concerning death *must* not be such as conflict with the due carrying on of life.

And this brings me to one aspect of the matter upon which Mr. Schiller does not touch. Professor Metchnikoff has, in a recent work, dealt with this question in a very striking and novel manner; and with this I hope to deal later. At present it is enough to note (1) that there is a dislike to death that is common to all, for no one, under normal circumstances, *wants* to die; and (2) all religions have traded upon this, and depended upon it for whatever power they possessed. The first-named phenomenon is again explainable as a normal product of evolution. The dislike of death is but the reverse of a clinging to life; it is an expression of the value of life. And this, again, is one of the conditions of survival. It is, therefore, only a normal result of the struggle for existence that, other things equal, those animals should survive in whom the love of life showed itself in the strongest manner.

But this does not give us either the belief in or the desire for a continued existence beyond the grave. So far as the origin of this belief is concerned there is no longer room for reasonable doubt that it began as the result of the psychological blundering of primitive man. But we are not now concerned with its origin, but with the use made of the belief by religious organisations. These have always affirmed that man desires a *future* life, and have spoken of the "hope of immortality" as a permanent characteristic of mankind. But the truth is, and this seems to have escaped Mr. Schiller, that analysis shows that men do not desire a *future* life, they simply desire to live. Prof. Metchnikoff argues that this is because death reaches them too soon; but whether this be so or not the fact remains, and it can be tested by one or two simple considerations. I suppose that were it offered to people to continue either living on earth, with all the mixed pains and joys of existence, or to live beyond the grave in some religious heaven, there is hardly one in a million who would not decide to stay where he or she is. It is not that the *kind* of heaven pictured would not suit them, but that once assured of a continued existence on earth they would be content. No one welcomes dying, not even those who are certain of their ultimate destination. Mr. Schiller cites a church-warden who being asked said he believed that after death he would enter into everlasting bliss, but wished that people would not bring up such *distressing* topics.

The conclusion, therefore, seems inevitable. People do not desire a *future* life, they merely desire to live. But this desire is, so to speak, fluid, the

particular form it takes is determined by the environment, and this circumstance gives religion its opportunity. Just as life in its fullest aspect spells to one military glory, to another literary or political renown, so religion has taken the general and formless desire to live, and interpreted it as a desire for a life beyond the grave. And this analysis explains both the persistence and the failure of the religious doctrine of immortality. It has been persistent because there are always the facts of death and the desire to live for it to rest on. But it has failed in seeking to impress people with the paramount importance of belief in a future life for the reason that all man's feelings and instincts are elaborated in relation to life here, and while people have accepted the religious interpretation in theory, in practice the course of natural selection has prevented them allowing it to dominate life.

Mr. Schiller suggests that religions have been "artful" enough to preserve around the question of death a fitting air of mystery, and that the social atmosphere co-operates by discouraging investigations concerning immortality. And he lays some little stress upon the power of this "social atmosphere" in discouraging inquiry. I am far from disagreeing with him, and it seems to me that the power of the social atmosphere is shown in a positive as well as in a negative direction. If it has suppressed a too curious inquiry, it has also served to keep the belief. If it has marked inquiry as "bad form," it has to an even greater degree branded specific unbelief as "bad form" also. The belief in a future life did not originate with organisations, but they have done much to keep it alive in an age when it might otherwise have died out. The hundreds of thousands of priests who are scattered throughout Europe preaching this doctrine, the social opinion that asserts a belief in it to be necessary to good breeding, and brands an expressed unbelief as almost criminal, cannot be without its influence in keeping the belief alive. If Mr. Schiller reflects he will doubtless find here a good reason why there is so much of a conviction abroad as to the value of the belief in spite of the notorious paucity of evidence on its behalf.

The curious thing is that Mr. Schiller, in spite of this absence of evidence and conviction, does regard the belief in immortality as socially and ethically justifiable; and with his arguments on this head I will deal in my next article.

C. COHEN.

(To be continued.)

## Is the Universe Eternal?

MANY people are perpetually puzzled and perplexed by the numerous problems suggested by the mystery of Existence, and by the practical impossibility of arriving at definite and generally satisfactory solutions. The conclusions of theology regarding such problems are no longer accepted as authoritative and final. Indeed, during the last hundred years the conclusions of theology have undergone several radical revolutions. Orthodoxy used to hold the dogma that the story of Creation in the opening chapters of Genesis was a direct revelation from God to Moses, and as such was to be taken literally as it stands; and that is the teaching of Orthodoxy, as represented by the Bible League, even to-day. In the logically consistent book, entitled *Criticism Criticised*, we are solemnly assured that every detail in the story of Creation as related in Genesis is strictly accurate. Broadly speaking, then, the contention of theology is that there was a time, whether six thousand or six million years ago, when the material of the Universe did not exist, when the Holy Trinity dwelt in the profound calm and felicity of its own society, and when, in reality, there was neither time nor space. In the twinkling of an eye, at the command of the Almighty, Matter sprang into being, and stood before the Creator ready to obey all further commands. In the Sunday-schools of fifty years ago, the primal act of creation, and the

subsequent shaping of matter into the present Universe were described, with thrillingly realistic effect, by men who believed that they thoroughly understood the whole subject. Why, there it was all written down and explained by God himself through his servant Moses! To doubt it would have been an act of high treason against heaven.

I know that the majority of present-day theologians use great liberty of interpretation in dealing with the first three chapters of Genesis. Many of them are thorough evolutionists, who believe all the discoveries of geology and astronomy; but even the most advanced among them vehemently maintain that there was a moment, however far back, in which a definite act of creation took place, and prior to which absolutely nothing save God himself was in existence. Evolution, they tell us, has been God's method of developing the Universe as we now find it; but the germ, the *prothyl*, as Haeckel calls it, out of which all things have been evolved, under divine guidance, must have been created by the Supreme Being. Theology holds on to this point with all its might. For the last fifty years it has been systematically adapting itself to new knowledge, shifting its positions in obedience to the dictates of triumphant science; but it clings like grim death to the belief that it was God who originated and guided the evolutionary movements. It was God who conceived and directed the whole process. Everything external to himself has had a beginning, he alone being from everlasting to everlasting.

Theology always falls back on faith. It possesses no knowledge as to the origin of the Universe, but simply relies on the testimony of Scripture. As the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews says, it is "by faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that what is seen hath not been made out of things which do appear." No one possesses positive knowledge on any of these high points. Science knows nothing of either creator or director; neither is it aware that there ever has been a beginning. For all it knows Substance is eternal. There is nothing to indicate that it ever began to be. Matter and force bear signs of having ever been as they are now, always active, always mounting to some grand summit, or always sinking to some formless chaos. There have ever been a rising and a falling, a growing and a decaying, an evolution and a devolution. Of such opposite processes astronomy alone furnishes us with innumerable instances. But of either a beginning or an end science is entirely ignorant. Long ago Dr. Mivart used to reiterate again and again that "science points to no beginning."

Mr. Rhondda Williams, who is one of the most progressive of modern theologians, says:—"Galileo, the founder of physical science, laid it down as the first principle of dynamics, that every movement of matter could only be explained by another movement of matter, and that has been a recognised principle of science ever since." That is exactly what is taught by our most advanced scientists to-day, and it is perfectly true and reasonable. But Mr. Williams betrays his theological bias when he adds:—"The difficulty was to explain how matter began to move, what caused the first movement, what gave the primitive push." That is an inquiry with which Science has nothing whatever to do. For all we know, matter has always been in motion. There was no "first movement," no "primitive push." I defy both Mr. Rhondda Williams and Mr. Frank Ballard to adduce a single scrap of proof that there ever was either a "first movement," or a "primitive push." If they refer to the story of Creation as told in Genesis, they can be met with the statement that many of the ripest Biblical scholars regard that story as a pure myth, borrowed from Babylonian and other sources.

When the child is asked, "Who made all things?" he is trained to answer, "God." But should the child, in his turn, ask, "Who made God?" he would be warned to be on his guard against even the appearance of irreverence. And yet the one

question is quite as relevant as the other. Such questions are altogether beyond us. We know nothing of a beginning. If there are people who are audacious enough to assert that there was a "first movement," or a "primitive push," let them prove their assertion, or cease to make it.

I am asked by a correspondent, "Is it possible to prove that a personal Creator exists?" and obviously the only possible answer is an emphatic, "No." Since it cannot be proved that a creation ever occurred, it is surely needless even to attempt to prove the existence of a creator. There were innumerable ingenious Cosmogonies in olden times; but they were all the offspring of superstition, not of knowledge; and people were expected to believe them, not on any evidence, but on the bare testimony of their inventors who were equally as ignorant as all their neighbors. Writing of the Biblical Cosmogony Canon Cheyne says: "It has a considerably mythic substratum. That substratum is mainly Babylonian; but Egyptian and even Persian influence is not excluded. Indeed, for that singular passage, Gen. i. 2, Egyptian influence, either direct or more probably (through Phœnician or Canaanitish mythology) indirect, seems to be suggested." (*Encyclopædia Biblica*, vol 1, p. 945). In that opinion Canon Driver, in his recent Commentary on the Book of Genesis, wholly concurs. In the old theological sense, these modern divines scorn the idea of a revelation; but in the absence of a direct revelation no Cosmogony can be anything other than an invention or an epic inspired by the imagination. As is well known, all these Cosmogonies belong to the childhood of the human race. They all had their origin in the ignorance of primeval times; and now, one by one, they are vanishing before the quickly advancing light of knowledge. The spread of scientific information proves to be their death-blow. Even the Genesis Cosmogony is no longer defended, as in any literal sense true, except by a constantly dwindling number of antiquated divines such as we find represented in the Bible League. Such theologians as Dr. W. N. Clarke, Professor Iverach, Dr. Newman Smyth, Dr. Dallinger, and the Rev. Rhondda Williams have completely abandoned the idea of creation in any strictly theological sense. Professor Iverach tells us that we are to think of God not so much as an "external artificer" as an "immanent directive principle." To the modern scientist, however, this "immanent directive principle" means only the necessity of Nature, or Nature working out her own destiny. The active presence of intelligence at the existing stage of the cosmic process is no proof whatever that there was a directive intelligence at the commencement of it. Intelligence is the fruit of evolution, not its cause, and was not present at the beginning of the cosmic process except as a germ. Nature makes numerous apparent mistakes, her prodigality is proverbial, and her wastes are incalculable, which shows that she is not working under the direction of infinite intelligence; but most of her products are beyond words exquisite, superb. Is there anything grander, of more delicate and perfect workmanship than the eye? But there is no evidence that when the constructive or evolving process started there was any definite or conscious purpose to produce such an incomparable organ. Science knows of nothing but Nature and her inherent forces; but are not these sufficient to account for all we see to-day?

The evolutionary process is never at a standstill. Our solar system may be a hundred million years old, or it may be double that age; and we know that at this moment it is hastening to destruction. As a system it most certainly had a beginning, and as a system it will most certainly come to an end. But astronomy informs us that there are thousands if not millions of other and immeasurably larger systems scattered abroad in the immensity of space, and that all of them are found to be in various stages of development or of decay. There are many dying and many dead worlds strewn about in space; but there are quite as many new worlds in the throes of

birth. This is now an astronomical truism. But when a world or a system dies it is in order that it may come to life again in another world or system. Nature's beginnings and endings are innumerable; but one of her chief beauties is that each of her endings is a seed that soon springs up into a fresh beginning. Solar systems come and go, but the Universe flows on for ever. Nature's children are born, and live, and die; but she herself ever persists. So far as any proof to the contrary is concerned, and taking the inference which the facts known to science seem to justify as our guide, we are entitled to affirm that, in all probability, the material of the Universe is eternal, or that Nature and her forces have never had a beginning.

The eternity of matter is only a hypothesis, as yet; but it is a hypothesis strongly supported by all the facts known to us. No other hypothesis so fully and so satisfactorily explains the various phenomena of Nature. It is a splendid working hypothesis, and scientists are beginning to use it without stint.

JOHN LLOYD.

### The Church and the Revolution.

IN the period just before the French Revolution, the Catholic Church was losing hold of Europe. We have a way of talking of Spain as if it was always lying in a kind of nightmare, with a priest squatting on its belly. But Spain moves, though slowly; and it moved in the eighteenth century. The Spanish Inquisition lit fewer martyr-fires. From 1746 to 1759 only ten persons were burned to death; from 1759 to 1788, only four. Spanish statesmen lessened the revenues of the Church, and they took from the monasteries the right of asylum. Even in Naples, marriage was now permitted as a civil ceremony, nor might the Pope publish his bulls without the King's assent. In Austria, the Emperor Joseph II. introduced civil marriages, allowed divorce, gave more toleration to Dissenters, and, in 1781, shut up six hundred monasteries. As a parallel case, we may note that in Russia, the Empress Catherine secularised the monasteries, that is, rendered them dependent on Government grants. But the kings of Europe were seldom able to form a concert. The kings of France, Spain, Portugal and Naples all agreed in combating the Jesuits. Europe knew the Jesuit peril. Frederick the Great remarked of the members of the Society of Jesus, "They are the advanced guard of the Court of Rome." And so Europe struck at the Jesuits, on the same principle that the French sharpshooters singled out Nelson at the Battle of Trafalgar.

Simultaneously, sects and heresies multiplied. Our own country, fearing it had not enough schisms, added another in the Methodist movement. John Wesley became a Messiah to thousands of the poorer classes of Britain. A provincial Wesleyan lately remarked that Methodism had saved England from such scenes of blood as the Revolution begot in France. Even assuming that to be the case, it is but a timid calculation which stops there. We ought to go on to note that the French Revolution gave Europe more political, intellectual, and, in the end, moral benefits than ever Methodism did or will give it.

We derive good, it is certain, from the clash of opinions. But I doubt if it was a healthy thing for western Europe that, after the failure of the Catholic Church had become evident, the people should be tossed about among the theological claims of Calvinists, Jesuits, Jansenists, Anglicans, Presbyterians, Methodists, and the rest. And we are still divided; and not one of the competing sects has the slightest hope of mastering the human mind. Dream, if you dare, of a Presbyterian world! All these petty bodies are doomed to a more or less rapid death while the Religion of Humanity is shaping in the womb. That religion is entirely natural. It believes in the goodness of the human heart. It

works through a sound and universal education. It aims at raising the condition of women and of working men. And it teaches gratitude to the labor and science which have given us all the blessings which we enjoy.

In eighteenth-century France there were some 65,000 clergy of all ranks, and they owned about one-fifth of the country, and were exempt from taxes. Every five years the council of the clergy voted the amount they would pay to the State treasury. They rendered unto Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's; but how much was really Cæsar's they decided without asking his opinion. The differences between the incomes of the higher and lower ranks were almost as the differences between the mansion and the slum. The Archbishop of Toulouse had a revenue of £54,000 in addition to a secular salary and a pension. In robes lined with white satin the Bishop of Troyes preached contentment to the ragged. Saucepans of silver gleamed in the kitchens of the Bishop of Strasbourg. On the other hand (very much on the other hand!), there were 40,000 village priests who could never hope for either the white satin or the silver saucepan. They often lived in dilapidated parsonages; some of them received £40 a year, some £30, some but £16. The priest was frequently the only man in the place who could read or write. To him the village-folk looked for advice, for comfort, for ideas that would lift them above the sorrows of the cottage and the cares of the field. We are right in despising the satin and the glorious saucepan; but let us, in the name of Freethought, make manly acknowledgment of the self-denial, the devotion, and the enduring courage of thousands of poor clergy who loved their flocks, not as priests, but as men.

For many years the Church in France was disturbed by the quarrels of the Jansenists and Jesuits. The Jansenists were Roman Catholics; but they valued a certain liberty of conscience, and they declined to accept the Pope's infallibility—a doctrine which was then boldly asserting itself. Jansen—a Dutch priest, who died in 1638—affirmed, as Calvin affirmed, that the grace of God inevitably saved a soul if once God chose to bestow it. The effect of such a principle was to throw the work of religion more into a man's own heart; the priest was less necessary. Jansen did not express this idea in so many words, but the Jesuits could feel the pull of his thought; and the pull was away from Rome. Masses of people took up Jansenism, knowing little, perhaps, of the issues of the controversy, but satisfied if the Jesuits were dissatisfied. While the Christian Church was thus divided, Frenchmen were suffering want intellectually and physically. In 1725 bread riots took place in several towns. A Parisian mob of 1,800 persons, who threatened to plunder, were charged by cavalry, and two of the ringleaders were hanged. Thus, as Milton says in one of his noblest poems, "the hungry sheep look up and are not fed." In 1729 the writer of a Jesuit pamphlet hinted that the Jansenists ought to be massacred. When Archbishop Noailles died, he was succeeded by one named Vintimille, whom the people joked at as "Ventremille," or Thousand-stomachs, on account of his enthusiasm for good dinners; and somebody wrote on the old Archbishop's door that, having died, he had left his pig in his place! In such wise was the Christian religion put to shame in the eyes of France.

A very singular event occurred in Paris in 1727. A young Jansenist priest, who had lived as a vegetarian, slept without sheets, and had given all his goods to the needy, died amid much popular grief. It was bruited that his very grave possessed the power to heal disease. People crowded to his tomb; women fell into convulsions; paralytics boasted of cures. The envious Jesuits induced the government to close the cemetery gates, whereupon a bright intelligence wrote over the entrance: "By order of the King; God is forbidden to work any miracles here." The biography of the Jansenist priest was largely circulated. "Burn it," ordered the Romish Inquisition. Paris screamed

defiance, and increased its faith, and more miracles were wrought than ever!

In 1750, the government proposed to tax the income of the Church. The Church rebelled. Even the local Parliaments sided with the clericals, but rather because they resented the greediness of the French court than because they loved the priests; and the proposal dropped. The Church was still strong to a certain point. It could menace royalty in manifestoes. On the common people who opposed it the punishment of withholding the sacrament was inflicted. Dying Jansenists were refused extreme unction. The people retaliated with their scorn. At the Easter Carnival in 1756, it was observed that the most popular costumes worn by the merry-makers were those of bishops, monks, and nuns. Priests cursed, and the people laughed. Not long afterwards there were no Jesuits to laugh at. An attempt had been made to assassinate the King of Portugal, and the Jesuits were suspected of being concerned in it. In 1761, the Parliament of Paris condemned a number of Jesuit books to the public fire, and forbade the Jesuits to teach. A Jesuit who is prevented from educating the young is a soldier without weapons. In 1763, Louis XV. dissolved the Society of Jesus in France. But the 65,000 priests remained. This great army had no living message for the country. It is true that the Church was becoming more independent of Rome. The Gallican movement, as it was called, was making the Church more national. But the old world was passing away, and the Church did not know it. It wrangled about taxes instead of giving the nation light. In 1780 (nine years before the Revolution), Louis XVI. asked the clergy for a loan of £1,200,000. They grumbled, and assented on condition that the King paid back £40,000 a year for fourteen years. At the same time, by way of bargain, they requested Louis to curb the activity of a writer who had (they said) for sixteen years waged warfare against the Lord and his Christ. The writer was Voltaire. So the Church's contribution to the problem of France was, first, to lend money sullenly to the King; secondly, to seek to check the utterance of honest opinion. A Church of that kind is sure to decay. I quite believe that most of the 40,000 pastors in the villages were excellent men. All their virtues could not save a church that was jealous of its vested interests, and that dreaded the criticism of trained thinkers. No wonder the men of the Revolution turned fiercely upon the creed that failed.

F. J. GOULD.

### Acid Drops.

We have been pegging away at the Torrey-Alexander charlatany long enough. Now the better sort of Christians are waking up—and it is time they did. A number of Congregational ministers write to the *Yorkshire Daily Observer* explaining why they stand aloof from the Torrey-Alexander mission. They say that they believe Dr. Torrey's main teachings to be untrue; namely, the verbal infallibility of the Bible, eternal torment for those who do not accept Christ in this life, and the similar fate of those who die without knowing him. They protest in the strongest manner against Dr. Torrey's calling persons who deny such doctrines "infidels," and declaring that they "live in sin." They believe that this "mission" hinders Christianity instead of helping it, and "causes a large, intelligent, and good-living outside public to despise organised Christianity." This is good honest plain-speaking, and we are glad to see it, if only for decency sake.

Dr. Torrey replies to these Congregational ministers. He says that they are heretics, and hints that they should be driven out from their churches. The rest of his letter is simply an impudent denial that the Bible teaches that the world was made in six days of twenty-four hours each. Every honest man knows that this is what the Bible does teach. To make it mean anything else you have to take the words in a non-natural sense—which is only a euphemism for nonsense.

According to a *Daily Mail* correspondent at New York, two clergymen have had a jolly old row on board a train in the State of Kansas. Both are well-known Baptist ministers and bitter enemies of each other. Meeting unexpectedly on the train, the Rev. James Crandill drew a revolver with the intention of sending the Rev. Samuel Hayden to glory. There was a struggle, and two shots went off, but neither took effect. The madmen couldn't even hit each other. For of such is the kingdom of heaven.

The Birmingham *Daily Guardian* prints a letter received by the British and Foreign Bible Society from Kobe, Japan, dated March 15. Speaking of the Japanese troops at Hiroshima, stationed there preparatory to embarkation, and quartered on the residents, the writer says: "They are bright and eager for action. Their behavior in the town is remarkably free from drunkenness and rowdyism." So far so good. The writer is speaking of what he saw with his own eyes. But how foolish he must be to repeat the nonsense he may have heard about Japanese soldiers divorcing their wives before starting for the war, and even cutting the throats of their children sooner than leave them behind! Does the British and Foreign Bible Society, which puts this stuff forward as a reason for supplying them with "that Book which can teach them to prepare for eternal life," really believe that Japanese law allows parents to kill their children with impunity? Nothing seems too silly for missionaries to report in Christian England.

Prophet Dowie, who sailed from Australia to Europe on board the *Mongolia*, is sneered at by the organ of the Non-conformist Conscience for occupying the finest saloon cabin in the vessel. Well, we never heard of General Booth travelling third class. Generally speaking, Christian leaders affect poverty as long as they are obliged to. As soon as they can "do the grand" they take to it cheerfully.

Talk about "the cheek of the Devil"—what is it to the cheek of a man of God? At a recent meeting in the Metropolitan Tabernacle in opposition to the Licensing Bill, the Rev. A. W. Jephson said that "He thanked God for the great note which was struck at Manchester by John Morley, which put him in a line with the Christian Church." It would be hard to beat the ill taste and impudence of such an observation.

"If we lose Sunday," the Bishop of London cries, "we lose the best thing we've got." If "we" means *the clergy*, we agree with him.

That noble Passive Resister, the Rev. F. B. Meyer, has been delivering moral lessons to helpless congregations at Hanley. He was particularly severe on young people who marry on what he elegantly called "the hire system." The reverend gentleman forgot that the majority of young men and women in Christian England have nothing like his pleasant job and agreeable salary.

Christians profess to believe a lot which they never expect to have to practise. Hence the "striking character" of the anecdote told by the Rev. Bernard Upward, from Cheb-Kiang, at the annual meeting of the China Inland Mission at Exeter Hall. One day a Buddhist priest met a young Chinaman who had been converted. "I believe," said the Buddhist, "your religion teaches you that if a man strike you on one cheek, you are to turn the other?" "Yes, it does." "Then take that," and he gave the Christian a sounding smack on the face. It was very hard to restrain his anger, but the Christian simply said, "Thank you," and walked down to the river, the astonished Buddhist following him and talking the matter over.

This is very interesting, of course, but it proves very little—except that Christians are not used to taking slaps on the face quietly. No doubt a Christian would take one in that way under a direct challenge in the name of his creed. But it would be unsafe, if he were a decent-sized person, to assume that he would act in that way habitually. Caught on the hop, without reference to a religious argument, he would almost certainly give back slap for slap.

Dr. Guinness Rogers, the venerable Nonconformist, spoke some sound sense in discoursing at the Dutch Church, Austinfriars, on Canon Henson's views as to the future of the Bible. The great question, he said, was whether holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. If they did not, the special value of the Bible was gone. Moreover, he objected to the Bible being classed as literature. It stood apart from human literature and claimed to be the Word of God.

So far so good. But we are unable to follow Dr. Rogers when he says that, if we admit that holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, the Bible's authority remains, whatever theory we may have as to its inspiration. The question of *how* the Bible is inspired cannot be escaped in that easy way. It is precisely here that the Higher Critics have the old-fashioned orthodox believers on the hip. Once admit, as Dr. Rogers himself appears to do, that different parts of the Bible are of different values in point of "spiritual inspiration," and you are bound to formulate a theory of inspiration which will cover such discrimination, and at the same time remain water-tight itself on the sea of criticism. Men like Dr. Rogers may try to evade this difficulty, but the logic of events will prove too much for them in the end. They will have to face it at last.

Naturally the Church in Russia is beating the patriotic drum in order to move the peasants forward to the seat of war with a good stomach for fighting. But a very different note is sounded by what is called the Revolutionary party—the party that wishes to see Russia brought into the current of liberal politics. A paper called the *Vosstanie* (the *Revolt*), secretly printed, of course, and circulated with great difficulty, tells the workers that the defeat of Russia will be rather a good thing instead of a desperate evil. "The Japanese," it says, "drive our troops in flight because they are an educated, progressive, and free people—in fact, everything which our Czars prevent us being. They are therefore our friends. The success of Russia means the perpetuation of slavery and degradation, whereas the victory of Japan means a new era, for it will teach our dull-witted rulers that even predatory designs cannot be carried out by ignorant and enslaved instruments. Our wishes are therefore that Japan may continue her victories. Her triumph is ours."

Mr. George Herring has informed the Council of the Metropolitan Hospital Sunday Fund that he is once more prepared to add one quarter to the amount collected on June 12 up to £100,000. The condition he makes is that the money determining the amount he will give must be received through places of worship. We hardly know whether to consider it sectarianism or discretion. In other respects, at any rate, the offer is extremely generous.

Dr. Hutchinson's speech in the House of Commons on the Licensing Bill contained a remarkable passage. Christian nations, he said, had always drunk, and always would drink. From the marriage feast at Cana down to the last Academy banquet drink had been placed on the table. This is quite true, and those who deny it are either ill-informed or dishonest. No Christian can be an abstainer as a Christian. The New Testament does not, any more than the Old Testament, enjoin abstinence from alcoholic beverages. Ruskin was quite right in what he said on this subject in *Time and Tide*. "Nor," he said, "while there is record of the miracle at Cana (not to speak of the sacrament) can I conceive it possible without (logically) the denial of the entire truth of the New Testament, to reprobate the use of wine as a stimulus to the powers of life." Of course it is only a subterfuge to say that the Gospel Temperance people crusade not against wine, but against beer and spirits. The principle involved is the same in both cases. And on such a method of interpretation the actor in the story was a good exegete, who said that he did not "swear at all," but only at some; or the boy who said he did not "call his brother a fool," but only his sister.

We see that a foolish person called A. M. Stones has nearly caused "a serious disturbance" at Liverpool. According to the local press report which has reached us, there was "a strong body of police in the neighborhood, under Inspector Foulkes," in the interests of peace and order. Mr. Stones conducted a meeting at the top of Wavertree-road, in front of Edge-hill Church, and spent most of his time in denouncing Atheists, and particularly "Tom Payne"—who, by the way, was so far from being an Atheist that he actually wrote an eloquent paper to prove the existence of God. Mr. Stone's knowledge of Paine's character was on a par with his knowledge of Paine's opinions. Calling the author of the *Age of Reason* "a fraud and an impostor" may pass as merely a common display of Christian good temper. But saying that he "died a drunkard" is more precise. Mr. Stone said he could prove this by "statements made by Tom Payne's landlady." One would fancy that she still survives, and that Mr. Stone had interviewed her; but, as Paine has been dead nearly a hundred years, his landlady must also be far beyond cross-examination. We are not even aware that Paine had a landlady. He did not live in a third-floor back room, but in a house of his own. And his drunkenness is an invention of Christian charity.

Mr. Stone was interrupted (the report says) by cries of "Liar" and "Prove it." Such cries were very natural. Nevertheless it is a pity that a person like Mr. Stone was not quietly ignored. Vulgar ignoramus are best left to their natural obscurity.

It is hard to realise that we really are in the twentieth century. Journalists still continue to say that this or that is "the most something or other" of the present century; but perhaps nothing yet during its three years has appeared more calculated to make one doubt the fact than that Fra Angelico and Fra Filippo Lippi have a successor in a Dominican in London—a veritable friar whose studio is merely his little bare cell.

Browning gave us an idea of the conflict of celibate superstition and Art in his poem on Lippi; but Lippi did not betray the inner heart of monasticism in his pictures. Our present-day Fra Angelico, however, is untrammelled, and has executed a medallion in his cell—can the reader guess of what? Of a woman in diaphanous drapery with her child. He has called it "Her Treasure," and he exhibits it at the Royal Academy, where it hangs—a most powerful impeachment of monasticism.

The bitterest satires of the Protestant Reformers were the wood-cuts they produced of the cells of the "religious," and of their frenzied devotions before nude figures of Adam and Eve, and of Jesus on the Cross—figures to be later superseded by slim young fellows, wearing tights up to their armpits, sitting on the bed tinkling a lute. But these things were kept within the convent walls; even Fra Filippo Lippi, exuberant as his life was, did not force on the world the fact that his life in his cell was filled by creating figures of mothers "in Greek robes," with their infants. What a revelation of insanity! Here in the very heart of the activity and intellect of the world a man exists who has voluntarily renounced all human desires and relationships, but actually passes his time in dreaming of quasi-nude mothers and their infants, and then sends the product of his erotic dreams to—the Royal Academy, for the delectation of the gilded youth of a reactionary age!

Apropos of this, there is a curious story of the same convent of friars in London which contains this genius. Some years ago a Father Rudolph was a prominent member of the Dominican Order in England. But he became erratic, and, among other things, delivered from the pulpit Fenian lectures instead of sermons. He threw off his friarship, left the Roman Church, and started a little advanced sect of his own, which devoted itself to the Higher Criticism. Of course he married, and when his first baby came he wrote a diatribe in disguise of a letter to the community in London, urging them all to marry, and to awake to the duty of becoming parents. Apparently the "odious force" of that letter still hangs about the cells of that priory.

*To-Day* is a decent sort of paper in its fashion. It has one undeniable good quality; it refuses to flatter the orthodox faith. But why should it represent Spencer's criticism of Carlyle as merely one "great" man's "opinion" of another, and thus very refreshing to the average fool who likes to see his betters taken down a few pegs? As a matter of fact, Spencer says some very creditable things about Carlyle; his criticism is merely directed against Carlyle's claim to be considered a philosopher—which he was not, either by intellect or temperament. Unfortunately, the popular press is rather a parasite upon literature than any assistance to it, as Spencer himself observed in one of his later essays. It has a way of digging "bits" out of books, and offering them to the reader as accurate samples; whereas they give no idea at all of the books they are taken from.

We often note literary blunders in journals that probably fancy themselves much superior to the *Freethinker*. In *To-Day*, for instance, at the top of the column dealing with Carlyle and Spencer, there is an extract called "Dr. Johnson on Lord Chesterfield," which should have been "Dr. Johnson on Lord Bolingbroke." The "blunderbuss against religion and morality" was Bolingbroke's *Philosophical Works*, published after his death; and the "beggarly Scotchman" who "drew the trigger" was David Mallet, who saw them through the press.

It is remarkable what a conspiracy of silence there is against the *Freethinker* and everybody and everything connected with it. Even the writers for and against Christianity in the *Clarion* seem never to have heard of our existence. Of course they are perfectly aware of it, but they don't like to say so—for reasons not hard to divine. It is not surprising, therefore, that orthodox speakers up and down the country pretend to be quite ignorant of any Freethought

movement in Great Britain. Here is Mr. A. Henderson, M.P., for instance, talking on "Religion and the Democracy" in a Wesleyan chapel at Darwen, and telling his hearers that "The movement led by Charles Bradlaugh died down with his death." If this gentleman refers to the Freethought movement he is either misled or misleading. "Labor M.P.'s" (Mr. D. J. Shackleton was there too) ought to get up their facts before speaking, even upon such a subject as religion.

We have received a little waistcoat-pocket *Bible Companion*, containing tables for "the profitable daily reading of the holy scriptures." There is a Preface by R. Roberts (the Christadelphian, we presume), in which the statement occurs that "straightforward reading from Genesis is objectionable." We should think so.

Edward Slater, the Burton-on-Trent blacksmith, who made a murderous attack upon his wife with a razor, and afterwards cut his own throat, nearly severing his head from his body—had been suffering from religious mania. Before going into the house and attacking his wife he had been working in the garden, where the neighbors heard him singing and occasionally praying. Evidently the Lord pays no attention to the welfare of his "saints" although his tender mercies are said to be over *all* his works.

Mr. D. Lloyd-George, M.P., speaking at a young people's meeting at the City Temple, in connection with the Congregational Union, said that "Cromwell's principle was that the law of Christ should be the law of the land." Begging the honorable gentleman's pardon, Cromwell was never such a fool. He was not a Fifth Monarchy man. Nor is Mr. Lloyd-George universally accepted as an authority as to what *is* the law of Christ. Even the Congregationalists have not yet elected him their head spokesman. Moreover, if *he* wants the law of Christ made the rule for the law of the country, there are a good many people who do not—including a lot of Christians. The late Bishop of Peterborough plainly said that any society which based itself on the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount would go to ruin in a week.

We have another word for Mr. Lloyd-George. If the law of Christ should be the law of the land, there would be no statute or common law necessary; and what would become of gentlemen like Mr. Lloyd-George then? Every court would be supplied with a copy of the Four Gospels, and all cases would be decided by the words of Christ. What rare fun it would be! Mr. Lloyd-George, as a lawyer, may perhaps fancy that he would be kept very busy under such an arrangement. For the world has been quarreling for the best part of two thousand years over what Christ said and what he meant; and the lawyers, under Mr. Lloyd-George's suggestion, might think they had got hold of a good going concern.

The *British Weekly* is a Christian paper, and it has a column headed "The Woman's World." We turned to it last week to see what Christian women were expected to read about. The first paragraph opened in this way: "Dresses were very lovely at the Royal Literary Fund dinner." The second paragraph opens in this way: "There has been a large sale of black and white marabout stoles during the bitter weather of the first week of May." Such are the objects of deepest feminine interest, even in special Christian circles, after nearly two thousand years of Christianity. Anybody can see from this how the Christian religion has purified, enlightened, and elevated the world.

Dr. Goodrich, of Manchester, Chairman of the Congregational Union, addressing the recent annual assembly at the City Temple, London, said: "Our logical position is that education, so far as it is provided by the State, must be secular, and secular only." This statement was greeted with loud applause. But it was soon discounted. What logic dictates is one thing; what self-interest dictates may be quite another. The *practical* policy of the Congregationalists was voiced by the Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon. "Passive Resistance," this gentleman said, "is Nonconformity trying to be consistent to itself. Passive Resistance logically means secular education with local option for Bible teaching." He might as well have said that the logical policy was total abstinence with local option for beer. A paltrier dodge was never attempted. The calculation is that, as the vast bulk of the people are at least professed Christians, a local majority could be whipped up anywhere in favor of Bible teaching; and, if option is given for this, and nothing else, there will be Nonconformist religious teaching in all the provided schools in England. What contemptible hypocrites Free Churchmen are proving themselves in the present struggle!

At a meeting of the House of Convocation of Canterbury last week, the Dean of Salisbury proposed that a committee be appointed to report upon "the present methods of anti-Christian organisations, and the literature circulated by them in aggressive attacks upon Christian faith and morals." This *sounds* formidable, but we shall await the finding of this committee with equanimity.

We can safely assume that the last word in this resolution was not there accidentally. It would never do to let people know that the anti-Christian attack was levelled against Christian doctrines; they must be led to believe that it is an attack upon morality also, and so excite indignation where none might otherwise exist. The Dean, according to the report in the *Church Times*, "gave some illustrations of a kind of literature which is not only infidel but obscene, writings which endeavour to present in some form of exaggerated filthiness the most sacred convictions of other people." We should have liked the report to have been more precise, and to have been informed what these writings of exaggerated filthiness were. "Obscene" is a very elastic and comprehensive word in the mouth of a Christian Dean when discussing Freethought attacks on Christianity; and we rather fancy that almost any straightforward attack on Christianity would have that label placed on it in the House of Convocation.

William Hampari, a young Maori, working on the pious lay, has been sentenced at Bristol to six months' imprisonment. Among other little devices, he represented himself as wanting Bibles for a number of boys he was in charge of. He has a Bible for himself now.

The Lifeboat Demonstration at Coventry included a "pretty car" supplied by St. Michael's Baptist Sunday-school, on which children represented in tableau "The Introduction of Christianity into England" by St. Augustine. Whereupon a correspondent of the local *Herald* deplores that "It was left for a Nonconformist Sunday-school to teach by means of little boys dressed as monks that England owes her Christianity to the Church of Rome."

Why did Jesus Christ visit this planet? According to the Bishop of London, who is supposed to know, the Jews set an example of sobriety, of love of children, of thrift, and of self-control, which is a pattern to the British people. In point of domestic virtue, the Bishop says, the Jews are ahead of Britishers; and in the matter of the education of their children they are ahead of any class in this country. Again we ask, What did Jesus Christ come for?

There is much to be learned of contemporary history in advertisements, history which will not be regarded as worth speaking of for another two hundred years. We are alarmed at the initiation of a new slavery in South Africa; but what of survivals of ancient slavery in Eccleston-cum-Fossilham? How is "the world" to think of the offer to a substitute for the month of June of a nice church, vicarage and garden, *two maids*, coals, lights, vegetables, and a guinea?

Dr. Amory Bradford, a "great" American preacher, is giving this country the benefit of his inspired eloquence at present. Some samples of a sermon of his at Bradford are given in the *British Weekly*. "I thank Rudyard Kipling," the reverend gentleman said, "for that splendid phrase, 'the God of things as they are.' *Splendid*, is it? We are puzzled to know where the splendor comes in. Mr. Rudyard Kipling's reputation is based upon very different utterances.

Dr. Bradford, we are told, referred "rather gloomily to the state of American politics." He lamented the rapid multiplication of warships, the shame of lynching, and the aggravation of the race problem. Yet he declared that "Jesus was leading history." Which is *very* consoling.

The *Daily News* complains that the Zanzibar natives "fall a prey to Mohammedan energy." "Fall a prey" is distinctly good. Anyhow, it saves the said natives from falling a prey to the Christian missionaries. It appears that the Mohammedan leaders build a mosque and a school straight away. Three cheers for the school!

The *Ayr Observer* will get excommunicated if it doesn't mind. It tells a story of a clergyman who called at a house and found only a boy in. On the table was a Bible and a copy of Burns's poems. The clergyman asked the boy who used the Bible. The answer was, "Mi father uses it on Sabbath mornin's." Of course the man of God was delighted. "And does he read it aloud to you?" he inquired. "No," said the boy, "he sharpens his razor on the back o' it."



## Mr. Foote's Lecturing Engagements.

Sunday, May 22, N. S. S. Conference, Leeds, 10.30 and 2.30 ;  
Demonstration at Theatre Royal, 7

## To Correspondents.

F. R. T.—(1) The body certainly undergoes "renewal" in the sense that there is constant waste and repair of its organs—or, to speak more precisely, of its various tissues. But the waste and repair are very gradual, and the size, shape, and character of the organism are not seriously affected by them; any more than a nation is seriously affected by the waste of social tissue (so to speak) through the death-rate, and the repair of social tissue through the birth-rate. Neither on the material nor the spiritual theory is this "renewal" of any importance to the argument; for, whether the body be principal or agent, it is equally affected by the process in question. (2) With regard to the memory, it is proved that this *does* depend upon the brain, for it is affected by the state of the brain in health and in disease; and has been in some cases absolutely destroyed for considerable periods of time. If the brain does not remember, what is the soul doing in cases of loss of memory? Your orthodox friends have evidently taken a hasty and superficial view of the matter.

A. G. LYE.—See paragraph. We are glad to see that the committee of the Coventry Free Library are so free from bigotry. Sorry to hear that you did not get a single reply to your query, through our columns, as to what Free Libraries admit the *Freethinker* to their reading rooms. We are certain that there are several. It is a pity that Freethinkers are not a little more energetic on such occasions. Probably the explanation is that everybody thinks that somebody else will write.

T. REEMAN (Johannesburg) writes: "This is a town of over 100,000 whites, hundreds of whom are Freethinkers awaiting a leader. I have done a bit of scouting for the cause on the Market-square from time to time, and can testify that if we only had a competent leader here, a very powerful Secular Society could be formed. The public, as far as I can glean, would welcome it. Will you kindly help us with your advice how to form such a Society." We have written this correspondent privately, and only insert this extract from his letter in order to show our English readers that Freethought is spreading in South Africa.

J. L. G. MACKINNON.—It is as absurd as you say it is. See paragraph. Thanks.

I. B. G.—Thanks for cuttings. Glad to hear you have joined the Camberwell Branch.

A. J. W. (Wolverhampton).—The verses have some merit, but they are not quite up to our standard for publication. We think you will do better in time. But practice is necessary as well as aptitude. The safest rule is never to write verse unless you must. It is only real poets who express things best in metre. Take your own opening lines:—

The God of all things nothing knows,  
And nothing sees or hears.

Clearly the second statement is included in the first. You would not have repeated yourself in this way in plain prose. "Hears" was brought in to rhyme with "spheres."

"SAINT."—It is impossible to tell you when the Bible first entered this country. Nobody knows. The Church of England, as by law established, dates from the Protestant Reformation. Prior to that the Church in England was simply a branch of the Catholic Church, ultimately ruled by the Pope of Rome. William Cobbett's little *Legacy to Parsons* gives a good account of the whole matter.

T. ROBERTSON.—Sorry you will not be able to attend the Leeds Conference yourself, but Mr. J. F. Turnbull will be welcomed as a sturdy and sterling representative of Glasgow Freethought.

W. P. BALL.—Many thanks for cuttings.

HANLEY ATHEIST.—Always glad to receive press cuttings with material for "Acid Drops."

OLIVA.—Mrs. Besant was in India when we last heard of her before writing that answer last week. We see by the advertisement you send us that she is now in England again. Evidently she is still a Theosophist—which was the main point.

G. J.—Pleased to hear you are so delighted with Mr. de Caux's letter, and that you think he "must certainly be a man of exceptional ability." All the more so as it was you who called forth his letter.

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.

## Sugar Plums.

Delegates and visitors arriving at Leeds for the Whit-Sunday N. S. S. Conference should look out at the station for stewards who will wear mauve, green, and white badges. If they miss the stewards by any chance, they will find a reception room open at the Victoria Hall, close to the Town Hall, on Saturday evening from 7 to 10.30. The local secretary's address (in case of accident) is—Mr. George Weir, 61 Portland-crescent. The Conference itself takes place on Sunday morning and afternoon (10.30 and 2.30) at the Theatre Royal, Lands-lane. The evening public meeting is timed for 7 o'clock, and the list of speakers includes G. W. Foote, C. Cohen, J. Lloyd, H. P. Ward, and F. A. Davies. Mr. John Grange prefers to play the part of an auditor on this occasion.

Mr. Foote delivered the last of his course of lectures at Printers' Hall on Sunday evening. His address on "The Disappearance of the Supernatural Christ" was much applauded, but the audience was not a large one. This was doubtless partly owing to the wonderfully fine weather. But that is not the entire explanation. The conclusion has to be come to that the Printers' Hall experiment is not a success. Another meeting-place will have to be found in an open thoroughfare. This seems to be an essential condition nowadays, and it is no use struggling against the inevitable. Colonel Ingersoll's lecture-agent told us in America, "If we took the Colonel to a side-street we should have a side-street audience." Of course he was right.

Some friends offered to contribute financial support regularly if Mr. Foote went to work on Sunday evenings in an attractive hall in a well-known and accessible thoroughfare. He was unwilling to tax them, however, if he could avoid it. Hence the experiment at Printers' Hall. Unfortunately London is the most difficult place in England to obtain halls for Sunday meetings, and especially Freethought meetings.

Good reports of Mr. Cohen's evening lecture at Coventry appeared in the local *Herald* and *Reporter*. Apparently the press boycott is breaking down, and we are glad to see it.

The new Coventry Branch presented a memorial signed by some thirty persons, asking that the *Freethinker* might be allowed to lie on the newsroom tables. This request has been acceded to, and a weekly copy will be supplied for the purpose.

Mr. John Grange's two nights' public debate with Mr. D. F. E. Sykes at Slaithwaite and Marsden on "Is Christianity True?" was a great success from the point of view of numbers, the hall being crowded on each occasion. There is a report of the proceedings in the *Slaithwaite Guardian*. Mr. Grange is described as "young and fresh-looking, with a sturdy, well-built figure," and also as "a typical demagogue, strong-willed, sharp-witted, and a boy to talk." Mr. Sykes is described as bearing himself "with all his old-time dignity," whatever that may mean. We gather from the report, imperfect as it is, especially in regard to Mr. Grange's speeches, that Mr. Sykes knows very little about the subject in debate. We really wish Mr. Grange could have a foeman better worthy of his steel. We are glad to hear that, bold and uncompromising as his speeches were, Mr. Grange had a very hearty reception, and made a first-rate impression on what our correspondent describes as "two rather outlandish audiences." The debate is certain to do good. By which we mean that it is sure to create an interest in the Freethought side of the question.

The Freethought Publishing Company has just issued a new edition of Ingersoll's famous lecture on the "Mistakes of Moses." Not the book, mind, but the lecture. It makes a thirty-two page pamphlet. Print and paper are both good, and the price is only one penny. Three thousand copies of the first issue of ten thousand have been purchased by the Glasgow N. S. S. Branch for circulation through the outdoor meetings during the summer. Mr. Thomas Robertson, the Branch secretary, says the local "saints" are highly pleased with the lecture in its new dress. He considers it a "wonderfully cheap and effective propagandist weapon." "There are few Freethinkers," he adds, "so poor as not to be able to afford a dozen copies to give to their Christian friends; and if all recognised their duty in this respect the effect would be immediate and palpable. In the present state of religious unrest and transition a pamphlet such as this would be a material and determining factor in the ultimate attitude of many towards religion." A glance at the advertisement of this new Ingersoll pamphlet will show that copies can be had cheaply for gratuitous distribution.

The Glasgow Branch finished its winter's indoor work three weeks ago. The season has been phenomenally successful. Often the hall could not accommodate the crowds that came. Money has been spent liberally on propagandist literature. A large number of young men have been brought into touch with the movement. And the Branch has an undiminished surplus of over £200 in hand. The outdoor work is now being pushed forward vigorously. Mr. Baxter, the newsagent, will attend all lectures with literature. Four very fair speakers have been retained for the lecturing.

The members and friends of the Glasgow Branch have their annual excursion on Sunday next, June 5, to Strathblane. Brakes leave foot of Queen-street at 10.10 a.m. Tickets are 2s. for adults and 1s. for juveniles, and may be had from Mr. Baxter, Brunswick-street. Friends must bring their own provisions, but tea and milk will be provided for them. Those having tickets for sale might notify Mr. Baxter, how many they have sold, in order that the committee may know how many brakes are required.

M. Léon Furnémont, member of the Belgian parliament, and honorary secretary of the International Freethought Federation, writes as follows to Mr. Victor Roger, who is corresponding on this matter on behalf of the N. S. S. Executive:—"You will receive by the same post the program of the Congress at Rome and the report of my journey through Italy. You will see that everything is well prepared. The thing now is to send numerous delegations. I am awaiting the latest information from Rome, but it is more than probable that we shall get a reduction of 50 per cent. on the Italian railways. Please present my homage to the Conference of the National Secular Society, and tell it how much I am honored by the renewal of my vice-presidency. Very fraternal greetings to Mr. Foote, Miss Vance, yourself, and all Freethought friends."

*Dana*, described as "a magazine of independent thought," appears to be an effort of the Young Ireland party. It is published at sixpence monthly by Nutt, of London, and Hodges, Figgis, and Co., of Dublin. The first number opens with an editorial Introduction, from which we judge that the clerical party will not be represented in *Dana*. The magazine is to be an organ of "Humanity," and those who conduct it "understand by tolerance not a conspiracy of silence in regard to fundamental and essential matters, but a willingness to allow the freest expression of thought in regard to these." Which is a very delightful novelty in the case of an Irish publication. Mr. George Moore contributes a first instalment of a brightly-written "Moods and Memories." Mr. John Eglinton writes an admirable article on "The Breaking of the Ice," in which Father Sheehan is vigorously "slated." "We must understand the whole of this life," the writer says, "before we are to think of another." And he pertinently asks, "Would we think of another world if all went well with us in this?" Next comes an interesting article by E. Dujardin on the Abbé Loisy, the French priest who is giving such trouble to his Church by telling the truth about the Bible—including the New Testament. An excellent article on "Political and Intellectual Freedom" bears the signature of Frederick Ryan, which will be recognised by many of our own readers. Altogether this little magazine is a very notable sign of the change which is coming over Ireland, and we wish it all success.

Mr. W. Thresh, a new Freethought lecturer, speaks from the Victoria Park platform to-day (May 22) for the first time. We hope he will have as fine a meeting as Mr. Cohen had on Sunday.

An important letter from our old friend and far-off colleague, Mr. Joseph Symes, reaches us as we are going to press. It will appear in our next.

Sabbath desecration is spreading. A Sunday Concert Club is being organised at the Grafton Galleries. There is to be pictures, music, smoking, and a stage entertainment.

Mr. Foote's promised articles on Herbert Spencer's *Autobiography* will have to stand over for a week and perhaps a fortnight. Dr. Clifford's letter has to be dealt with this week, and next week's *Freethinker* will have to be largely devoted to the National Secular Society's Conference. By postponing the Spencer articles for a fortnight they will follow each other week by week without interruption, and this will be an advantage. After all, Spencer's *Autobiography* is not a book of the passing moment; it will keep a while, and will not lose any of its interest in the keeping.

## The Jewish Life of Christ.

"That there really lived such a person as Jeschu Ben Pandira, and that he was a disciple of the Rabbi Jehoshua Ben Perachia, I see no reason to doubt."—REV. BARING-GOULD, *The Lost and Hostile Gospels* (p. 62).

"The personal existence of Jesus as Jehoshua Ben Pandira can be established beyond a doubt." "When the true tradition of Ben-Pandira is recovered, it shows that he was the sole historical Jesus who was hung on a tree by the Jews, not crucified in the Roman fashion."—GERALD MASSEY, *The Historical Jesus and Mythical Christ* (pp. 2—4).

THE Jewish Life of Jesus presented by Mr. Mead<sup>¶</sup> from a Strasburg MS. does not differ materially from Wagenseil's edition. Many of the variations, we should say, are owing to the translators; some passages are transposed. Wagenseil's edition is divided into chapters and verses, like the New Testament; but the Strasburg MS. is divided into twelve parts.

Messrs. Foote and Wheeler point out<sup>†</sup> that the Jewish Life really ends with chapter three; this corresponds with part eight of the Strasburg MS., where the Jews, having discovered the hiding-place of the body of Jesus, tie cords to his feet, and dragging it round the streets of Jerusalem, threw it at the feet of Queen Helena, saying, "There is he who is ascended to heaven!"—Wagenseil's version stating that the wise men tied the body "to a horse's tail, brought and threw it down before the Queen, saying, Behold the man of whom thou hast said, He hath gone up to heaven." The remaining portion of Mr. Mead's version must have been added centuries later, for it contains references to the Nestorian heresy, the Finding of the Cross, and other anachronisms, and may be dismissed from further consideration. It should be borne in mind that the oldest MS. of the Jewish Life of Jesus is not earlier than the sixteenth century. Nor is this to be wondered at, seeing that the sleuth-hounds of the Inquisition were on the look-out for all copies of the work, and were in the habit of making immense bonfires of all Jewish manuscripts, and were not particular in consigning the owners of them to the same fate, just to illustrate the practical working of Christianity.<sup>‡</sup> As might be expected, the story contains some interpolations and alterations by later copyists.

Messrs. Foote and Wheeler pointed<sup>§</sup> out that verse 7, chapter 2 of their—Wagenseil's—version was "probably an interpolation." That their surmise was correct we have now proof, for it is omitted in the Strasburg MS. The passage in question was interpolated by some scribe to enlighten his readers as to the personality of Queen Helena, who plays a prominent part in the Jewish story. It runs as follows:—

"She was Queen Helena, the wife of King Janneus mentioned above; she reigned after the death of her husband. She is otherwise called Oleina, and had a son Nunbasus, the king otherwise called Hyrcanus, who was slain by his subordinate Herod.]]

Now the wife of King Janneus was named Salome, and hostile critics seizing on this dis-

\* *Did Jesus Live 100 B.C.?* The present article is a continuation of an article on Jesus Ben Pandira in *The Freethinker*, Feb. 7th and 14th, 1904.

† *The Jewish Life of Christ* (p. 35).

‡ Draper says of Torquemada: "This frantic priest destroyed Hebrew Bibles wherever he could find them, and burnt six thousand volumes of Oriental literature at Salamanca, under an imputation that they inculcated Judaism." (*Conflict Between Religion and Science*, p. 146.) Moncreu Conway tells us that the precious archives of the Synagogues "strewed the streets of many cities. On the 17th of June, 1244, seventy-four cartloads of the ancient MSS. were burned in Paris alone." (*Demonology*, p. 282.) On Sept. 9th, 1553, an immense bonfire, says Dr. Berliner, of Hebrew books was lit in the Campo dei Fiori. As late as 1753 thirty-eight wagon-loads of Hebrew books were collected from the Ghetto of Rome for examination. (See *Freethinker*, Aug. 9th, 1891.) As early as the reign of Valens "Many men of letters," says Milman, "in their terror destroyed their whole libraries, lest some innocent or unsuspected work should.....bring them unknowingly within the relentless penalties of the law." (*History of Christianity*, Vol. III., p. 43.)

§ *The Jewish Life of Christ*, p. 23.

|| *Ibid.*, p. 23. The Strasburg MS. merely says, "Now the rule of all Israel was in the hand of a woman called Helene." *Did Jesus Live 100 B.C.?* p. 261.

crepancy have declared that this Helena was the mother of Constantine, who discovered the three crosses on Calvary A.D. 365.\* Others have thought that the Queen Helene referred to was Queen Helene of Adiabene, a small province of Mesopotamia, on the Tigris, who became a Jewish proselyte somewhere about 30 A.D. On this point we are in agreement with Mr. Mead when he says "that it could ever have been seriously imagined that the sovereignty of the land of Palestine could have been in this Helen's hand, as is usually stated in the Toldoth when the Toldoth Helene is mentioned, is unthinkable." For, as he points out, the only queen of the Jews in whose hand was all the land was Jannai's wife Salome, who was sole ruler of the Jews from 78-69 B.C. Now Mr. Mead states that the Hebrew name Salome, in both Greek and Latin is given as Salina, and gives philological reasons for supposing that this was further transformed into Helena. However that may be, our oldest MS. is not earlier than the sixteenth century, and we believe that the earliest version would be found to speak of the wife of King Janneus, the name of Helena being introduced by some ignorant copyist.

We will now return to the passage relating to Jesus in the Babylonian Gemara† which may be summarised as follows. When King Jannai persecuted the Rabbis, Joshua ben Perachiah and Jesus fled to Alexandria. When peace was restored, Rabbi Simeon ben Shetach sent him word to come back. On the return journey, at a certain inn on the way, Jesus made some remark about the landlady's eyes, whereupon Joshua, calling him a godless fellow, directed that 400 horns should be brought, and put him under strict excommunication. Jesus often asked Joshua to take him back, but without avail. One day, as Joshua was reciting the Shema, Jesus came again. Joshua made a sign to him with his hand. Jesus, thinking he was altogether repulsed, went away, and set up a brickbat and worshipped it. Joshua now came to him and said, "be converted." But Jesus retorted that Joshua had taught him that "From him that sinneth and maketh the people to sin, is taken away the possibility of repentance." And the Teacher has said: "Jesus had practised sorcery and had corrupted and misled Israel."

Can we test this story by the facts of history? Undoubtedly we can. Jannai or Jannaeus, reigned over the Jews 104-78 B.C. During the greater part of his reign he was engaged in a bitter feud with the Pharisees, whom he had deprived of all their privileges. The Pharisees finally leading a rebellion against him, in which no less than 50,000 Jews are said to have fallen. The prisoners were taken to Jerusalem and 800 of them were crucified before Jannai, his wives, and concubines, the wives and children of the wretched Pharisees having been previously butchered before their eyes. After this atrocious act, 8,000 Rabbis are said to have fled the country.

Joshua ben Perachiah who, with Nithai of Arbela, formed the second of the famous "five pairs" of Talmudic tradition, was the most famous Rabbi of his time.

Simeon ben Shetach, who, with Judah ben Tabai, form the third "pair," was, according to the Talmud, the greatest hero of those times, and is said to have boldly withstood the tyrant Jannai to his face. This Simeon ben Shetach is also said to have been the brother of Jannai's wife Salome. It was no doubt owing to his influence that the Pharisees were recalled to favor after the death of Jannai, and until her death practically ruled the country.‡ Here we are upon the bed-rock of history.

And further, as Mr. Mead points out, there is a striking similarity between the state of Jewish affairs in Jannai's time and the numerous hangings

and burnings of Pharisees in the days of Herod (37-4 B.C.).

In the second chapter of Matthew we read that Herod, seeing he was mocked of the wise men, slew all the children of two years old and under in Bethlehem and all the coasts thereof.\*

Now, it is certain that no such atrocity ever took place. "If this massacre had ever really taken place, the fathers and mothers of these innocent children would certainly have appealed to Cyrenius against so frightful a crime. Neither Tacitus nor any contemporary historian mentions it. Josephus and the Rabbis, who were violent against Herod, are silent respecting it."† If Herod had committed such a frightful crime, his name would have been handed down in history as the greatest monster the world had ever known, instead of being relegated to a verse in Matthew, who expresses no surprise at such a monstrous crime, and calmly passes it by without comment. Can it be, asks Mr. Mead, that we have here some reminiscence of the 800 victims slaughtered in cold blood by King Jannai? It is highly probable. And when we find that the Jesus of the Talmud and the Gospel Jesus were both taken to Egypt to escape death, the inference becomes still more probable. "One of the most persistent charges of the Jews against Jesus," says Mr. Mead, "was that he had learned magic in Egypt." As we have seen, the oldest record of Jesus in the Talmud declares that he had "practised sorcery and had corrupted and misled Israel." In the Toldoth, or Jewish Life, the Queen is made to say: "Ye say he is a sorcerer, nevertheless every day he doeth great wonders."‡

W. MANN.

(To be continued.)

### The Essential Doctrines of Buddhism.

THE religious systems of India may all be grouped under the one name of Hinduism. Buddhism is no exception, for it arose as a mere branch of Hinduism. The Buddhists always acknowledged the existence of the Hindu Gods: and the Buddha himself figures in the modern Hindu pantheon as an incarnation of Vishnu. European scholars, with a vivid recollection of the religious history of their own continent, endeavored at first to account for the total disappearance of Buddhism from the land of its birth by the theory that it had been forcibly suppressed by means of a violent and prolonged persecution. Later research, however, has rendered this theory quite untenable. The successive reports of Chinese travellers and pilgrims prove that Buddhism really died out by gradual decay, extending over several centuries; and the influence of the Brahmins increased as the Buddhist faith declined.§ Buddhism, therefore, was merely a wave of Hinduism, and can only be adequately understood in connection with the latter.

Most religions regard philosophy with suspicion and dislike. In India the case is quite different. In other lands philosophy is a business of the laity; and it is apt to come into conflict with religious pretensions—even in Greece the philosophers had to be cautious. But in India it was the care and study of the priestly class; and although it has been by no means confined to that class, yet the Brahmins have been its chief expounders. Consequently Hindu religion and philosophy have always acted and reacted upon one another. The Philosophy revolved

\* The Holy Spirit who inspired Matthew being evidently under the impression that Bethlehem was on a lake.

† *The Gospel History*, p. 72.

‡ Strassburg MS. The Talmud says that Jesus brought enchantments out of Egypt in the cutting in his flesh. In the Toldoth the enchantments are performed by the holy name which Jesus brings out of the Temple of Jerusalem in the cutting in his flesh.

§ *Buddhist India*. By T. W. Rhys Davids (London, 1903), p. 319.

\* See the Rev. Baring-Gould *The Lost and Hostile Gospels*, p. 84.

† See *Freethinker*, Feb. 14.

‡ See Mead, *Did Jesus Live 100 B.C.* chapter viii. Mr. Mead takes his facts from the Talmud, Josephus, and Schurer.

in a very limited orbit ; as is usual with philosophies. In fact, as Professor Max Muller put it :—

“ We find a number of ideas in all, or nearly all, the systems of Indian philosophy, which all philosophers seem to take simply for granted, and which belong to no one school in particular.”\*

The chief of these ideas are the following :—

1. Metempsychosis.
2. Pessimism.
3. Karma.

Christianity shirks most of the problems of the soul. Every year 42,000,000 persons are born into the world ; but we are left quite in the dark as to the source of this avalanche. About the same number of people die every year ; so that there must exist somewhere a stupendous warehouse, containing all the souls that have ever lived, with capacity for more. To the Hindu the problem would be even greater ; for he does not limit the idea of the soul to the human species ; but each living thing, whether animal, insect, tree, or grass, is equally credited with the possession of one. If, therefore, there is a perpetual creation of souls, we would have to look forward to the time when they would be packed so tightly into the universe that there would be no room for anything else. This difficulty is overcome by the doctrine of the conservation of souls. No fresh stock is being created ; but the same souls are being continually used up again, and they pass through and through entirely different bodies, and thus the teeming tide of life is kept flowing on. This, then, is the doctrine of metempsychosis, or transmigration of souls.

Pessimism is the fundamental view of all religions. If existence were admitted to be a pleasant thing, then they would have no ground for obtruding themselves upon mankind. Christianity is just as pessimistic as any other faith. The Prince of this world is the Devil ; and the Christian looks beyond.

This world is all a fleeting show  
For man's illusion given.  
The smiles of joy, the tears of woe,  
Deceitful shine, deceitful flow.  
There's nothing sure but Heaven !

But the Hindu is clearer-sighted than the Christian. He does not suffer himself to be beguiled by the lazy belief that heaven is necessarily perfect. The Hindu perceives that if this world is bad, any other state of existence is probably equally bad. All stages of life have their trials and sorrows ; and the histories of the gods show that those blessed beings have their trials and conflicts, too. Hence it is useless to dream of dodging sorrow by flying to another existence. Evil is a condition of being—and to exist is to suffer. These pessimistic views have no doubt been enhanced by the enervating climate of India, as well as by the course of life prescribed by Brahminical custom. The young Hindu is recommended to be placed under the care of some teacher at the age of seven. For ten or twelve years he is to learn the Vedas, etc., by heart ; and then he is to marry and enter into the duties of life. When his sons had grown up, he was recommended to retire from the world and meditate on philosophy. Such an individual, after a satiety of such delights as the world affords, and sobered or soured by experience of its sorrows, was naturally likely to adopt the pessimistic view : hence it is not wonderful that pessimism should be the universal standpoint of the Hindu philosophies.

*Karma* is not so easily grasped by the Western mind. The word itself means “ deed ” or “ action ” ; and the doctrine of the Karma asserts that every thought, word, and act goes on working through all ages. Christianity is continually endeavoring to demonstrate that an effect can be produced without an adequate cause. Hinduism, on the other hand, is unable to imagine that a cause can be without an effect. The science of acoustics assures us that when a sound is uttered a vibration of the air is set up, and this vibration travels on for an unknown distance ; and so Indian philosophy teaches that each action is the commencement of an endless train of

other actions vibrating for ever. This doctrine, superposed upon the theory of metempsychosis, can be used to explain many problems of life. A man is born blind ; that is because in a past life he used his eyes improperly. But his hearing is good ; that is because he was diligent in learning the Vedas. The explanation may be made exact in every case ; for the simple reason that it is a mere repetition of the case. The modern doctrine of Heredity has very much in common with the Hindu theory of Karma. We are told that a man's constitution and his character have been determined for him by a chain of ancestors. If a man has red hair, though his father and mother had not, we are to suppose his great-grandfather had that complexion. If he is fond of whisky, whereas his father was a Good Templar, we are assured that one of his forbears was a dreadful drunkard. Thus everything can be accounted for by merely accusing one's ancestors of all one's faults, and crediting them with all one's virtues. We frequently find that two brothers are totally different in physique and intellect ; and although the doctrine of Heredity is somewhat staggered, we are brazenly told that the two young men have taken on the characteristics of two distinct ancestors. The Hereditarians, however, are totally unable to predict whether the children of a given couple will turn out sages or imbeciles ; and when we reflect that a doctor cannot tell you whether your next baby will be a boy or a girl, it is obvious that the medical profession knows practically nothing of birth and inheritance, however much it may prate of Heredity. In any case, however, the European and the Hindu speculations are the same in character. Both teach that there is a chain of cause and effect between persons in the present life and persons in a past one ; though in one case the persons are supposed to be connected by physical descent, in the other by a spiritual succession.

These three ruling ideas of Hinduism being properly understood, we have only to consider the Buddhist modifications of them.

Private persons think that the possession of power and wealth confers the highest bliss. Thus St. John the Divine, who probably never owned ten pounds in his life, pictured the New Jerusalem as a city paved with gold. But Gautama Buddha was a royal prince ; his childhood and early manhood had been spent in palaces, where he experienced everything that wealth and power could supply. The condition of the heavenly gods was only an exaggeration of the life of an earthly king, and therefore Gautama knew better than to imagine that divinity brought bliss, any more than earthly royalty. The pessimistic philosophy of Hinduism assured him that existence of every kind was evil. The doctrine of transmigration emphasised this feeling of hopelessness, for it condemned the soul to an endless cycle of being. Life would continue to revolve for ever and for ever in states of greater or less misery, and it was impossible to break away from existence. After long meditation upon these problems, a light suddenly broke into his mind. The idea of this endless cycle was really the offspring of the idea of the existence of a soul. If, therefore, there was no such thing as a soul, the cycle could come to a sudden stop. Consequently it is the fundamental teaching of Buddhism that there is no soul. Writers who have taken their knowledge at second-hand have strenuously denied that this was Gautama's contribution to philosophy. They have argued that, because Buddhism accepted the idea of transmigration, it must believe in a soul that does transmigrate. It was equally difficult to convey the Buddhist theory to the Hindus ; and as a consequence all the manuals of Buddhism commence by formally refuting the idea of the existence of a soul.\*

Some people say the breath is the soul ; and, as the same Hebrew word is used for both these conceptions, it seems that that was the view of the writers of the Old Testament. But the Buddhist

\* *The Six Systems of Indian Philosophy* (London, 1899), p. 137.

\* *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xxxvi., p. xxi.

argues that when a musician blows a trumpet his breath goes out at the other end of the instrument, and there is nothing to show that the same breath ever returns to him again. Therefore the breath is not an indwelling property of the body.

Others talk of a living principle within, which sees through the eye, hears through the ear, tastes through the tongue, and thinks with the mind. But the Buddhist replies that these powers are not united. A man in a palace can see through any window he chooses; but one cannot see with the ear or with the hand, but only with the eye. If a spoonful of vinegar is placed upon a man's tongue he can tell that it is sour, but if he be placed in a tub of honey he cannot tell if it be sweet or not. If we put our heads out of a window we can see more; and, by the same token, if there were a soul in a man, and his eye was torn out, then the soul ought to be able to stretch itself forward and see more; but, as a matter of fact, in such a case the man would see nothing. Thus there is no soul inside to look out and see.

When the Buddhist is then asked what constitutes an individual, he replies that the aggregation of the bodily organs constitutes him; just as the body, the axle, the pole, and the wheels, when joined together, constitute a chariot. All these things thrown promiscuously together do not make a chariot, but only when each part is in its proper place.\*

The western mind would think that the Buddha had removed the chief prop of Hinduism by rejecting the soul, and that the edifice would naturally collapse. But Gautama was of a different opinion. To him, it appeared that the Karma would still go on. He was unable to imagine that an action could take place without entailing future consequences. Hence, although he disposed of the idea that there was any soul to be transferred to a future body, he so far retained the idea of metempsychosis as to imagine that immediately one individual died, another individual was born with the inheritance of the consequences of all the acts of the first one. If a man planted acorns, and some years after another man came and took away the acorns from the resultant oak trees, the latter would be adjudged a thief. It would be useless for him to argue that the acorns he took were not the acorns which the forester had planted, because it is evident that they were the result of the work (or Karma) done by the forester and were consequently *his* property. Thus the work remains, and must reveal itself. If one takes a lighted lamp and lights another lamp, there is no transmigration; yet the second derives something from the first. If a scholar learns a verse from his teacher, there is no transmigration, yet the verse is reborn in the scholar's mind.† Therefore, as the flame and the verse can be renewed in a fresh environment, without any transference, the Buddhist can see no difficulty in the doctrine that the decease of one individual lights up life in another individual that will carry on his cycle.

The vehicle of the transference of the Karma is the universal longing for life and its concomitants. When the saint has extinguished this longing, he flickers out like a flame that has no fuel, and no fresh individual can result. There being no soul to live on, the cycle of existence can be finally broken, and sorrow can no longer continue. That is the message the Buddha proclaimed to the world; and the success of his teaching shows that it was felt to be a distinct advance in Hindu philosophy.

CHILPERIC.

#### DIFFERENCE OF OPINION.

If we are to give pain to anyone because he thinks differently from us, we ought to begin by inflicting a few smart stripes on ourselves; for both upon light and upon grave occasions, if we have thought much and often, our opinions must have varied.—*Landor*.

\* *The Questions of King Milinda*, by T. W. Rhys Davids, vol. i., p. 45.

† *Ibid.* p. 111.

## Correspondence.

### ART AND FREETHOUGHT.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Mr. Geo. Trebells, in his appreciative notice of Verestchagin, makes one mistake when he says that no artist since the fifteenth century has had the courage to paint Freethought pictures. Jean Paul Laurens is a great modern French artist, and the majority of his pictures are avowedly against the Churches. His picture, "Releasing the Prisoners of the Inquisition," adorns the walls of the Luxembourg. The *Windsor Magazine* about two months ago contained an article on Laurens, emphasising his Freethought and reproducing several pictures, including "Men of the Holy Office"—as finely satirical as Verestchagin himself. Being interested in the question, I should like to know what particular Freethought artist Mr. Trebells had in mind when mentioning the fifteenth century?

Personally, I think the modern age has produced more Freethought pictures than any other period of the Christian era. Artists do not usually put their whole efforts to propagandism—they cannot afford it. But every now and then they blossom out, as it were. Sir John Millais, for instance, painted several works which will have a good effect—"St. Bartholomew's Eye," "Release of a Heretic," etc. Then there is Geo. Frederick Watts, an avowed philosophical artist, and one of the greatest of English ones. Writers like Mr. Stead and Mr. Begbie take a liberty by trying to insinuate that he is a "kind" of Christian—anything, in short, but what he says he is—an Agnostic. Watts's picture of "Jonah" in the Tate Gallery is both realistic and satirical. Jonah in this work looks very dirty and very mad.

Charles Keene was another famous *Punch* man whose Freethought came out in his pictures, even more so than Du Maurier's. Keene's Freethought is affirmed in his biography.

On the whole, I suggest that modern Art has nothing to be ashamed of in regard to its Freethought. G. D.

### THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—It would be slightly absurd if I sent you (for Mr. T. J. Thurlow's eye) a list of persons whom I know to be satisfied with Voltaire's services as "the grand terminus of human progress." I will simply say that, having lived a good while in the Freethought world, I have often met people who practically regard Voltaire's critical attitude as the last necessary step in mental reform. Of course, they never say that in so many words.

As I consider the main consequences of the French Revolution to be entirely beneficent in quality, though incomplete in scope, it is needless for me to follow Mr. Thurlow's protest against any supposed complaint. Though the Revolution was democratic, it could not possibly raise the whole proletariat to immediate citizenship. That work has still to be accomplished. I have seen too many hungry children and too many honest people in poverty to be moved by the fact that many working-people are wasteful. Even if they are, the case for reform is strengthened.

F. J. GOULD.

### Prize Essays.

THE ETON COLLEGE BEAGLES.

The Committee of the Humanitarian League offers three prizes of £10, £3, and £2, respectively, for the best essays on the cruelty of "The Eton College Hare-Hunt."

The subject may be treated from the following points of view:—

- (1) The inherent cruelty of hare-hunting.
- (2) The special objections to encouraging schoolboys in blood-sports.
- (3) The advantages of the drag-hunt as a substitute for the hare-hunt.

Literature bearing on these points can be obtained free from the office of the Humanitarian League; but writers of essays are at liberty to deal with the subject as they choose.

The essays, which should be either typed or written in a clear, legible hand on only one side of the paper, must not exceed *three thousand words* in length. A *nom de plume* may be adopted, but in every case the writer's full name and address should be sent in a sealed envelope.

All essays must be received by the Hon. Secretary of the Humanitarian League, at 53 Chancery-lane, London, W.C., before June 30, 1904. The result will be announced in the August number of the League's journal, the *Humanitarian*, and the two best essays will be printed by the Humanitarian League.

The Hon. Secretary will return any of the unsuccessful essays if stamps are sent for the purpose, but he cannot undertake to enter into correspondence about them.

**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.**

**EAST LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY** (Ethical Hall, Libra-road, Old Ford, E.): 7.30, Miss Madarns (Co-operative Union), Lantern Lecture, "A Century of Co-operation."

**SOUTH LONDON ETHICAL SOCIETY** (Masonic Hall, Camberwell New-road): 7, Alderman Sanders, L.C.C., "Rudyard Kipling and the Spirit of Militarism."

**WOOD GREEN ETHICAL SOCIETY** (Fairfax Hall, Portland-gardens, Harringay): 7.15, Harold Hare, "Tolstoy and his Teachings."

**OUTDOOR.**

**BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N.S.S.** (Victoria Park, near the Fountain): 3.15, Mr. Thresh, "How I was Freed from the Fetters of Faith."

**CAMBERWELL BRANCH N.S.S.:** Station-road, 11.30, W. J. Ramsey; Brockwell Park, 3.15, W. J. Ramsey; 6.30, J. W. Needes, "The Basis of Morality."

**KINGSLAND BRANCH N.S.S.** (corner of Ridley-road, Dalston): 11.30, E. Pack.

**WEST HAM BRANCH N.S.S.** (The Grove, Stratford): 7, R. P. Edwards.

**COUNTRY.**

**GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY** (110 Brunswick-street). Open-air Meeting (Glasgow Green, Jail-square): 4, Mr. McNulty and Mr. Glen.

**LEEDS:** Theatre Royal N.S.S. Conference Demonstration.

**THE BEST BOOK**

**ON NEO-MALTHUSIANISM IS, I BELIEVE, TRUE MORALITY, or THE THEORY and PRACTICE OF NEO-MALTHUSIANISM.**

By J. R. HOLMES, M.M.L., M.V.S., M.N.S.S.

160 pages, with portrait and autograph, bound in cloth, gilt lettered. Price 1s., post free.

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

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

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

Orders should be sent to the author,

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

**Introduction to the History of Civilisation in England**

BY HENRY THOMAS BUCKLE

New and Revised Edition with Annotations and an Introduction by JOHN M. ROBERTSON.

*Demy 8vo, bound art linen, price Five Shillings*

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.

2 NEWCASTLE-STREET, FARRINGDON-STREET, LONDON, E.C.

**TWO SECULAR BURIAL SERVICES**

PRICE ONE PENNY.

THE FREETHOUGHT PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.,

2 NEWCASTLE STREET, FARRINGDON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

**Pamphlets by C. COHEN.**

An Outline of Evolutionary Ethics - 6d.

Foreign Missions: Their Dangers and Delusions. Full of Facts and Figures. A Complete Exposure of the Missionary Movement - 9d.

What is the Use of Prayer - 2d.

Evolution and Christianity - 2d.

Pain and Providence - 1d.

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

**SELF-MEASUREMENT FORM.**

<b>COAT</b>	Length of coat at back	inches
	Half width of back	"
	Full length of sleeve	"
<b>VEST</b>	Round chest over vest	"
	Round waist over vest	"
<b>TROUSERS</b>	Centre of back to opening	"
	Centre of back to full length	"
	Round waist	"
	Round seat	"
	Length inside leg	"
	Length outside leg	"
	Round thigh	"
	Round knee	"
	Round bottom	"

**TRY OUR 10s. 6d. GENTS' BRADLAUGH BOOTS.**

200 SPLENDID ALL WOOL

SQUARE CUT FRONT

**LOUNGE SUITS.**

BLACK, BLUE, BROWN, OR GREY.

NEWEST AND FINEST GOODS.

Men's, 25s. Youths', 21s.

ODD TROUSERS, 7s. 6d.

FILL MEASUREMENT FORM UP CAREFULLY.

FIT GUARANTEED. SEND AT ONCE.

**J. W. GOTT,** Warehouse—2 UNION ST., BRADFORD, Branch—20 Heavitree Rd., Plumstead, S.E.

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.

**THE BOOK OF GOD**

IN THE LIGHT OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

By G. W. FOOTE.

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

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

Bound in Stout Paper Covers - - - 1/-  
Bound in Good Cloth - - - - - 2/-

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

**LITERATURE FOR DISTRIBUTION**

In exchange for a P.O. for 1s. 6d, or 2s. 6d. the Freethought Publishing Company, Limited, will send a parcel of well-assorted shop-soiled PAMPHLETS, carriage paid, very suitable for outdoor distribution.

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

# 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 SECULAR SOCIETY,

(LIMITED)

Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered Office—2 NEWCASTLE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Chairman of Board of Directors—MR. G. W. FOOTE.

Secretary—E. M. VANCE (Miss).

This Society was formed in 1898 to afford legal security to the acquisition and application of funds for Secular purposes.

The Memorandum of Association sets forth that the Society's Objects are:—To promote the principle that human conduct should be based upon natural knowledge, and not upon supernatural belief, and that human welfare in this world is the proper end of all thought and action. To promote freedom of inquiry. To promote universal Secular Education. To promote the complete secularisation of the State, etc., etc. And to do all such lawful things as are conducive to such objects. Also to have, hold, receive, and retain any sums of money paid, given, devised, or bequeathed by any person, and to employ the same for any of the purposes of the Society.

The liability of members is limited to £1, in case the Society should ever be wound up and the assets were insufficient to cover liabilities—a most unlikely contingency.

Members pay an entrance fee of ten shillings, and a subsequent yearly subscription of five shillings.

The Society has a considerable number of members, but a much larger number is desirable, and it is hoped that some will be gained amongst those who read this announcement. All who join it participate in the control of its business and the trusteeship of its resources. It is expressly provided in the Articles of Association that no member, as such, shall derive any sort of profit from the Society, either by way of dividend, bonus, or interest, or in any way whatever.

The Society's affairs are managed by an elected Board of Directors, consisting of not less than five and not more than twelve members, one-third of whom retire (by ballot) each year,

but are capable of re-election. An Annual General Meeting of members must be held in London, to receive the Report, elect new Directors, and transact any other business that may arise.

Being a duly registered body, the Secular Society, Limited, can receive donations and bequests with absolute security. Those who are in a position to do so are invited to make donations, or to insert a bequest in the Society's favor in their wills. On this point there need not be the slightest apprehension. It is quite impossible to set aside such bequests. The executors have no option but to pay them over in the ordinary course of administration. No objection of any kind has been raised in connection with either of the five wills by which the Society has already been benefited.

The Society's solicitors are Messrs. Harper and Battcock, 23 Rood-lane, Fenchurch-street, London, E.C.

*A Form of Bequest.*—The following is a sufficient form of bequest for insertion in the wills of testators:—"I give and bequeath to the Secular Society, Limited, the sum of £— free from Legacy Duty, and I direct that a receipt signed by two members of the Board of the said Society and the Secretary thereof shall be a good discharge to my Executors for the said Legacy."

Friends of the Society who have remembered it in their wills, or who intend to do so, should formally notify the Secretary of the fact, or send a private intimation to the Chairman, who will (if desired) treat it as strictly confidential. This is not necessary, but it is advisable, as wills sometimes get lost or mislaid, and their contents have to be established by competent testimony.

## 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.

## A GLASGOW FREETHOUGHT NEWSAGENT

D. BAXTER,

32 BRUNSWICK STREET

Mr. Baxter is the Glasgow Branch's newsagent at the Secular Hall on Sundays. He is energetic and trustworthy. Orders committed to him will receive prompt and proper attention. His regular place of business is 24 Brunswick-street, where he keeps a good stock of all advanced literature. Local "saints," and travelling Freethinkers who happen to be in Glasgow, should give him a call.—G. W. FOOTE

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

## Thwaites' Celandine Lotion.

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

Cullpeper says in his Herbal Book that if the virtues of Celandine were generally known it would spoil the spectacle-makers' trade. 1s. 1½d. per bottle, with directions; by post 14 stamps.

G. THWAITES,

HERBALIST, 2 CHURCH ROW, STOCKTON-ON-TEES.

## Protection or Free Trade

By HENRY GEORGE.

Half Price, Sixpence. Postage 2½d.

# The Pioneer

A POPULAR PROPAGANDIST ORGAN  
OF  
ADVANCED IDEAS.

CONTENTS FOR MAY:—

Shakespeare's Day  
A New Prodigal Son  
The Birmingham Mikado  
Mostly Fools!  
The Parson in Politics  
Questions Concerning Women  
Newman's "Apologia"

Russia and Japan  
Old Nick  
Intemperate Temperance  
The King in Ireland  
Comte on Monotheism  
Human Love  
Dr. Gardner's Lectures

The Blackmore Memorial  
A Blatant Revivalist  
The Thibet Mission  
The Mad Mullah  
Ingersoll on Morality  
Shakespeare and Hereafter  
The Present Position of the Bible

PRICE ONE PENNY.

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

A MIRACLE OF CHEAPNESS

## "MISTAKES OF MOSES"

BY

COLONEL R. G. INGERSOLL

(THE LECTURE EDITION)

Thirty-two pages, good print, good paper

ONLY A PENNY

Twelve copies post free for tenpence for gratuitous distribution

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 NEW TRACT.

## "GOD AT CHICAGO"

BY

G. W. FOOTE

Reprinted from the *Freethinker*. Four pages, well printed, on good paper.

Sixpence per 100—Four Shillings per 1,000. Postage 3d. per 100; 1s. per 1,000.

(These are special cheap rates, for propagandist purposes).

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