

# THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXV.—No. 46

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1905

PRICE TWOPENCE

I know few Christians so convinced of the splendor of the rooms in their Father's house, as to be happier when their friends are called to those mansions, than they would be if the Queen had sent for them to live at Court: nor has the Church's most ardent "desire to depart, and be with Christ," ever cured it of the singular habit of putting on mourning for every person summoned to such departure. On the contrary, a brave belief in death has been assuredly held by many not ignoble persons; and it is a sign of the last depravity in the Church itself, when it assumes that such a belief is inconsistent with either purity of character, or energy of hand.—RUSKIN.

## Wait Till You Die.

PASCAL remarked that, whether Christianity were true or false, the Christian was on the safe side; and Diderot replied that the priests and apologists of Mohammedanism, or any other creed, could say the very same thing with equal force. The argument, if it be an argument, implies the possibility of error, and what applies to one religion applies to all. The votaries of every creed may be mistaken if there is no absolute certitude; or, if there should be one true religion among the multitude, and but one, only the devotees of that single faith can be on the safe side. But as no one knows *which* is the true religion, it follows, according to the law of probabilities, that the odds are greatly against any particular religion being the right one. The Christian therefore would have one chance of being right, and nine hundred and ninety-nine chances of being wrong. He has thus one chance in a thousand above the Atheist.

But, on the other hand, if all religions but one are certainly wrong, what is the chance of a single one being certainly right? Does not the Christian's slight percentage of safety fade into something quite inappreciable in the light of this question? And is what is left—if *anything* is left—an adequate price for the abnegation of manhood? Would it tempt an honest man, with a sense of human dignity, to play fast and loose with his intellect, and accept a creed because it appeals to his selfish hopes and fears? Could such a slender chance of profit in the next life compensate for slavery in this life?

If belief is the safe side, the proper course is to believe *everything*. And it is useless to cry that this is impossible. Faith enables men to believe against reason, and one act of credulity is little easier than a thousand. He whose creed is determined by his fears should give free scope to such emotions. If they are his guides let him follow them. Why should he argue when argument may mislead? Why should he stumble at trifles when he has surmounted the first great obstacle to credulity? Let him believe all the religions of the world at once. He can do

this as easily as he can believe in the Trinity. And having embraced all, he may rest satisfied that if there be a true religion he undoubtedly possesses it.

We do not suppose, however, that this reasoning will have any effect on Christians, Buddhists, Brahmins, Mohammedans, or Jews. But that very fact shows the hollow character of the argument from which we started. When the Christian talks about the safe side he is only displaying the weakness of his faith, and appealing to timidity when he has no further appeal to reason.

The argument of "the safe side" would have no pertinency, even with the imbecile, if man were immortal. It seeks advantage from the fact that every man must die. It tries to paralyse reason with the clutch of fear.

How frequent is the superstitionist's remark, "Wait till you come to die!" He does not always use these very words, but this is the meaning of all his verbiage. He forgets, or does not know, that philosophy destroys the terror of death. A rational man is aware of the truth expressed by Mill, that death is but one incident in life, and often the least important. He recognises with Bacon that we die daily. He knows that every hour is a step towards death. He does not play, like an ostrich, with the universal law of mortality; nor, on the other hand, does he allow the tomb to cast its chill obscurity over the business and pleasure of life. He lives without hypocrisy, and when the time comes he will die without fear. As Hamlet says, "the readiness is all." Another word also comes from the wisest of men—"Cowards do often taste of death; the valiant die but once."

A belief that will do for life will do for death. The religionists prove this themselves. Whatever a man is confident of is sustaining. The Christian dies a Christian, and the Mohammedan a Mohammedan. The one has dying visions of angels—or may be of devils; the other sees heaven burst open, and the black-eyed hours of paradise beckon him with rosy fingers. What they leaned on in life supports them in death. Its truth or falsity makes no difference at that moment.

Freethinkers are sustained by *convictions*. Intellect and emotion concur in their case. They have no visions of angels or devils, but dear loved faces are better than phantoms, and he who has done a little good in the world, however humbly and obscurely, may dream of the happier and nobler days to come, when true words and good deeds will have brought forth the glorious fruit of happiness for the children of men.

We do not mean to assert that no Freethinker, at any time, ever relapsed on his death-bed. Such cases have apparently occurred during life, and while one particular religion is in the ascendant it is not difficult to understand them. The relapses are always to the creed a man finds about him, or to the creed

of his childhood. They simply prove the power of environment and early training, and that a man needs all his strength to stand against big majorities. At best they are cases of mental pathology.

Great historic Freethinkers have always died true to their convictions. They were used to standing alone. For ample proof of this the reader is referred to our *Infidel Death Beds*. And when smaller Freethinkers are numerous enough they avoid the greatest danger of physical weakness. It is easy for Christian relatives or friends to pester a dying Freethinker; it is easy even, in the worst moments of weakness, to put words in his mouth. But if Freethought friends visit him, he feels strengthened and relieved. Allies may well be needed, sometimes, in such a battle with bigotry.

After all, "Wait till you die!" is an argument of folly and cowardice. What can we conjecture of any other life except from our experience of this? On this earth reason is the safe side, honesty is the safe side, humanity is the safe side; and what is the safe side here is likely to be the safe side elsewhere.

G. W. FOOTE.

[Being more than usually busy, partly in consequence of provincial Sunday lecturing engagements so many weeks in succession, and partly through a rush of special correspondence, I have ventured to reprint an old article of mine, which will be new to most of my readers, on a subject that I have met with many inquiries about lately. They who read this article all those years ago may not object to reading it again. I hope to have something of exceptional interest for my readers next week.—G. W. F.]

### Mythopeic Christianity.

IT may be freely admitted, at the outset, that the title of this article is open to the charge of tautology. Mythopeic is made up of two Greek words meaning "myth" and "make," and it may well be asked how it is possible to have a Christianity that is not mythopeic? Well, I plead guilty to the charge, merely remarking that for the present I am concerned with the preachers of Christianity who are myth-makers by training and inclination; or if it is objected that they do not *make* the myths with which this article deals, then they are myth-distributors, and their zeal in this direction certainly argues that they have all the natural aptitude for distinguishing themselves in the other. The fact that intellectual mythopia flourishes among Christian preachers like the green bay tree is, however, unquestionable. So incapable are they of seeing things in the true proportion, or of stating them with accuracy, that in their case it is really the most charitable course to regard it as a disease.

Before me as I write are a trio of sermons that bear out, if they point to anything at all, what has been said above. Their authors are the Rev. John Hunter, of Glasgow; Mr. Silvester Horne, of London; and Mr. J. R. Walker, of Regent's Park Chapel, London. The whole three of them are suffering from the same disease, and in each case it has probably been superinduced, as the result of defective training, upon an original and inherited weakness. The sermons of the two first-named gentlemen were delivered in connection with Citizen Sunday, and so dealt with social topics. The last-named "sermonised" upon "The Unifying Power of Christianity"—a title that contains a strong suggestion of moralised murder, or some such phrase. We will take Mr. Walker first.

"There is no gainsaying the fact," says this gentleman, "that Christianity is the greatest unifying power that has ever been set on foot in the history of the world. And there is no gainsaying the fact

that its unifying power has been manifested in three directions. First, it has been manifested in the direction of breaking down barriers between the races I need not point out.....the terrible lengths to which national hatred had gone when Jesus was born.....There was no sense of brotherhood on earth; race was pitted against race.....But when Christianity rose like a blazing sun in the firmament.....then a wonderful change was inaugurated."

Now if this is not evidence of chronic mental deformity, what is it? "There is no gainsaying the fact"! Why, there is not a particle of evidence in favor of the "fact." Does Mr. Walker ever read the papers? If so, what does he make of the war between races in Austria, of the anti-Semitic movement in various parts of the Continent, or of the anti-negro feeling in the United States? And this to say nothing of the "no Irish need apply" tendency, or the constant talk of a Yellow Peril, etc. No one who was not suffering from religious mythopia in its most virulent form could possibly miss the significance of facts that can be gleaned from almost any newspaper that one cares to pick up. The fact that *cannot* be gainsaid is that Christianity has never yet succeeded in breaking down racial hatreds, but has always done much to intensify them. It is, as Canon Scott Holland confessed, "The Roman Empire far more nearly succeeded in giving unity of life, culture, government, and intercourse to the entire body of civilised men—European, Asiatic, and African—than we in our wildest dreams could ever imagine possible to-day.....A common unity for Christian Europe is infinitely less conceivable now than it was for pre-Christian Europe. It is Christian Europe which gives us the spectacle of race divided against race by implacable enmities.....Racial differences grow more intense, and let us note it is Christianity itself which tends to sharpen them." And if Mr. Walker joins issue with Canon Scott Holland, there is little question as to who will come to grief.

Perhaps Mr. Walker was only thinking of the Jews. If so, it is true that racial hatred was more intense among the Jews than other civilised people; but then he has to face the awkward fact that the people who were most energetic in their racial antipathies were the people "of the book," and who were under the special care of the Christian Deity! No brotherhood on earth! Race was pitted against race! Has Mr. Walker never heard of the Roman Empire? Does he not know that members of all races could meet, and did meet, on the common ground of Roman citizenship? Does he not know that the Romans could maintain peace with a standing army of 400,000 men, while Christian Europe needs to-day over four million? Can a man by any possibility be reasonably accurate in the pulpit? Is there any statement too absurd for a Christian audience to swallow?

Mr. Walker also lays stress upon the good Christianity has done for woman; and this is also a point emphasised by Dr. Hunter. Mr. Walker's is the more stupid treatment of the two, for he claims that Christianity has brought about the enfranchisement of women, while Dr. Hunter is content to dwell upon the part women *might* play in social life, to lament that they often show "absolute indifference" to public matters, and an "absence of any keen sense of public responsibility," and to say that he sees no reason why they should not share with men on more equal terms all the largest aims of public life. Nor do I, as a Freethinker. But as a Freethinker I can see that this want of public spirit on the part of women is a direct result of the Christian teaching of the past eighteen centuries. A religion that has taught the subordination of woman to man, that declares man to be the head of the woman as Christ is the head of the Church, and that she is to give the same obedience to both; a religion that has forbidden women to speak in church, which filched from her every shred of freedom and independence she possessed in pre-Christian times, which deprived her of the right to vote, denied her the right—when married—of owning property, and so reduced her

from a person to an object, and which still excludes her from the higher offices in the Church, need not look further than itself for the cause of her lukewarmness in public matters. Had man been subjected to the same training he would have been in no better condition. If Dr. Hunter will compare the types of excellence among the women of Rome and Athens in Pagan times, with the female types of excellence in Christian times, he will see how far the latter had fallen from what he now holds up as an ideal. It is all part and parcel of this religious mythopia that a man should be able to talk as Dr. Hunter does without apparently realising that all he wishes for is in direct opposition to Christian teaching and Christian history.

The last of the three sufferers is Mr. Silvester Horne. He is much concerned about our social welfare, and so informs us that Christianity stands for a "just, free, a human and well ordered State." When? Where? Let Mr. Horne betake himself to the New Testament and see what amount of information he can glean therefrom as to how to build up a "just, free, human, and well-ordered State." Why the structure of the State is precisely one of those subjects that the New Testament is practically silent upon. You can get theories of the State from the Pagan writers, but Christianity, as such, has no theory of the State, and never has had. It has preached passive obedience, it has taught the divine right of kings to govern wrong, but apart from this, it has been a gospel of individual salvation, pure and simple. And of all religions Christianity has been among the worst offenders in inducing anti-social feelings. What of the ascetic epidemics Christianity has induced? What of the feeling of other worldliness, which Mr. Horne laments as existing among Christians. If this did not result from Christianity, where did it come from? Mr. Horne's belief that the gospel of social justice is better than doles, charity, and relief of any kind, does him credit, but it is not Christianity.

With quite an heroic disregard for facts, Mr. Horne goes on to tell us that the belief that no man should suffer "hurt or loss or injury on account of his opinions," as well as all our personal liberties such as are conferred upon us by the Habeas Corpus Act, have "Come to us with the gospel of Jesus Christ." Oh, modest Mr. Horne! Why leave out the telegraph, the steam engine, the County Council, the law of gravitation, or the principle of Natural Selection? Really these might as well be claimed as the outcome of Christ's gospel as the other things named; and it would be on all fours with his claiming as a man of "simple devout faith"—that is, a Christian—Abraham Lincoln, who said that he would rather die upon the platform than admit that he believed in Christianity!

If there were a V.C. for impudence in the face of the enemy, Mr. Horne would richly deserve it for the statement that the teaching that no man was to suffer injury or loss for his opinion, is a Christian teaching. Why, his religion damns a man eternally for a difference of opinion. And the followers of his religion have done all they could to give people of different opinions a foretaste of that damnation, this side of the grave. Again, one asks what of the centuries of Christian persecution one knows of? Is it all a dream, or a delusion? And what about the persecution one *knows* of? What of the people who are boycotted in society and in business because of their opinion? Will Mr. Horne please say what he has ever done to stop this species of punishment for opinion? Easy it is for him to mouth liberal sentiments, but has he ever done anything to prevent his fellow Christians punishing people for their opinions? What assistance did he give Mr. Stead in the attempt to prevent a fellow preacher besmirching the reputation of two dead men? What Mr. Horne means is that he does not believe in anyone punishing *him* because his opinions are different to theirs. This all Christians have believed in at all times. But when and where have Christians believed in, and practised, giving to all absolute equality in the expression of

opinion? A parson preaching freedom of thought is, to-day, only making a virtue of necessity.

What is it? Is it ignorance; is it impudence; is it profound trust in the credulity of their hearers; is it downright capacity for lying, that leads people in the pulpit to make statements so widely and so obviously at variance with facts? Or is it just a case of disease? Let us be charitable and assume it is the latter. The alternative is an ugly one, and makes one feel ill at ease with our common human nature. And, after all, religious mythopia *sounds* better than either of the other expressions.

C. COHEN.

### "The Fall Story."

THE above is the title of the fifth in the series of *Essays for the Times*, now being published by Mr. Francis Griffith, 34 Maiden-lane, Strand, London. The author of this essay is the Rev. F. R. Tennant, B.D., B.Sc. From a theological point of view, the subject is one of fundamental importance. According to orthodoxy, had there been no fall of man in Eden there would have been no incarnation of the Son of God at Bethlehem, and certainly no atoning death on Calvary. The Church has always represented Christianity as a religion of recovery, restoration, renewal, regeneration. Jesus Christ's mission was to seek and save the lost. Mr. Tennant says: "Many Christian writers have been wont to base the whole scheme of salvation or redemption on the ruin caused to human nature by original sin, and have derived the doctrine of original sin, in turn, from the Fall Story of Genesis. This they have done by interpreting the narrative either as an actual history or as an inspired allegory; and perhaps the majority of living theologians assign this place of dogmatic importance to the narrative of Paradise, and of the sin of Adam."

How vivid is the recollection of many of us of the manner in which that dreadful doctrine was taught to us in our childhood days. We were told that man, although created perfect in every respect, deliberately broke the covenant of works into which he had entered, and, in consequence, lost his original integrity and his fellowship with God, and became thoroughly corrupt in soul and body; and that, inasmuch as he was the root and representative of humanity, his first sin was imputed to all his descendants, who have ever been and are incapable of and opposed to all good and naturally inclined to all evil. There was a hymn we were in the habit of singing, which put the doctrine in this form: "In Eden, as I shall ever remember, I forfeited blessings as numerous as the dewdrops. But the glorious conquest of Calvary won them all back again." Indeed, we were assured that the object of Christ's advent was to redeem a fallen race and restore it to God's favor. If some of us were bold enough to suggest that Jesus never mentioned the Fall, we were at once silenced by the statement that He *assumed* it in all his teachings, while Paul, under the guidance of his Spirit, made it the foundation of his theology.

Mr. Tennant, however, informs us that "of late it has seemed to some thinkers within the Church, especially to such as whole-heartedly accept the doctrine of evolution as applied to man, the main results of Old Testament criticism, and the methods of historical and mythological research, that the narrative in question cannot longer be regarded, in the light of modern knowledge, as what it has been claimed to be, and that it is unable to bear the weight of the immense dogmatic superstructure which has been built upon it." Mr. Tennant's language shows clearly that to him the Fall Story is anything but a historical document. He looks upon it as a pure legend that was cherished, in one form or another, by most of the nations of antiquity. Nothing can be more obvious to him than "that the story can no longer be looked upon as either history or allegory or as supplying any basis for a theological

doctrine of man, or of the origin and mode of propagation of human sin." On this point I am in full agreement with the essayist, and heartily congratulate him on his emancipation from the trammels of orthodoxy. The only wonder is that, holding such a view, Mr. Tennant is able to continue a minister of the Christian religion. How *can* Christianity stand when one of its chief foundation stones has been removed?

The story of the Fall in Genesis is neither better nor worse than scores of other similar legends of antiquity. All of them speak of a golden age which was believed to have occurred at the beginning of history, "in which the earth yielded its products freely, and men lived a life of ideal happiness, unalloyed by care or sin, by toil or trouble." Persians and Indians, as well as Greeks and Romans, have left us charming pictures of such a happy time, and as *poetical pictures*, or flights of imagination, they are intensely interesting; but nobody ever dreams of taking them as history. The idea of a Fall is also to be found in many ancient literatures. The garden, the apple, and the serpent figure in numerous old-world accounts of the origin of evil and suffering and sorrow. The garden was the abode of God, and the fruits of the various trees were his food. Man started life in this Divine home as an intimate companion of his Maker. Then came the serpent insidiously to tempt the first human couple to partake of the forbidden fruit. Both the man and the woman succumbed to the wiles of the evil one, and in consequence lost their delightful home. The only fault to be found with that picture is that it is not true to fact. History gives it the lie at every point.

But while Mr. Tennant admits the unhistoricity of the Fall Story, he still clings to the notion that the Genesis narrative is immeasurably superior to all others of the kind. In some sense, which he is not prepared to define, the Bible story is inspired, while the others are not. Wherein the inspiration lies it is impossible to discover. Canon Driver says that "we must distinguish between the narrative itself—the scenery and incidents, as such—and the spiritual teaching which they are intended to convey. The *material* side of the narrative was derived, there can be little doubt, from the representations and traditions current among the writer's fellow-countrymen, though not entirely of native origin. The narrative contains features which have unmistakable counterparts in the religious traditions of other nations; and some of them, though they have been accommodated to the spirit of Israel's religion, carry indications that they are not native to it." The question that forces itself upon us here is, What evidence is there that the spiritual teaching of the Genesis version of the legend is superior to that of other versions? Its theology is woefully mixed. The writer was evidently a Polytheist. Even when using the singular number, *God*, he implies a plurality: "God said, Let *us* make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness"; "God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Mr. Tennant himself readily admits that "echoes of polytheistic theology and animism survive in the narrative." But not only is the story partly monotheistic and partly polytheistic, it also attributes an unenviable character to Jehovah. It represents him as making man in his own image, and then as being inordinately jealous of him. It was jealousy that induced him to forbid Adam and Eve to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, and it was jealousy that caused him subsequently to *expel them* from Paradise. Jehovah was afraid of man's rivalry, and did his utmost to keep him down. That was his motive in not allowing man the same food as himself.

When we pass on from the theological implications of the story to its ethical teaching, we find that here also the tone is anything but high and noble. Adam's sin consisted in breaking a positive commandment imposed upon him by his Maker. There was nothing *wrong* in eating the forbidden fruit. The apple was a thoroughly healthy one and did not disagree with

either man or woman. They were assured that on the very day they were disobedient enough to taste it they would surely die; but the threat was an empty one, as even the serpent was able to foretell them. What high moral teaching can anybody discover in this? It is quite impossible to conceive of an all-good, all-wise, and all-loving Father treating his children in such a ridiculous and immoral fashion as that. To curse the whole human race for all time simply because the progenitor of it ate a forbidden apple would have been an act utterly unworthy of such a Deity. Obedience, under proper conditions, is a beautiful virtue; but blind obedience, on the part of a reasonable being, would be an absurdity. Adam deliberately disobeyed his Maker, we are told; but we maintain that his Maker had no right to expect compliance with such an arbitrary request, and certainly no moral right to punish non-compliance. The punishment was as arbitrary and immoral as the command.

I am aware that many divines regard the story of the Fall as an allegory; but the *principles* involved are the same whether it be taken literally or allegorically. On this point Mr. Tennant's observations are excellent:—

"It only remains to give reasons why the Fall Story cannot be regarded as an allegory. In the first place exegesis alone is fatal to such a view. The narrative itself condemns such a mode of interpretation. The curse of the serpent is nonsense unless a real animal is meant. And as the trees of life and knowledge belong to the same circle of ideas as the serpent, it follows that they must also be taken as really what they seem to be—means of directly imparting supernatural qualities. Secondly, the narrative occurs in a context which professes to supply information as to the beginnings of human history; the story could hardly be placed where it is, if it were solely, or even primarily, intended to have a psychological and didactic, and not a historical, signification. Thirdly, allegory is a literary product which we cannot ascribe to the Jahvist writer. And this for two reasons. Abstract teaching conveyed by allegorical imagery is utterly foreign to the naive concreteness which is so characteristic of the Jahvist's style, and gives to that style its great charm. And further, to ascribe allegory to the ninth century B.C. is surely to commit an anachronism."

Were it not for the undercurrent of supernaturalism that occasionally makes itself felt, Mr. Tennant's essay could be pronounced a masterpiece; and even in spite of that undercurrent, its criticism is thoroughly sound. The essayist has shown conclusively that the Fall Story is neither a history nor an allegory, but an old-world legend. But, in that case, what happens to Christianity, the object of which is said to be to save people who are lost and ruined through the Fall? The whole of the New Testament *assumes* the Fall; and the apostle Paul traces the close connection between our falling in Adam and our rising in Christ. He tells us that "through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners" just as "through the obedience of the one the many shall be made righteous." But if Mr. Tennant is right Paul was wrong; and if Paul was wrong about Adam, who can tell but that he was equally wrong about Christ and about the scheme of salvation through Christ's name? If Paul mistook the Fall legend for a history, is it not just as likely that he made the same mistake with regard to the Jesus legend? The Bible is a unity. It is permeated through and through by a few great ideas. Had Adam kept his first estate there would have been no need for Christ. This is how Paul put it: "For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor. xv. 21, 22). Such was Paul's gospel, which he claimed to have received by a revelation from heaven. Again and again he describes it as a direct communication from God. Peter and James and John may have been mistaken; but the man who had received a Divine revelation was of necessity infallible. And yet history, read in the light of modern criticism, gives a flat contradiction to Paul's account of Adam. Did God tell Paul a falsehood about Adam, or did Paul tell a falsehood when he

said his gospel was God-given? It is immaterial to my argument who Paul was, or when he lived, the vital point being that some of the claims he made on behalf of his doctrine were palpably false, and that this fact is a positive proof that his belief in the revelation from Jesus Christ was, to say the least, a delusion.

The conclusion to which we are irresistibly driven, therefore, is that the abandonment of the doctrine of the Fall destroys the whole case for Christianity as a Divinely revealed religion. We must now look upon Paul as one of the many *makers* of Christianity, and upon Christ as the *creation*, not the *creator*, of the Church.

J. T. LLOYD.

### One of Rome's Converts.

THE name of the Reverend John M. M. Charleson may be familiar to some of our readers. He created a mild sensation four or five years ago by seceding from the Church of Scotland and going over to Rome. He had indeed displayed Romanising proclivities for a considerable period prior to his actual secession; so much so, as to excite the umbrage of the ultra-Protestant section in the Scotch Establishment. He himself tells us that while still a pastor of the Church of Scotland he felt an "increasing respect for the Bishop of Rome as the successor of St. Peter, together with a growing reverence for the Holy Mother of the Lord." He confesses that over and over again he endeavored to make his Protestant flock discern the Lord's Body and Blood in the Blessed Sacrament, he exhorted them to love and adore Him therein, and called upon them to come to Him in the Holy Communion, not once or twice a year, but often, even Sunday after Sunday. On the whole, therefore, while not impeaching the honesty of the motives that detained Mr. Charleson in the Church of Scotland long after he had lost touch with Protestant sentiment, any more than we would impugn the motives of Newman in a similar case, it seems evident he did not resign his charge a day too soon.

We have read the Reverend Mr. Charleson's *brochure* entitled *Why I left the Church of Scotland*, but we have no present intention of examining its contents in detail. So far as we can judge the writer appears to possess a semi-mediæval temperament, and to have added his brain studying the Patristic literature—that huge monument of misplaced and misspent intellectual activity and mental ingenuity erected by the so-called Fathers of the early Christian Church. There is nothing novel in the story of Mr. Charleson's conversion to Roman Catholicism. It is the old story of a soul casting about for some solid foundation for the baseless chimera called Christianity, and finding it where alone it can be found (if one has to choose at all between the conflicting sects), in the Roman Catholic Church.

Some individuals have a perfect craving for "authority." They cannot stand alone; they cannot live their own lives independently; they cannot think or act without being guided by others. They cannot be satisfied with nature in all her wondrous works and ways. They must have something to lean against, or, like the limpet, something to cling to. They must have religion. And in the search for a satisfying worship, the Roman Catholic Church seems best to fill the bill, perhaps because she is the only Church that always appears to be thoroughly satisfied with herself. Minds, also, of a certain type, when they begin to drift away from their old moorings, are naturally attracted by the Roman Church, if only because of the confidence with which she asserts herself. And, as we have said before, if it is a question of choosing a Church worth being a member of, the Church of Rome easily bears the palm. What is the use of belonging to a Church that is unanimous on scarcely a single point of doctrine, and hesitates to commit itself to a binding definition of anything? The invertebrate Christian wants a

religion with some backbone in it to supply the stiffening he lacks. And he goes where he can find it.

There is nothing in Mr. Charleson's little book that would raise in our readers anything but a tolerant and more or less pitying smile. It is written by an intense believer in the supernatural and in the necessity for a visible, teaching guide in faith and morals; and it is written *for* believers. It will doubtless appeal to those who accept the Bible, and the principle of authority in religion. On one who rejects both it will make no impression whatever. Mr. Charleson takes the Bible and the rodomontade of the Fathers seriously, and anyone who does that to-day has really been born too late. He seems to have been tremendously affected by a passage in one of the Epistles of the fiery Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage in the first half of the third century, and to have applied the passage to himself. In those distant days Marcian of Arles had started an opposition show, and this roused the ire of the vigorous Bishop, who declared that Marcian "had attempted to erect a profane altar, and to set up an adulterous throne, and to offer sacrilegious sacrifices opposed to the true priest." The Roman Catholic priests were keen on creating a monopoly in those days, and indeed have never at any time relished opposition. Worthy Cyprian's indignation against the heresiarch is pardonable at this date. Religion was a serious affair in those days. People did not discuss it aimably over the tea-cups, or philosophically in the smoking-room, as they may do to-day. They broke each other's heads about it, or where it had not come to that, they anathematised and cursed each other over it till all was blue, or ought to have been.

It is painful to contemplate the amount of ill-feeling raised, the extensive persecution and bloodshed that took place in the earlier Christian centuries and right through the middle ages, over matters about which no one cares two straws to-day. To mention only one instance that comes uppermost—how many children were orphaned, how many wives were left widows, how many homes were wrecked, how many thousands of men were slaughtered to rescue Jerusalem and the Holy Sepulchre from the Turks? Yet the Turks are in Jerusalem to-day and nobody worries about it. Nor is there any certainty that Christ ever cared who possessed his tomb. But we are travelling away from Cyprian.

Marcian then had started, or joined, an opposition Church. Somebody starts a new Church every other week nowadays, and nobody gets particularly annoyed about it; but Cyprian was riled, and denounced Marcian to the Pope in language of which a sample is given above. And after about sixteen hundred and fifty years the Reverend Mr. Charleson comes across the passage and immediately is "wounded, and trembling and horrified," and feels himself a companion in guilt with Marcian. Prodigious! This is what comes of lacking a sense of humor. No one should be allowed to read Patristic literature whose bump of humor is not well developed.

We said we did not intend to criticise Mr. Charleson's pamphlet in detail, but before passing to what really prompted the present article, we cannot refrain from commenting on the fact that the reverend gentleman lays great stress upon Christ's founding of his Church on the rock of Peter. Peter!—who recalls Bismarck's famous phrase, "A lath painted to look like iron." The usual New Testament passage about Peter and the rock, is, of course, quoted by Mr. Charleson. Now it seems to us marvellous that any educated intelligent man, reading this passage referred to, should imagine for a moment that the Eternal Son of God would condescend to a play upon words worthy only of a pantomime librettist. What an idea some Christians have of the dignity and majesty of the great God of the universe! That one passage alone, to our mind, disproves the divine inspiration of the Scriptures. Incidentally we may note that at one part Mr. Charleson appeals to "history" and "fact," as if these two words connoted different ideas. Perhaps he has unwittingly stumbled upon a truth.

There is sometimes a distinction between "historical" facts and simple "facts." In the Bible for instance.

But the Reverend Mr. Charleson having left his Protestant tabernacle, and having been to Rome and seen the Pope, is amongst us once more in the interests—this time avowedly—of the Roman Catholic Church. He has been Father Charleson for some time now, and our attention has been called to some discourses he is delivering to the League of the Cross—the total abstinence society of the Catholic Church in this country. Had his remarks been confined to the audience for which they were primarily intended it would scarcely be necessary to pass any reflection upon them. Anyone who is acquainted with the League of the Cross, knows that it is not the intellectual section of the Roman Catholics that constitutes its membership. So that much will pass muster before such a body that would not stand the open air. As, however, the remarks of Father Charleson have been fully reproduced in the columns of one or two public journals, they seem to challenge criticism.

We see that Father Charleson has been defending the custom of "offerings" for Masses, and explaining the obligation of the faithful to contribute to the support of their pastors. How to do this seems to be one of the first duties a priest learns, and we can well understand that a few of the priests find it no very palatable duty. However, the Reverend Mr. Charleson has learned his lesson well. But then, of course, he always was a priest, though he has transferred his allegiance so recently. Consequently he had probably very little to learn regarding the importance of "offerings" and the adequate sustentation of the clergy. In viewing a convert's utterances something must be allowed for fresh enthusiasm, and inexperience of the inner side of Roman Catholicism—of which the neophyte does not see much. Father Charleson will perchance learn as he grows older, if he perseveres in the course he has taken; though, in our opinion, the functions and life work of a priest are not calculated to develop any man on the intellectual plane. That apart, however, and while Father Charleson's knowledge of the purer theory of Roman Catholicism may be considerable, he doubtless well knows—or will soon learn—that theory and practice are not any more synonymous in the religious world than elsewhere.

As regards then the purchase or non-purchase of Masses, it may be true that that vague abstraction the Church does not countenance their sale in theory, but in practice they are paid for nevertheless. Why—in this connection—should we differentiate the Church from the individuals who compose the Church? Perhaps Father Charleson will tell us how many Masses are said gratuitously for the dead or for particular intentions in any typical parish annually. Our acquaintance with Roman Catholicism as it is, is of an older date than Father Charleson's, and we would say that to go empty-handed and ask for a Mass to be offered is about the last thing a Roman Catholic would think of. Do the clergy encourage non-paying applicants? We know very well that they do not. But go with some money in your hand, and you are welcome. It is quite understood, whatever the philosophic teaching of the Church may be, that half-a-crown is the minimum respectable fee for a Mass in working-class circles. The money is given for the purpose of obtaining the Mass, and it seems to need rather subtle casuistry to distinguish between this and an ordinary commercial transaction. At all events the average humble layman is not equal to such hair-splitting. He knows if he wants a Mass he must bring along an offering, and he acts accordingly. If his offering be made out of an overflowing sentiment of benevolence towards the priest, why not make it without seeking any equivalent? Nothing can buy a Mass, forsooth! We fancy this principle was originally laid down to prevent the necessity for naming a maximum figure. There is no maximum. You can give as much as you like. But that the Catholic Church comes perilously near fixing a minimum price for a Mass we will show by an example

from our own knowledge. Perhaps Father Charleson or some other Catholic will be able to explain the matter away.

In the Roman Catholic church at Lanark, a box used to be kept for the reception of small offerings for the benefit of the souls in Purgatory. Not, of course, that the souls in Purgatory got the money. It did not go quite so far as that. The idea was to secure the periodical saying of a Mass (at least once a month) for the suffering souls; and it was arranged that a Mass would be said for every half-crown found in the box. If this was not putting a price on the Mass we would like to know what it was. Nor was this all. It was distinctly intimated from the altar that if there were no half-crown there would be no Mass. We speak of a good many years ago, and cannot say if such a state of matters obtains in that locality now, but we have a vivid recollection of the facts as they then were, and our childish mind was much puzzled as to what would be done if there were only two and fivepence halfpenny in the box any given month. It seemed a horrible idea that the priests should decline to offer up a Mass for the poor souls in Purgatory—whose sufferings it would relieve so much—merely because they were a copper or two short of the fixed amount. We have never forgotten it, and never shall.

G. SCOTT.

---

### Acid Drops.

---

Sir Oliver Lodge is, of course, a highly accomplished gentleman, but he has his peculiarities. For instance, he rebukes Haeckel for dealing with subjects outside his special province as biologist; but he is perpetually doing the same thing himself. Sir Oliver Lodge's idea appears to be that an Atheistic man of science should stick to his science and say nothing about his Atheism, while a Christian man of science should leave his science whenever he likes and talk as freely as he pleases about Christianity.

Sir Oliver Lodge's latest appearance as a religious advocate was at the City Temple in London. He delivered an address there on "Science and Religion." The chairman who introduced him to that profoundly scientific audience (or ought we to say congregation?) was the Rev. R. J. Campbell, who assured him that young men of the City of London regarded him as a guide, philosopher, and friend. Then, in his vague manner, which is supposed to be very eloquent, Mr. Campbell went on to say that Sir Oliver Lodge was something more than one of the most eminent scientists of the day; he was "doing valuable work in that vast region which was at once science and religion." We presume that this is the region that Mr. Campbell himself wanders in when he mounts the pulpit. Rightly understood—whatever that means—science and religion were one; and "they were deeply grateful that a man like Sir Oliver held that view." No doubt. And the word "grateful" is a revelation. It shows that the men of God, who pretend to have a divine impregnable faith, are glad to grasp at anything in the shape of a blessing from a man of science.

Mr. Campbell might reflect, if he had time, that, if men of science are to be the arbiters of religion, what one of them says in favor of it is balanced by what another says against it. That is to say, if the two men are equal; and any person who fancies that Sir Oliver Lodge is a greater scientist than Professor Haeckel has a good deal to learn.

Sir Oliver Lodge began his address at the City Temple by saying that it would consist of "hints and suggestions." Exactly! That is the sum and substance of all his articles and lectures on the subject of "Religion and Science." As a scientist, in the proper sense of the word, he has really nothing of any importance to say on the subject—nothing that could not be quite as authoritatively said by the common "man in the street." As a chemist or a physicist, he knows no more about God than a navvy or a bootblack. All he can throw out is "hints and suggestions"—a plentiful crop of which can be gathered in any pulpit, and in any lunatic asylum.

We need not follow Sir Oliver Lodge any further. What he said about matter being probably electricity was very

interesting, but electricity brings him no nearer God than gravitation or any other natural force. And what he had to say about the power of God and man's free agency was simply the hackneyed old metaphysics of Christian divinity. One point, and one point only, in Sir Oliver Lodge's utterance at the City Temple is worth picking up; and that did not occur in his address but during question-time. With regard to miracles, he replied that some, as related in the Old Testament, never happened; just as though people, at this time of day, needed the Principal of Birmingham University to assure them that Balaam's jackass never talked Moabitish, or that Jonah never spent three days and nights in the intestines of a "whale" or a "sea monster." As to the miracles of the New Testament, Sir Oliver Lodge talked round the subject quite beautifully. He remarked that we ought to be very sure before saying that anything was impossible; at the same time, he referred to the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection as "representing the material aspect of what he conceived to be a great truth"—but he "did not attach much importance to the material aspect" himself. Such are the Christian apologetics for which Mr. Campbell is "deeply grateful."

In unveiling the Gladstone statue Mr. John Morley quoted once more (he seems rather fond of it) the late Lord Salisbury's eulogy of the dead Liberal leader, ending with the description of him as "a great Christian man." Not satisfied with that, Mr. Morley went out of his way to say that the Christian Churches were rightly proud of him. Is the statue, then, erected to Mr. Gladstone as a Churchman? Certainly it seems strange that Mr. Morley, of all men, should trouble himself so much about the Christian Churches. Perhaps the explanation is that Mr. Morley, as a politician, must be as agreeable as possible to those who command a large number of votes. But this only reminds us of what an Irish election agent says in one of Mr. George Meredith's novels. "Politics, sir," he says, "is climbing the greasy pole; mutton or no mutton, there's grease for sure."

Mr. Hall Caine, we should say from his latest novels, considers himself about the first Christian in England—and we wish he were the last. Being in America, he is naturally anxious to cultivate the acquaintance of those distinguished Christians, the Rockfellers, whose piety has been more successful even than his own. Mr. Caine actually addressed Mr. Rockefeller's Bible Class; which was probably an excellent stroke of business, and will lead to a more extended circulation of our great Manx Christian's novels in the United States.

In the course of Mr. Caine's address to that remarkable Bible Class he said that Great Britain needed a man like Mr. Roosevelt, whose public acts were ethics, not politics. No doubt this sounded very agreeable to American ears—which we are afraid are just as long as those on this side of the Atlantic. But what on earth does it mean? We all know that President Roosevelt leads "the strenuous life," and some people seem to think he invented it; but it is not very easy for onlookers of the great game of politics to perceive what particular good has been done by him or under his immediate auspices. Besides, we have one politician over here already who bears a certain resemblance to Mr. Roosevelt; and if anything happens to him there might be a vacancy for Mr. Hall Caine—if he would only go into training for the part.

At the burial of Miss Money, the victim of the "tunnel mystery," which is a mystery still, the officiating man of God prayed that the murderer might be moved to give himself up to justice. Any policeman who heard that prayer must have smiled—remembering how active the Lord is in inducing criminals to confess their crimes and "take their gruel." But, of course, there is more than one foolish person in the Christian ministry; and we are not astonished to find another man of God offering up a similar prayer at the funeral of poor little Elizabeth Peers, who was so brutally done to death in an entry behind Cullen-street, Liverpool. We do not suppose that this prayer will be answered any more than the other. Probably the reverend gentlemen themselves don't expect such prayers to be answered. But they are in the praying line, and feel bound to conform to its rules and regulations.

The Bishop of Newcastle has been advocating flogging for certain offences. No wonder. Christian clergymen are the last people in the world to understand the principles of wise and humane jurisprudence. Preaching a God who gives his enemies hell, it is natural that they should want to give the "cat" to those they detest.

The Bishop of Liverpool has been presented with an exceedingly fine motor-car, with an endowment of £120 a year

towards its maintenance for the next six years. The Bishop thanks the donors, and hopes to live up to the ideal they set before him. This means, probably, that he will use the motor-car.

Never did the Bishop of Liverpool's "Master" enjoy such a luxury. The only ride J. C. ever had "on his own" was astride of a jackass. The Bishop of Liverpool rides a different sort of asses—with less than four legs.

On the morning that Anthony Comstock's crusade against Mr. Bernard Shaw's play, "Mrs. Warren's Profession," was announced in the London press, the dear *Daily News* printed a long laudation of the professional secretary of the American Vice Society. Anthony Comstock was declared, in brief, to be one of the martyrs of this world; so often misunderstood, misrepresented, and slandered; but always laboring, amidst difficulty and danger, for the "purity" of America. Of course the secret of all this blarney lies in the fact that Anthony Comstock is a Christian. All who know the facts are perfectly aware that Anthony Comstock brings a cold, hard, brutal temperament to a task which he undertakes for a living; and that, under the pretence of suppressing obscenity, he carries on a crusade against all kinds of advanced literature—mainly through the United States postal laws, which are a disgrace to a civilised country, and would not be tolerated for an hour in any part of "effete old Europe." There is hardly a Liberal paper in America which has not been the object of Anthony Comstock's pious attentions. At annual meetings of his precious Society he has frequently boasted that he would put down "blasphemous infidel publications." His view is that all ideas which go beyond his own are "indecent," and the average American Christian is quite content to regard this as a sufficient reason for persecuting the conductors of every kind of "advanced" literature. Never was there anything more contemptible in its cowardice and hypocrisy. Anthony Comstock's hatred of Mr. Bernard Shaw is, of course, due to the fact that the author of "Mrs. Warren's Profession" is a Freethinker. Anthony Comstock can smell a Freethinker three thousand miles away.

Anthony Comstock's latest exploit was arresting Bernard Macfadden on account of the posters he used to advertise his physical culture show. It is understood that Anthony Comstock objects to the recognition of any part of the human anatomy except the face—of which he has a large stock himself.

The first effect of Anthony Comstock's war on Bernard Macfadden was to secure a terrible crush at the latter's show. Five thousand people were turned away from the doors the first night.

We cut the following items of news from one number of an American exchange:—

"On account of charges made by Miss Lydia Wretman, the Rev. Titus Pohl, pastor of the Lutheran Mission Church, Chicago, has resigned his charge. Miss Wretman and her baby are living with her parents in Moline, Ill.

If his case is not reversed by a higher court, the Rev. James Hofer, a Catholic priest of LaCrosse, Wis., will be sent to state prison. He has been convicted of holding improper relations with an orphan girl under 18, whom, according to her testimony, he drugged and assaulted.

On testimony said to be unfit for publication, the Rev. Edward A. Johnson, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Newport, R. I., has been expelled by the board of managers of the Rhode Island Baptist state convention. Against their will, the Rev. Johnson kissed, hugged, and took other improper liberties with the girls belonging to his church. His church supports him and will stand aloof from all other Baptist churches in the state."

It looks as though Dr. Torrey were staying too long in England. He seems to be badly wanted in America.

The Bishop of Bangor declares that the Welsh revival cannot be revived. They must not expect it to be repeated within their lifetime. It must now be regarded as a thing of the past. But what about Evan Roberts? Does the Bishop mean that he should go to Canada? We had almost written Coventry.

The riff-raff in Russia, egged on by the authorities, went murdering and pillaging in many centres of population. "At Kherson," the report ran, "the mob, carrying a portrait of the Czar and national flags, and singing the National Anthem, proceeded this morning to pillage the Jewish shops, and afterwards went to the Cathedral to attend a Thanksgiving Service." Comment would only spoil this delicious sentence.

The raid upon the Jews seems to have been common during the Russian anarchy. Religious fanaticism and a taste for profitable plunder have generally gone well together.

M. Pobiedonostseff, the Procurator of the Holy Synod, whose resignation was announced, was described in a pious London paper as "the incarnation of bigotry and reaction." This may be perfectly true, but has the pious London paper a right to say it? The truth is that Pobiedonostseff is—a Christian! He takes his stand on the old ideas because they are the ideas of the Bible and of historic Christianity. He is on the wrong side, but he is a thinker—not a paste-headed Christian journalist.

Rev. J. H. Ritson, secretary of the Bible Society, told an interviewer that its big Centenary meeting would be addressed by all sorts of representative Christians, including General Booth. He also told how the circulation of the Bible was going forward. Four times as many copies were being sold in Wales in consequence of the revival. Copies of the Gospels were being pushed round in Japan. When the Baltic Fleet passed through the Suez Canal the Society's colporteurs boarded the ships and in one day and night sold 700 copies of the Scriptures to the men. "Think of that," Mr. Ritson says, "when you remember that the Baltic Fleet went to its doom in the Eastern seas. Who knows but what the Russian Scriptures did their work of consolation and revelation of a Savior before the day of battle came." This seems to mean that all the sailors who did not get a copy of the Bible Society's volume went straight to hell when they sank with their ill-fated ships. In other words, if any of them went to heaven at all, it was only because they happened to meet the Bible Society's agents at Suez. Fancy a man's eternal happiness or misery depending on such an accident! Fancy a God who allows it! Fancy a religion that teaches it!

The *Daily News* should really look after "P. W. W." In a recent article he (or she) said that "a visit from an angel might leave a man crippled for life." We presume this is a sarcastic allusion to Jacob's all-night wrestling match with the angel of the Lord (some say the Lord himself), in which the celestial combatant put the terrestrial one's thigh out of joint—without, however, to all appearance, being able to give him a fair back on the sawdust.

The *Wiltshire Times* reports a speech of Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice, M.P. (the biographer of the late Lord Granville) at the opening of a Unitarian bazaar. He spoke eloquently of the part which Unitarians had played in obtaining liberty of conscience, but he did not add that, since they had obtained it for themselves, they have done very little towards obtaining it for others. Perhaps the very meanest thing ever written about the Blasphemy Laws was Dr. Blake Odgers' report to the Unitarians, in which he told them, substantially, that there was no need for them to trouble, as it was only people who went further than they did who were in any danger. Unitarians, as a body, have never lifted a finger to carry freedom a step beyond the point which left them in safety. They have been quite content to see Freethinkers persecuted and even imprisoned. Their bigotry is rather passive than active, but it is bigotry all the same; and those who wink at crime are sometimes worse than those who commit it—by the amount of cowardice they display.

Dr. Emil Reich's foolish book on *The Failure of the Higher Criticism* was reviewed in the *London Daily Chronicle* and described as "swelled head" work. "In the form of popular lectures," reviewer said, "it may have tickled the ears of select audiences who still hope to resurrect a view of Bible history and literature long since dead, and discredited by the majority of competent scholars of nearly all denominations."

The Bishop of Killala and the Bishop of Ardagh went to Rome and presented the Pope with £1,637 as Peter's Pence. His Holiness, we read, was very glad to see them, and entered into a long conversation with them, in the course of which he expressed his high esteem for the Irish people. The Irish people will read this, and go on subscribing more Peter's Pence. It is as good as a pantomime—but not quite as laughable.

A country villa near Bale, occupied by a wealthy manufacturer, has been broken into and ransacked by a "religious" burglar. Pinned to a pillow was the following note: "In the Bible it says, 'Lead us not into temptation.' You and your show of wealth tempted me, and I fell, though an honest workingman. Therefore, you are the sinner, not I. Repent before it is too late."

Blackburn's most prominent Nonconformist minister, the Rev. Fred Hibbert, has just declared that there is "nothing in religion to debar a man attending a football match." Blackburn breathes again. Three cheers for the Nonconformist Conscience! By-and-bye it will forgive Lord Rosebery for winning the Derby.

Some time ago we had to stop the little game of a rabid Christian who used to send disgusting postcards to us, addressed to various places about the country where we were lecturing. The Post Office authorities took the matter up, and the fellow soon caved in when he saw danger ahead. Recently another postcard writer, who varies his name and tries to vary his caligraphy, has been indulging in the same little game. He has favored us chiefly with his missives, but he has not forgotten our nearest colleagues. His latest move is to send his malignant postcards to us, at addresses which he reads in the *Freethinker*, but at which he knows very well that we are not to be found. His object, of course, is to let others see what he writes. Carefully as this wretched creature covers up his traces, by means of assumed names and false addresses, the Post Office detectives may succeed in getting upon his track—for we are not entirely without a clue.

### In Church.

"Archdeacon Sinclair, interviewed yesterday respecting the sex of an angel, a question now agitating the artistic and theological circles of New York, said there was no formulated Church doctrine on the subject of angels."—*Vide Yorkshire Evening Post*, Oct. 6, 1905.

THESE grave and reverend men are conjurers;  
This place, these vestments, are their stock-in-trade  
By which they live and thrive. They tell of things  
Known only to the holy men of God;  
For, by the Act and Book of Common Prayer,  
The points of tweedledum and tweedledee  
They do expound. While some do claim to know,  
Betwixt the set of sun and dawn of day,  
How many souls are saved, how many damned,  
And how the Devil, sitting by hell fire,  
Counts o'er his daily gains. And yet,  
Although they understand not any feathered fowl  
That flies above the earth, these learned men  
Discourse and speak with awe of some strange bird  
Called by the name of Gabriel, with wings—  
Half cock and hen—which never laid an egg,  
Whose mission is to crow or blow the trump  
In Heaven. And of a great white throne,  
And sat thereon a snow-white bleeding lamb,  
A creature with a hemorrhage but no tail;  
Where on one side are ranged the silly sheep,  
With here and there a stupid ram or two,  
And on the other are the sturdy goats,  
Awaiting judgment, and the final doom  
Which he, the godlike butcher, shall pronounce.

This in Religion's name. Nay, do not laugh!  
For these are sacred truths, and sanctified  
By custom and long use. So much depends  
Upon the reading of an ancient book  
The right interpretation of the Word,  
That good bright gold, fresh from the mint, is paid—  
Sanctioned by forms of law in Parliament—  
To fat and unctuous knaves, all college bred,  
Who hide the truth, or gloss it with a text,  
And ever conjure with a bag of tricks  
Before the multitude; and daft dull fools  
Do cry Amen! for blessed are the poor.

False spiritual lords and counsellors,  
Have ye no shame? I'd liefer herd with sharks  
That eat the dead within the green sea waves,  
Than feast with Birds of Pray that prey upon  
The living and the dead. Time is not far off  
When all the world shall know you as ye are—  
Because we know you, and the things ye do,  
And therefore shall unbosom.

WILLIAM EMSLEY.

For I have learned  
To look on nature, not as in the hour  
Of thoughtless youth; but hearing oftentimes  
The still, sad music of humanity,  
Not harsh nor grating, though of ample power  
To chasten and subdue. — *Wordsworth.*

The metaphysician's treatise on Nature: a torch to see  
the sunrise!—*George Meredith.*



### Mr. Foote's Engagements.

Sunday, November 12, Alexandra Hall, Islington-square, Liverpool; at 3, "Oscar Wilde and Jesus Christ"; at 7, "Why the 'Yellow Monkeys' Won: an Object Lesson to Christians."

November 19 and 26, Stanley Hall.  
December 3, South Shields; 31, Leicester.

### To Correspondents.

- C. COHEN'S LECTURING ENGAGEMENTS.—Address, 241 High-road, Leyton, Essex.—November 12, Stanley Hall, North London; 19, Coventry; 26, Manchester. December 3, Birmingham; 17, Forest Gate.
- J. T. LLOYD'S LECTURING ENGAGEMENTS.—November 19, Glasgow; 26, Neath, South Wales. December 3, Forest Gate; 10, Coventry.
- E. FENTON.—Your friend is wrong. Mr. Foote does not "believe in God." He is an Atheist. We can hardly advise you as to what book you should read on "the principles of Freethought." One book is scarcely enough. Write to our publishing office for a catalogue and make your own selection from time to time.
- F. RICH.—Always glad to receive useful cuttings.
- W. VILE.—Mr. Lloyd may be quite right in his interpretation of Acts x. 35, but it seems to us that his view depends not merely upon the immediate context, but also upon the general tenor of the New Testament teaching. In the sense in which the Christians try to read the passage, and in reference to its "face" meaning, we do not see why it should be eliminated from the "contradiction" you mention in the *Bible Handbook*, which was compiled for quite another purpose than a storehouse of controversial exegesis.
- F. S. EDWARDS.—Thanks for your interesting and encouraging letter. We will give the "key" to the Voltaire photographs in our next.
- W. P. BALL.—Many thanks for cuttings.
- ATHEIST.—Your letter is sensible enough, but we think our article is a sufficient answer to that correspondent—at least for the present.
- W. B.—It would take columns to answer your question properly. To answer it in a few sentences would be a mental and moral blunder.
- J. W. BENNETT.—Cuttings welcome.
- A. A.—See answer to F. S. Edwards. Mr. Foote has not been photographed separately since 1896. He hates being photographed. Perhaps he may face the camera again presently—for the sake of pressing friends.
- J. PARTRIDGE.—Glad to hear Mr. Cohen had good meetings at Birmingham in spite of the rain.
- H. TUCKER.—Your letter to the Chairman and Committee of the Torrey-Alexander mission at Plymouth is excellent, but it would do more good in the local press than in our columns. The many thousands of our pamphlets distributed outside the Drill Hall will produce their effect, and counteract the conspiracy of silence.
- E. H. DAVIES.—The reverend gentleman's story about Voltaire calling on God in a storm is absolutely silly. Voltaire was not an Atheist, to begin with; and the story is pious fiction of the weakest order.
- G. THWAITES.—Will be seen to.
- NEMO.—We hope your prophecy will be fulfilled.
- F. RICH.—Thanks for cuttings.
- S. E. STEVENS.—Will be useful. Thanks.
- E. PURCHES.—Mr. Foote will write you.
- SECLARIST.—You probably mean St. Paul, not St. Augustine. Call on Mr. J. Dewar, ornithologist, Hanover-street, Edinburgh.
- T. HOPKINS.—Thanks both ways.
- R. CHAPMAN.—Yes, we are still open to send a gratuitous copy of this journal post-free to any address our readers may forward to us as that of a person likely to become a subscriber after reading it for six consecutive weeks.
- W. H. POWELL.—Shall have attention.
- E. PUTMAN.—Pleased to learn that our writings have had something to do with making you a Freethinker. Also that one of our pamphlets fell into your hands some months ago at one of Dr. Torrey's meetings, and enabled you to realise "what an ANERNIAS he was." Your dictionary definition of Atheism is wrong. Atheists are without God because they have no knowledge of such a being. That is all.
- ARTHUR INGRAM (Palmer's Green).—A shorter letter than yours, on the same subject, was all we could find room for. Mr. Cohen will accept correction, as far as he is wrong as to Adult Schools. He is not silly enough to fancy himself infallible.
- A. G. S.—We will read it and see.
- R. J. DERFEL.—Sorry to miss you on Sunday, and sorrier still to hear of your illness, from which we wish you a speedy recovery.
- D. Segelhe.—Pleased to receive your letter, and to hear that you had heard of the *Freethinker* before leaving Germany and now read it regularly. "G. B." will be glad to hear of your acquaintance with and admiration for Scholermann.

S. STEVENSON.—You want to know how Atheism explains the world better than Theism. Theism does not explain the world, and Atheism does not pretend to. It is the business of Science to explain the world. And if you cannot get the explanation from that quarter, you will never get it from any other.

JOHN EDDY.—We cannot undertake to reply to such queries by post. The work we alluded to was John Stuart Mill's *Three Essays on Religion*, published after his death.

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

THE NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY'S office is at 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

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

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

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

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

PERSONS remitting for literature by stamps are specially requested to send *halfpenny stamps*.

THE *Freethinker* will be forwarded direct from the publishing office, post free, at the following rates, prepaid:—One year, 10s. 6d.; half year, 5s. 3d.; three months, 2s. 8d.

SCALE OF ADVERTISEMENTS: Thirty words, 1s. 6d.; every succeeding ten words, 6d. *Displayed Advertisements*:—One inch, 4s. 6d.; half column, £1 2s. 6d.; column, £2 5s. Special terms for repetitions.

### Sugar Plums.

According to the Bible, the heavens declare the glory of God; but the man who wrote that would never repeat it on a wet Sunday in Manchester. In spite of the rain, however, Mr. Foote had a record afternoon meeting in the Secular Hall, and a grand audience in the evening. Friends were present from many South Lancashire towns, and one came all the way from Sheffield. Both meetings included a considerable number of ladies, and a gratifying number of young men, who will represent the Freethought of the future. Mr. Foote's lectures were, to all appearance, very highly relished, the applause being vigorous and frequent; indeed, the utmost enthusiasm prevailed on both occasions; and with such meetings, and such fervor, there ought to be a decided Freethought revival in Cottonopolis this winter.

Mr. Foote delivers two lectures, afternoon and evening, to-day (Nov. 12) in the Alexandra Hall, Islington-square, Liverpool, which is too small for his audiences. An effort was made by the Branch to obtain the use of a theatre on this occasion, but it failed; and we can only hope now that the negotiations going on for the use of a large handsome hall for future meetings will be successful.

Mr. H. Percy Ward, having "a Sunday off" at Liverpool to-day (Nov. 12), in consequence of Mr. Foote's visit, is paying a visit to Coventry, where he delivers two lectures (afternoon and evening) in the Union-street Assembly Hall. Mr. Cohen follows with two lectures next Sunday, and Mr. Lloyd is due at Coventry on December 10. That will be his first visit, and we hope it will be a hearty one.

The fresh course of Sunday Freethought lectures at Stanley Hall opens this evening (Nov. 12), when Mr. Cohen occupies the platform. An advertisement of these lectures will be found on the last page of this week's *Freethinker*. Stanley Hall can be reached by omnibuses, which pass the door, from Victoria and Charing Cross. The nearest Midland station is Kentish Town. The nearest North London station is Camden Town. Trams run from the corner of Euston-road and Hampstead-road.

Mr. F. Ryan has been writing for Freethought as a volunteer for many years—more than we care to count—and wields a keen pen in the service of a good head. Such a man has a right to be heard, and we could see no reason for declining to insert his letter in criticism of Mr. Blatchford, which appears in this week's *Freethinker*.

Mr. Malcolm Quin is delivering a course of nineteen lectures on "The First Philosophy of Auguste Comte" in the lecture room of the Church of Humanity, Eskdale-terrace, Newcastle-on-Tyne. The course began on Tuesday evening, November 7 (at 7.30) and will be continued on subsequent Tuesday evenings until December 12; resumption being made on Tuesday, January 9, and thenceforward on Tuesday evenings

until April 3. The lectures are free and open to the general public. Some of our own readers may have enough of what Ingersoll called intellectual hospitality to hear Mr. Quin on this subject. His competence is beyond question, and Comte is a very great figure in modern thought.

The "Nonconformist Conscience" has had a set back at East Ham. Councillor Wilkinson, a particularly bigoted advocate of the present code of religious teaching, was opposed by Mr. Evan Jones, who is prepared to support the substitution of an ethical code, and "considers the schools should be used for educational purposes, for which the rate is demanded." The result was a tie, and there is to be a re-election. Mr. Jones should receive the assistance and the votes of all Freethinkers in Plashet East.

Southend readers, who have complained of the difficulty in obtaining the *Freethinker* now, in consequence of some recent changes, are informed that it is obtainable at Bright's, a small newsagent's shop on the old lower front, about half way between the Palace Hotel on the west and the Ship Hotel on the east.

*Secular Thought* (Toronto) reproduces our Open Letter to Mr. W. T. Stead on "Infidelity and Immorality." We are glad to see Editor Ellis's paper still in the land of the living, and hope he will some day be able to turn it back from the monthly to the old weekly issue.

Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, in his newly published Autobiography, records his opinion that Charles Darwin's name "should stand above that of every philosopher of ancient or modern times." He was quite right in recognising Darwin as a greater man than himself, but how unusual is the modesty of such a recognition! Dr. Wallace's character is a beautiful one, but we think that Darwin's was a more beautiful one still. Without any loss of strength he was sweet to the very core. What could be more exquisitely lovely than the following extract from a letter of his to Dr. Wallace, referring, of course, to the fact that both their names were associated with the great theory of Natural Selection? "I hope it is a satisfaction to you to reflect," he wrote, "and very few things in my life have been more satisfactory to me—that we have never felt any jealousy towards each other, though in some sense rivals. I believe I can say this of myself with truth, and I am absolutely sure that it is true of you." The more anyone *fit* to admire this looks at it the more he *will* admire it. The case is one—to use the inevitable language of paradox—in which utter simplicity comes to the same thing as profound subtlety. A supreme master of composition could not have bettered that expression of natural sincerity. And this Charles Darwin was an "infidel." Dr. Wallace thinks that his own character has "continuously improved, and that this is owing chiefly to the teaching of spiritualism." To what, then, does he attribute the pure and noble character of Darwin? Are we not thrown back upon the shrewd proverb that "men act as they are built?" "'Tis in ourselves that we are thus or thus."

#### FOR THE LIVING.

We crown our departed with laurels,  
And whisper, with quivering breath,  
How nobly they stood in the conflict,  
How faithful they were, unto death.  
But if we had come, in the heat of the strife,  
With a cup of cold water it might have been life.

We meant, in the hush of the evening,  
At the close of some peaceful day,  
To tell them how precious we held them,  
But now they have slipped away.  
And their hearts may have longed with a secret ache  
For the one word of courage that nobody spake.

If we only had said in the morning,  
"Because you are steadfast and true,  
The world has a loftier vision,  
My life is the richer for you."  
It may be the heart with a smile and a song  
Would have lifted its burden and borne it along.

Beloved, the years that have vanished  
Can never again come back,  
And the treasures we miss in their passing  
The soul forever must lack.  
Let us do the errands of kindness to-day,  
For never again shall we journey this way.

—"Truthseeker" (New York).

#### Bible Intolerance.

ACCORDING to the teaching of some Christians, all the good in the world, socially, morally, and religiously, is a naturally developed fruit of the Word of God, the Bible. From other sacred Bibles nothing but evil has resulted, and Christian missionaries must be maintained abroad to destroy them and convert their victims. Woman has been emancipated and elevated by the Bible; which is utterly untrue. The slaves have been freed by the Bible; another false assertion. Political and religious freedom have been won by the Bible; though the truth is they have been partially attained in spite of it.

From the encomiums bestowed on the Bible by apologists, and some of them great scientists, one would have to believe that there would have been no civilisation, no improvement, no refinement, no education, no science, and no good without it, and if it was destroyed all goodness would be lost. Of course, the claims made for the Bible are never supported by any facts or evidence. In all the lectures and sermons delivered and re-published in book form, in defence, recently, there is nothing but bare assumptions and assertions, without a shadow of an attempt to produce evidence and proofs.

Is it true that the Bible is favorable to toleration, and freedom of thought and speech? I have no hesitation in answering the question with an emphatic No! On the contrary, I venture to assert that the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, in spirit and precept, is dead against toleration and freedom of thought and speech, and therefore that it is a persecuting book; which accounts for the fact that Christians are always persecutors in spirit, and also in acts, when they have the power. For proof I will now go to the Bible, and let it speak for itself.

As Christianity is partially an offshoot of Judaism, I must first examine what the Old Testament has to say on the matter. Thus we read: "Thou shalt have none other gods before me. For I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me" (Deut. v. 7-9). "Other gods" means other religions, opinions, and rites. The Jews were to have no liberty of choice. They must accept the religion provided for them, under a threat of severe punishment and death for refusal. And the threat was not an empty one, for we read: "And Israel joined himself unto Beol-Par; and the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel. And the Lord said unto Moses, Take all the heads of the people, and hang them up before the Lord against the sun, that the fierce anger of the Lord may be turned away from Israel" (Num. xxv. 3-4). It was done accordingly. Because the people took the liberty to worship the sun instead of Jehovah, they were slaughtered by the commandment of the Lord. A Hebrew who took a fancy to a Midianitish woman caused an awful tragedy and a plague. "Phinehas, a grandson of Aaron, took a javelin in hand, and he went after the Hebrew into the tent and thrust both of them through, the Hebrew, and the woman through her belly. So the plague was stayed from the children of Israel. And those that died in the plague were twenty and four thousands" (Num. xxv. 7-9). And all the slaughter because the Midianitish woman was not a Jewess, and the Jew followed his fancy instead of obeying the Lord. Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and two hundred and fifty men with them, were swallowed up by the earth because they took the liberty to worship in their own way.

In religion the Jew had no liberty. He had to think, believe, speak, and worship as he was told. His creed and practice was ready-made complete by Jehovah. The law was perfect, full, final, and contained all that was known or could be known. It was infallible. He must not, under pain of death, take from it or add to it. It contained all truth, and nothing but the truth; and he needed nothing more.

All other religions were false, and he must have nothing to do with any of them. He was told: "He that sacrificeth unto any god save unto the Lord only, he shall be utterly destroyed" (Ex. xxii. 20). Not only was he forbidden to worship other gods, he was told to kill anyone that did. "But thou shalt surely kill him: thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones till he die" (Deut. xiii. 8-10). Evidently Judaism was an intolerant, cruel, and persecuting religion. Had the Jews, under the influence of such a narrow, cramping, and cruel creed, been a powerful race, the world would have been deluged with blood, and all progress and improvement would have been prevented. Fortunately, even among the Jews themselves, the forces of evolution proved stronger than the powers of conservatism and stagnation.

But some Christians—not all—will say that the verses quoted belonged to the old dispensation, which was abolished by the new under Christ. They will also very likely quote the verse: "The creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. viii. 21). "But their minds were blinded; for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which veil is done away in Christ. But even unto this day when Moses is read the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless when it shall return to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now the Lord is that Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (2 Cor. 14-17); "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (Gal. v. 1). The quoted verses, and others, seem at the first glance to favor liberty of thought, speech, and action; but the seemingness, on close examination, turns out to be a delusive mirage. The only liberty a Christian has is to be a Christian, and nothing but a Christian, as we shall see presently.

As Christ is supposed to be the founder of Christianity, let us first see whether his teaching was favorable to toleration and freedom of thought and action. What was the purpose of Christ in coming to the world? Was it to bring liberty and harmony? Let him answer for himself: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother" (Matt. x. 34, 35); also Luke xii. 49-51. The terms of discipleship preclude any idea of liberty: "If any man come to me and hate not his father and mother and wife and children, and brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple" (Luke xiv. 20). His teaching was to be believed and accepted without doubt, inquiry, or objection. "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark xvi. 15, 16). There is no liberty or toleration here. In plain language it is, Believe the Gospel as taught by the priests or be damned. It is useless to point out that the verses are an interpolation; they are in the Bible as we have it; they are accepted by the Churches, and taught to children as divine truth. Besides, the doctrine taught in them is in complete harmony with other texts attributed to Jesus. Thus: "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not on the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him" (John iii. 36); "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear you, when ye depart thence shake off the dust under your feet against them. Verily I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city" (Mark vi. 11). There is no room for freedom and toleration in teaching like that. The doctrine must be believed and accepted as it is, without a question. For doubting it, objecting to it, hackling it, altering it, adding to it, and rejecting it

there is nothing left but hell fire, where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched (Mark ix. 44).

The same mischievous doctrine is taught also by the apostles, or some persons who wrote in their names. When Paul was preaching to the Jews in Corinth, "When they opposed themselves and blasphemed, he shook his raiment and said unto them, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean; from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles" (Acts xviii. 6). If we go through the epistles one by one, from Romans to Revelation, the same horrible teaching is met with. "But though we or an angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed" (Gal. i. 8); "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ let him be Anathema, Maran-atha" (1 Cor. xvi. 22).

The same intolerant and revengeful spirit is manifested in the instruction given as to how unbelievers and backsliders were to be treated. "And if he shall neglect to hear them tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican" (Matt. xviii. 17); "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrines which ye have learned; and avoid them" (Rom. xvi. 17); "To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh" (1 Cor. v. 5); "And if any man obey not our word, note that man and have no company with him" (2 Thes. iii. 14); "Having the form of godliness but denying the power thereof, from such turn away" (2 Tim. iii. 5); "A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition, reject" (Titus iii. 10); "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed" (2 John 10); "Holding faith and good conscience: which some having put away concerning faith have made shipwreck: Of whom is Hymeneus and Alexander; whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme" (1 Tim. i. 19, 20).

Such teaching contains the full essence of intolerance and persecution. To claim a spirit of liberalism and progress for a book containing such doctrines is the acme of absurdity. The very idea of the Bible being the Word of God is an assumption that it is perfect, full, holy, and infallible, and therefore that it is a mortal sin to doubt it, to object to it, to criticise it, to deny it, to disbelieve it, to oppose it, and to reject it. A divine religion is essentially a persecuting religion. There cannot be truth or goodness outside of it; and it is the duty of its believers to exterminate all other religions and religionists, for they are all infidels. And that is what Christians throughout the past have tried to do, but, fortunately, have failed. Liberalism and science have proved too strong for them, and triumphed over them all along the line. There is no thanks due to Christians and the Church for any privilege and advantage that we possess. Science and civilisation have triumphed in spite of the most bitter and strenuous opposition of the Christian Church. No thanks to the Church for that. It is the spirit of the age that merits the thanks. It is true that the Church is not so intolerant and persecuting as formerly; but the reason for the change is the loss of power. The Church dare not, and cannot, imprison, burn, and torture heretics as it used to do. Heretics are too numerous and too strong for her.

But the spirit of persecution and intolerance in the Church is not dead. We have public proof almost weekly of what some Christian bigots would do to heretics if they could. Christians that try to fine and imprison a cripple boy for selling a newspaper on a Sunday, and prosecute a poor shopkeeper for opening her shop for business on the Sabbath day, you may depend upon it, would not hesitate to burn infidels at the stake if they had the power.

Many Christians—not all—use every means at their disposal (and the means are numerous) to punish unbelievers. They are ostracised and shunned; they are boycotted in business, rejected for offices, and libelled in their character. Their literature is

often refused admittance to libraries and news-rooms, and newsmen and booksellers who sell it are often punished by the loss of their customers. As long as the Church adheres to the Bible as the Word of God it will remain an intolerant and a persecuting institution. Tolerance is a hateful word, and anyone that talks of tolerating the opinions of others assumes an air of authority he does not possess. Every man has as much right to think, speak, and act for himself as he has to his form or the color of his hair.

R. J. DERFEL.

### Correspondence.

#### A PLAIN WORD ON MR. BLATCHFORD.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR.—It is, no doubt, one of the most unpleasant tasks possible to criticise our friends, and in every public movement, I take it, most of us allow to pass on our own side some arguments which we would not ourselves employ, as well as methods of propaganda which we should not care to imitate. For instance, it is not to be supposed that every Free Trader is morally responsible for every argument that anyone may use against Protection, nor that every Irish Nationalist is an assenting party to every argument or tactic adopted by Nationalist leaders. Life is too short and the struggle of opinion too pressing to occupy our time in incidental criticism of those with whom we are in general agreement. But it does seem to me that the time has arrived when a word may fitly be raised in a Freethought journal against the tone and the temper adopted by Mr. Blatchford. In my humble judgment, Mr. Blatchford is tending to lower the standard of Freethought argument. It really is not edifying to see the careless slap-dash methods of the ordinary pulpit transferred to our own side, or to read a man volubly asserting, week by week, his own superiority to his critics, without, so far as I can see, offering clear evidence by his grasp of his subject that he is entitled to claim this superiority. Indeed, if it is permissible, I would venture to say that Mr. Blatchford, in undertaking the philosophic exposition of Determinism is undertaking something beyond his powers. Frankly, he is not a philosopher and has given no time apparently to a philosophic preparation. He is an admirable populariser of simple arguments and ideas; but the issue between "Free Will" (so-called) and Determinism, in order to be properly handled, involves a deeper study than Mr. Blatchford gives evidence of having made.

In a recent issue of the *Clarion*, for instance, there is quoted a letter from Sir Oliver Lodge to a Wolverhampton paper, together with a covering letter to Mr. Blatchford. Sir Oliver Lodge's Wolverhampton letter is certainly weak enough. He speaks of "our not being able to do either right or wrong if, as some philosophers have maintained, we are 'automata' having no power of choice or effective control over our actions." Such a sentence is clumsy enough in all conscience. If, as seems to be the case, Sir Oliver Lodge is standing for "Free Will," then "automata"—that is, presumably, self-acting, self-sufficient machines—are exactly what men are alleged to be. Sir Oliver further goes on to say that "we cannot in any proper sense of the word do right or wrong unless we are able to discriminate between good and evil—to choose our own path and to follow it." As if anyone had ever argued that we cannot discriminate between "good and evil" as between red and green, even though some men are color blind, and the very greatest diversity exists amongst men as to what exactly is good and what evil. Good and evil, red and green, are all relative terms, whilst causation is an attribute—the sole attribute—of the sum of happenings, to which no alternative is possible in thought. Uncaused volitions are simply unthinkable; that is the end of the matter. Absence of causation is not a possible concept. And the only remaining crux is as to whether we are entitled to praise or blame our fellows. The answer is: we are so entitled, provided the bestowal of such praise or blame is motivated by a moral purpose. Blame beyond such as is necessary or sufficient to cause moral betterment is mere revenge, and is, therefore, aimless brutality and iniquity. That, in very few words, seems to me to be the logic and ethics of the matter. Sir Oliver Lodge who, by his recent coquettings on Christian platforms, however, must be held to be a sort of a Christian and certainly a Theist, arguing at one and the same time for an Omnipotent Creator and for "Free Will" is an interesting spectacle. If volitions are "uncaused," then Omnipotence can in no way design anything into which

human activity enters. Though the people who tell us that men may "choose" this or that without motive or cause, at the same time tell us that "God" caused the Welsh revival or stopped the Russo-Japanese war; things which were obviously achieved by human volition.

To return, however, to Mr. Blatchford, he does not answer Sir Oliver Lodge in any way whatever. Instead, we have the mere vigorous assertion that Sir Oliver is surprisingly ignorant, that Bishop Butler and Mr. W. H. Mallock are similarly mistaken, and voluble declarations that he (Mr. Blatchford) knows what he is talking about, and is not a fool, and that he can prove what he says, and that he did not write his book for fun, and much more to the same effect; all which, if it is meant to be humorous, is very weak, and if it is meant to be serious is very reprehensible. Nothing half so empty or wretched would be allowed for a moment to appear in the least sophisticated Freethought journal.

Surely it is time that at least a faint word was raised against methods which must ultimately tend to the disadvantage of Freethought. Strangers approaching the matter under Mr. Blatchford's auspices get an erroneous idea as to the gravity, philosophic depth, and intellectual competence of the Freethought School. No one wishes the "bounce" of the Tory platform or the "bluff" of the Christian pulpit imported into Freethought advocacy, and the people who would be attracted by Mr. Blatchford's later reckless and unbalanced writing, would be almost undesirable acquisitions to a movement which, before all, needs serious students. Mr. Blatchford, without question, means well; the only difficulty is that he is not properly equipped for his task.

FREDERICK RYAN.

#### A WASTED ARMY.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR.—I am always greatly interested with the leading articles in the *Freethinker*, all of which I find profitable, and with most of which I am in complete agreement. There are one or two remarks, however, I wish to make with reference to an article by Mr. C. Cohen, entitled "A Wasted Army." It is in to-day's issue of the *Freethinker*, and it deals with a statement made by Mr. Crooks the other day, in which he spoke of the 70,000 adult Sunday scholars of Birmingham as being one of the signs of improvement in the country.

There is one great difference I wish to point out between these adult schools and the old-fashioned Sunday-schools. This point, if considered, will show the case against Mr. Crooks to be not quite so bad as appears from Mr. Cohen's article. Whereas a Sunday-school for children is an institution got up by the particular church to which the school belongs, for the furthering of the influence of that church, an adult school is only religious in so far as the members who compose it are religious, and if the school is composed of average working men the utmost freedom of thought and speech is generally not only allowed, but encouraged.

Mr. Cohen asks, "What are these thousands of adults likely to learn in Sunday-schools that will be of value to them?" Then he enumerates certain things—"the wonders of science, the beauties of art or literature, or the duties of citizenship?" "Will he learn anything concerning the resources of the country, its wasted agriculture, or the means of redressing political and social injustice?" To these questions I answer: Yes, certainly they will learn these things. Speaking of the adult school here at Chippenham, of which I am a member, I may say that to learn these things is the aim and object of our school. There are at least half a dozen (including myself) members of the school who are Atheists, and who have "gravitated" to this institution, it being the only place where either of us who has the ability can speak freely and be on equal terms with his fellows; there being, unfortunately, no Branch of the Secular Society here. So far from breaking up our adult school, social reform is the one subject on which most of us are agreed. This morning, at our school, I had the pleasure to listen to a paper on "An Alternative to General Booth's Scheme" by a brother member, a reader of the *Freethinker* and a Socialist. Hoping these few facts will be of interest, I am yours sincerely,

ALBERT J. WILKINS.

8, Park-street, Chippenham, Wilts, Nov. 5, 1905.

There is chastity in the wrath of the just against the unjust. The Imprecation can be as holy as the Hosanna; and indignation, honest indignation, has the very purity of virtue. In point of whiteness, the foam has no reason to envy the snow.—*Victor Hugo*.

## To Robert G. Ingersoll.

BY THE LATE EDGAR FAWCETT.

Thou hast peered at all creeds of the past, and each one hath seemed futile and poor

As a firefly that fades on a marsh, as a wind that makes moan on a moor;

For thy soul in its large love to man, in its heed of his welfare and cheer,

Bids him hurl to the dust whence they sprang all idolatries fashioned by fear.

Not the eagle can gaze at the sun with more dauntless and challenging eyes

Than thou at the radiance of truth when it rifts the dark durance of lies.

From thy birth wert thou tyranny's foe, and its deeds were disdain in thy sight;

Thou art leagued with the dawn as the lark is—like him dost thou leap to the light!

Having marked how the world's giant woes for the worst part are bigotry's brood,

Thou hast hated, yet never with malice, and scorned but in service of good.

Thy compassionate vision saw keen how similitude always hath dwelt

Between fumes poured from altars to God and from flames haggard martyrs have felt.

What more splendid a pity than thine for the anguish thy race hath endured

Through allegiance to spectres and wraiths from the cohorts of fancy conjured?

At the bold pomps of temple and church is it wonder thy wisdom hath mourned,

Since the architect, Ignorance, reared them, and Fright, the pale sculptor, adorned?

But sterner thy loathing and grief that the priesthoods have shamed not to tell

Of an infinite vengeance enthroned in the heart of an infinite hell;

That they shrank not to mold from void air an Omnipotence worship should heed

And yet clothed it with ruffian contempt for the world's multitudinous need.

Thy religion is loftier than theirs; nay, with vehement lips hast thou said

Its foundations are rooted in help to the living and hope for the dead.

All eternity's richest rewards to a spirit like thine would prove vain,

Were it sure of but one fellow-mortal that writhed in unperishing pain.

Like a mariner drifted by night where tempestuous wracks overshadow

Every merciful star that perchance might with silvery pilotage aid,

Resolution and vigilance each close-akin as thy heart-beat or breath,

Dost thou search in thy courage and calm the immense chartless ocean of death.

There are phantom ships that lurch up, and thou seest them and art not allured

By their masts made of glimmering dream, by their bulwarks from cloudland unmoored;

For the helmsmen that steer them are mist, and the sails they are winged with, each one,

By the feverish hands of fanatics on looms of delusion are spun.

At the vague stems are visages poised that in variant glimpses appear.....

Here the swart and imperial Osiris, the crescent-crowned Mabomet here;

Or again, mystic Brahma, with eyes full of omens, manitions, and vows;

Or again, meek and beauteous, the Christ, with the blood-crusted thorns on his brows.

But thou sayest in thy surety to all: "Empty seemings, pass onward and fade!".....

Not by emblems and symbols of myth wert thou born to be tricked and betrayed;

For aloof o'er the desolate blank thou discernest, now dubious, now plain,

The expanse of one sheltering shoreland, worth ardors untold to obtain.

Full of promise, expectancy, peace, in secure sequestration it lies,

Undismayed by a menace of storm from its arch of inscrutable skies.....

Canst thou reach it, strong sea-farer?.....Yes! for the waves are thy bondsmen devout.

Look! they wash thee safe-limbed on its coast, clinging firm to thy tough spar of doubt!

Roam at large in its glorious domain; from its reaches night half has withdrawn;

Over inlet, bay, meadow, and creek broods the delicate damask of dawn;

Roam at large; 'tis a realm thou should'st love; 'tis the kingdom where Science reigns king;

In its lapses of grove and of greensward sleeps many a crystalline spring.

To the eastward are mountains remote, with acclivities towering sublime:

The repose of their keen virgin peaks mortal foot hath not ventured to climb;

In their bastions and caverns-occult, in their bleak lairs of glacier and stream,

There are treasures more copious and costly than fable hath yet dared to dream.

Thou shalt see not their splendors, for fate may retard through long ages the hour

That in bounteous bestowal at last shall mankind inconceivably dower.

Yet thy prophecies err not, O sage; thou divinest what wealth shall outpour

When exultant those proud heights of knowledge posterity sweeps to explore.

Not for thee, not for us, those dear days! In oblivion our lots will be cast

When the future hath built firm and fair on the bulk of a petrified past.

Yet its edifice hardier shall bide for the boons fraught with help that we give—

For the wrongs that we cope with and slay, for the lies that we crush and outlive!

And if record of genius like thine, or of eloquence fiery and deep,

Shall remain to the centuries regnant from centuries lulled into sleep,

Then thy memory as music shall float amid actions and aims yet to be,

And thine influence cling to life's good as the sea-vapors cling to the sea!

As in the bodies of animals, nature tends always to purge herself of those humors and elements which do not assimilate with those of which their bodies are properly composed, so in the human communities the same nature directs that whoever differs greatly from his neighbors, especially if such difference is also contrariety, shall be subjected to persecution or expulsion. The good and the generous are also wont to be most hateful because usually they are sincere and call things by their right names. This fault is never pardoned by the human race, which never hates so much those who do evil, or the evil itself, as him who insists on calling evil things by their proper names. So that very often while he who does evil obtains riches, honors, and power, he who insists on giving evil names to evil things is condemned to the gallows, men being most ready to suffer either from each other or from heaven anything whatever, provided only that their ears are not offended by hard words.—*Leopardi* (James Thomson's translation, edited by Bertram Dobell).

### WHY NOT!

Here's a suggestion in form of a question:

How would it be if we infidels vile

With your sheepish, lion-like, serpentine guile,

Entered the half empty churches—good luck to them—

Some day, and by rule of majority stuck to them?

It's not so long since, as Christians, we paid for them

With our fathers before us. Ere long if we stayed for them

Some ultra fanatic of Christful obsession

And a score of old tabs will be left in possession.

G. E. W.

I have ridiculed the futility of speculative minds, only when they would pave the clouds instead of the streets. To see distant things better than near is a certain proof of a defective sight. The people I have held in derision never turn their eyes to see what they can see, but direct them continually where nothing is to be seen. And this, by their disciples, is called the sublimity of speculation!—*Landor's "Lucian."*

## 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.

STANLEY HALL (near the "Boston," Junction-road, N.): 7.30. C. Cohen, "Christianity's Last Stand: an Examination of Mr. Mallock's *Reconstruction of Belief*."

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S. (North Camberwell Hall, New Church-road): Freethought Parliament, 3.15, F. R. Theakstone, "The Immortal Soul."

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Liberal Hall, Broadway, Forest Gate, E.): 7.30, W. J. Ramsey, "Where Angels Dwell."

### OUTDOOR.

BATTERSEA BRANCH N. S. S. (Battersea Park Gates): 11.30, a Lecture.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S. (Rushcroft-road, Brixton): Open-air meeting every Wednesday evening at 8.

### COUNTRY.

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Coffee House, Bull Ring): Thursday, Nov. 16, at 8, H. Hyman, "Charles Bradlaugh."

CARDIFF BRANCH N. S. S. (Maskell's Restaurant, St. Mary-street): Monday, Nov. 13, at 8, P. B. Williams, "Some Free-thinkers' Objections to the N. S. S. Answered."

COVENTRY BRANCH N. S. S. (Union-street Assembly Hall): H. Percy Ward, 3, "Has Man a Free-Will?" 7, "What Secularism Offers in Place of Christianity."

FALLSWORTH SECULAR SUNDAY SCHOOL (Pole-lane): 6.30, Mr. F. B. Grundy's String and Vocal Party.

GLASGOW BRANCH N. S. S. (110 Brunswick-street): 12 noon, Discussion Class, D. G. Lindsay, "N. S. S. Aims and Objects: a Criticism"; 6.30, G. Scott, "Some Aspects of Roman Catholicism."

GLASGOW RATIONALIST AND ETHICAL ASSOCIATION (319 Sauchiehall-street): Monday, Nov. 13, Llewellyn W. Williams, "British and American Education: a Comparison."

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate): 6.30, Joseph McCabe, "The Evolution of Man." With Lantern Illustrations.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N. S. S. (Alexandra Hall, Islington-square): G. W. Foote, 3, "Oscar Wilde and Jesus Christ"; 7, "Why the 'Yellow Monkeys' Won: an Object Lesson to Christians."

MANCHESTER BRANCH N. S. S. (Rusholme-road, Oxford-road, All Saints): 6.30, John R. Ferrey, Dramatic Recital, Humorous and Sentimental. Free.

NEWCASTLE RATIONALIST LITERARY AND DEBATING SOCIETY (Lockhart's Cathedral Cafe): Thursday, Nov. 16, at 8, Social Evening.

PORTh BRANCH N. S. S. (Room, Town Hall, Porth): 6.30, T. R. Thomas, "How the Religious Idea Originated."

## TRUE MORALITY:

Or, The Theory and Practice of Neo-Malthusianism,

IS, I BELIEVE,

THE BEST BOOK

ON THIS SUBJECT.

The new Popular Edition, consisting of 176 pages, is now ready.

In order that it may have a large circulation and to bring it within the reach of the poor, I have decided that the price for a COPY POST FREE SHALL BE ONLY TWOPENCE. A dozen copies, for distribution, may be had post free for a shilling.

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

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

Orders should be sent to the author,

R. HOLMES, HANNEY, WANTAGE, BERKS.

## 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 PIONEER PRESS, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

## TO INSURANCE AGENTS.

I WANT TO INSURE MY LIFE FOR

**£1,000.**

(ONE THOUSAND POUNDS)

Is there a reader of the "FREETHINKER" who is Agent for a really good Company? If so, send full particulars to **J. W. GOTT, Union St., Bradford**

**GOING  
LIKE  
PENNY  
CAKES.**

1 Pair Pure Wool Blankets.  
1 Pair Large Bed Sheets.  
1 Beautiful White Quilt.  
1 Pair Fine Lace Curtains.  
1 Long Pillow Case.  
1 Pair Short Pillow Cases.  
1 Tin Freeclothing Tea.

All for 21s. Carriage Paid.

SPECIAL LINES:

25s. Overcoats to Measure.

35s. Suits to Measure.

10s. 6d. Bradlaugh Boots.

AGENTS WANTED.

**J. W. GOTT, 2 and 4 Union Street, Bradford**

And at

ST. JAMES'S HALL, MANCHESTER, every Tuesday, 8 to 8 o'clock.

London Branch,

60 PARK ROAD, PLUMSTEAD, LONDON, S.E.,

## Taxes on Knowledge.

By C. D. COLLETT.

The story of their origin and final repeal after twelve years persistent agitation. Few people know of their wicked intention or how disastrously they operated during their pernicious existence of 146 years. They were deliberately intended and used to keep persons in perpetual ignorance. The Author was Secretary for their Abolition, and he was the only living person able to write this full and romantic account, the details of which have never been told before.

Every Freethinker should possess this exceptional work.

PUBLISHED IN TWO VOLUMES AT

**SIXTEEN SHILLINGS.**

NOW OFFERED AT

**FIVE SHILLINGS.**

(POST FREE.)

THE PIONEER PRESS, 2 Newcastle street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

## Thwaites' Liver Pills.

The Best Family Medicine in the World.

Will cure Liver, Kidney, and all Stomach Diseases effectually.

Good for Heart Troubles and Cardiac Complaints, Female Ailments, Anæmia.

1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d. per Box.

Post free 14 or 33 stamps. Directions with each box.

G. THWAITES, Herbalist,

2, Church Row, Stockton-on-Tees, and

24, Linthorpe Road, Middlesbrough.

THWAITES' LIVER PILLS are not Sugar-coated or got up to deceive, nor factory made, but are made from Herbs by a Herbalist of nearly 40 years' experience in curing disease with Herbs and preparations from them.

# 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 any of the 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.

# THE BIBLE HANDBOOK

FOR  
FREETHINKERS AND INQUIRING CHRISTIANS

EDITED BY

G. W. FOOTE AND W. P. BALL

A New Edition, Revised, and Handsomely Printed

CONTENTS:

Part I.—Bible Contradictions. Part II.—Bible Absurdities. Part III.—Bible Atrocities.

Part IV.—Bible Immoralities, Indecencies, Obscenities, Broken Promises, and Unfulfilled Prophecies.

The above four useful parts, convenient for the pocket, may be had separately, FOURPENCE EACH, or the whole, bound in one volume, 1s. 6d.; Best Edition, bound in cloth, 2s. 6d.

"This is a volume which we strongly commend to all interested in the study of the Judaic-Christian Scriptures. It is edited by G. W. Foote and W. P. Ball, and Published by the Freethought Publishing Company, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C., price 1s. 6d. Indeed, we cannot conceive any Christian as having a faith worth regarding unless he has studied this remarkable volume. Teachers in Sunday and elementary schools will find it of special value as an aid to the exposition of the Christian religion from a thoughtful and critical standpoint. It is a perfect army of facts and comparisons. Since 1888 it has been the standard volume of the subject with which it deals, and its popularity is emphasised by the fact that the public have demanded a new edition."—*Reynolds's Newspaper.*

Under the Ban of the London County Council.

THE POPULAR EDITION

(Revised and Enlarged)

OF

# "BIBLE ROMANCES"

BY

G. W. FOOTE

With a Portrait of the Author

*Reynolds's Newspaper* says:—"Mr. G. W. Foote, chairman of the Secular Society, is well known as a man of exceptional ability. His *Bible Romances* have had a large sale in the original edition. A popular, revised, and enlarged edition, at the price of 6d., has now been published by the Pioneer Press, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, for the Secular Society. Thus, within the reach of almost everyone, the ripest thought of the leaders of modern opinion are being placed from day to day."

144 Large Double-Column Pages, Good Print, Good Paper

SIXPENCE—NET

(Post Free, 8d)

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

# THREE SPECIAL LECTURES

AT THE

## STANLEY HALL

NEAR THE "BOSTON," JUNCTION ROAD, LONDON, N.

(Under the auspices of the Secular Society, Limited).

Sunday, November 12—**C. COHEN**: "CHRISTIANITY'S LAST STAND: AN EXAMINATION OF MR. MALLOCK'S *Reconstruction of Belief*."

Sunday, November 19—**G. W. FOOTE**: "THE BEAUTIFUL LAND ABOVE."

Sunday, November 26—**G. W. FOOTE**: "WHAT HAS CHRISTIANITY DONE FOR RUSSIA?"

Doors open at 7 p.m. Chair taken at 7.30 p.m. Admission Free.—Reserved Seats, 1s.

680 pp., Cloth Gilt, 3s., Post Free.

## THE ELEMENTS OF SOCIAL SCIENCE;

Or, PHYSICAL, SEXUAL, AND NATURAL RELIGION.

With a Memoir of the Author, the late **Dr. GEORGE DRYSDALE**,  
by his brother **Dr. Chas. R. DRYSDALE**.

The *Weekly Times and Echo* of Oct. 8th, in a leading article, says: "We, who well remember the first appearance of this book [1854], which was published anonymously by Mr. Edward Truelove, were struck at the time by the fearlessness and knowledge of the author. It was a risky thing in those days to advocate the limitation of families, and to write boldly on the terrible maladies—moral and physical—which were sapping the vitals of the nation, and for which mere spiritual anodynes were the only remedies preached by the orthodox."

Publisher: **GEORGE STANDRING**, 7 & 9 Finsbury Street, London, E.C.

### A WONDERFUL BARGAIN.

## "THE RIGHTS OF MAN"

BY

**THOMAS PAINE.**

Well Printed on Good Paper, 164 pages,

WITH A BIOGRAPHY OF PAINE BY **J. M. WHEELER.**

PRICE SIXPENCE.

Post Free, EIGHTPENCE.

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

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY EDITION OF

## THE AGE OF REASON

By **THOMAS PAINE.**

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

Printed on Good Paper, and Published at the

**MARVELLOUSLY LOW PRICE OF SIXPENCE.**

Postage of Single Copies, 2d.

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

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