

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXVII.—No. 40

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 6, 1907

PRICE TWOPENCE

I make war against this theological instinct: I have found traces of it everywhere. Whoever has theological blood in his veins is from the very beginning ambiguous and disloyal with respect to everything.....I have dug out the theologian instinct everywhere; it is the most diffused, the most peculiarly SUBTERRANEAN form of falsity that exists on earth. What a theologian feels as true, MUST needs be false: one has therein almost a criterion of truth.—NIETZSCHE.

A Blackguard Policy.

THERE were men of genius once in the Christian fold. It was a long time ago, of course, when the truth of Christianity could be fairly taken for granted, and a man of genius could enter into its service without hesitation. The Church of England then had a Hooker, a Taylor, a Barrow, and a South, who were all masters of English prose. South was a peculiarly masculine writer; he was also very witty, and on one occasion he was rebuked by a brother Bishop for sprinkling so many witticisms over his sermons; whereupon he asked his dull episcopal monitor if he himself wouldn't have used his wit if God had given him any. It was this witty Bishop South who said of the interpretation of prophecy in general, and the book of Revelation in particular, that it was a subject which generally found a man cracked—or left him so.

We may apply South's witticism on prophecy to another subject. It is a curious thing that "Christian Evidence" generally finds a man a blackguard—or leaves him so. The Christian Evidence Society—which, by the way, never troubles about Christian Evidences—has always had a prize collection of controversial blackguards in its service. The taste of these gentry is all for personalities. They seldom have the brains for anything else. Without knowledge or ability, they have a rare capacity for impudence. They are object-lessons, not in envy—for they have not sense enough to conceive anything superior to themselves—but in hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness. Their total stock-in-trade is an assortment of lies and libels against well-known Freethinkers. Short of murder, there is hardly a vice or a crime which they have not alleged or insinuated against their opponents. To specify would be simply to run through all the moral and social offences that have names in the English dictionary. This blackguard policy they have exclusively to themselves. Freethinkers have never imitated it. They have never even retaliated. And the future historian will have to put this fact to their eternal credit.

We have no scruple in saying—for it is demonstrably true—that the chiefs of the Christian Evidence Society have deliberately encouraged the blackguard policy of their subordinates. Let us look at some recent facts.

On August 11, of the present year, Miss Vance, the N. S. S. secretary, wrote to the secretary of the Christian Evidence Society, complaining that speakers from his platforms constantly twitted the Secularists with having a hymn in their "hymn-book" in glorification of whisky. She gave him the names of four of the culprits, and asked him to give her the title

of the book and the date of publication. Rev. R. V. Faithfull Davies replied that he would "make enquiries into the matter." Four days later he wrote saying: "I understand that the book about which you ask is 'The Secularist's Manual of Songs and Ceremonies,' edited by Austin Holyoake and Charles Watts, and published by Austin and Co., 17 Johnson's-court, E.C." Miss Vance replied on August 28, saying that she had carefully looked through the volume to which she had been referred without being able to find the "glorification of whisky"; accordingly, she asked him to give her a more precise reference. His answer, dated September 2, appears to have miscarried. He now forwards a copy of it, and it runs as follows: "I understand that the reference for which you ask is lyric No. 94, verse 5, page 56."

Note this gentleman's trick phrase—"I understand." He doesn't know. Of course he *did* know all the time. He was simply fencing; that is, evading responsibility. Were it otherwise, he would have shown a little more animation. A real gentleman would have satisfied himself as to whether his employees had been lying and libelling. He would have read the lines in question for himself, and formed an opinion of his own. *This* gentleman leaves the question to settle itself.

We will push the Rev. R. V. Faithfull Davies towards the horns of the dilemma. Either he has read the lines to which he referred Miss Vance or he has not. If he has *not* read them, he is indifferent to the honor of himself, his lecturers, or his Society. If he *has* read them, he either understands them or he does not. If he does *not* understand them, he is a fool; if he *does* understand them, he is a blackguard.

The "Secularist's Manual" referred to was published in 1871. It was a private, not an official venture; but Charles Bradlaugh contributed a Preface, and Austin Holyoake and Charles Watts were his lieutenants at that time, and anything disgraceful in its contents would, of course, reflect upon the party.

That was thirty-six years ago. During all that period we have heard nothing about the "glorification of whisky" until recently. Perhaps it was thought that a volume so long out of print, and quite unknown to the present generation, might be misrepresented with impunity.

The "Manual" contains various poems, singable and unsingable, by all sorts of authors, including Shelley and Byron. On page 56 there is a satirical poem entitled "Let Us All be Unhappy on Sunday." We believe it was written by Brough, but the author's name is not given. Its sub-title is "A Lyric for Saturday Night." The whole poem is a satire on the Sabbatarianism of forty or fifty years ago, which was of the most galling character. Here is the opening verse:—

"We zealots made up of frail clay,
The sou'-looking children of sorrow,
While not over jolly to-day,
Resolve to be wretched to-morrow.
We can't for a certainty tell
What mirth may molest us on Monday;
At least, to begin the week well,
Let us all be unhappy on Sunday."

The "zealots" are made to speak from beginning to end. They are made to satirise themselves, as

Burns made the rigid, canting Presbyterians satirise themselves in "Holy Willie's Prayer." The last verse is as follows:—

"What tho' a good precept we strain
Till hateful and hurtful we make it;
What though, in thus pulling the rein,
We draw it so tight as to break it?
Abroad we forbid folks to roam,
For fear they get social or frisky;
Of course, they can sit still at home
And get dismally drunk upon whisky."

This is an allusion to the Sabbatarian argument that the working classes, if they had liberty to enjoy themselves rationally on Sunday, would only abuse their freedom. The satirist, in a satirist's way, points out that if the working classes were not allowed to move about for a little pleasure, they could sit at home and get drunk—under the benevolent law of Christian England.

It is not the "Secularists," we repeat, but the Sabbatarian "zealots" who are speaking in every verse of "Let Us All Be Unhappy On Sunday." This must be obvious enough even to the intelligence of a Christian Evidence lecturer. It follows, therefore, that these blackguards have wrested four lines away from the context, which explains them; have taken them out of one person's mouth and put them into another's; and have thus constructed a vile slander on the whole Secular party.

We include the reverend secretary of the Christian Evidence Society in the foregoing indictment. We also include the Rev. A. J. Waldron. This person mouthed those four perverted lines from his Hyde Park platform the other evening. He asked his audience to believe that Secularists advised people to stay at home and get drunk on Sundays. We brand him as a cowardly and contemptible liar. He is worthy of his creed.

G. W. FOOTE.

Religion and the Press.

MUCH has been heard of late from the Christian pulpits concerning the necessity of purifying public and social life. It is being called a Christian duty, with the inference, sometimes avowed sometimes implied, that this work will be carried through by Christians or not at all. Yet Christianity, as an organised religion, flourished during those periods of our history when public life was most corrupt, nor were those who impeached that corruption always remarkable for the rigidity of their Christian faith. Indeed, a broad survey of English history would show that corruption has never yet failed to get a backing of religion; while those who look beneath the surface are well aware that an unquestioned religious supremacy has been the indispensable condition of sustained public maladministration and depravity. And, on the contrary, periods of political and social reform have been equally distinguished by a weakening of religious conviction, however much this may have been disguised. It is, therefore, quite in accord with past experience that the present pulpit preaching on behalf of a better public life, should follow increased attention by the general public to social betterment. The clergy are, at the best, merely social barometers; and as they are thrown more upon public opinion for support, the more they tend to reflect that phase of opinion which happens to be, for the time, the strongest.

Two or three sermons have lately been delivered by as many prominent preachers, concerning the quality of English journalism. They have lamented the low tone adopted by the "Yellow Press," the pandering to more or less unworthy passions by newspapers with no other thought than an increase of circulation, the space devoted to betting news, etc. In many papers, says one speaker—

"There is not even a pretence of fair play in the leader columns, and as for the report, there is nothing that you can call reports at all. You have snippets of speeches, stray sentences picked out, and often garbled, so as to convey an entirely misleading impression."

These charges are true enough, and regrettable because they are true; but the evil to which they point did not originate with the class of papers in question, nor is a denunciation of them the most effective method of preventing a continuance of the evil.

Now, generally speaking, the object of proprietors of papers is to sell their wares by pleasing their actual or potential readers. And that a paper has a large circulation may be taken as proving that it suits the tastes of a large section of the general public. If the paper did not suit them it would not be subscribed for. That it is subscribed for may be taken as a proof that it does, one thing with another, suit those who buy it. Allowing, therefore, for the influence of a badly conducted paper in depraving taste and in perpetuating a depraved taste, it is far more important to study the people who buy the papers complained of, than it is to launch out into denunciations of the papers themselves.

In the next place, the majority of people in this country, and, therefore, the majority of newspaper readers, are professedly Christian. They may not be Christian in the sense of being devotedly attached to their creed, and burning with evangelistic zeal for its propagation; but they are sufficiently Christian to resent anything in the shape of either a direct attack on Christianity or at too great a prominence being given to movements that openly ignore Christian claims. It may further be safely assumed, that if the preachers indicated had been dealing with a non-Christian country, or even with a country where, say Roman Catholicism was the dominant faith, they would not have hesitated to say that the dominant religion was responsible, negatively or positively, for the evil of which complaint is made.

The evil, then, is one that springs primarily from the general public. The "Yellow Press" did not create the feelings to which it panders; it simply exploits them. The Harmsworth group, against which most of the speakers were talking, runs quite a number of religious weeklies; and this may be taken as further evidence that it understands the public mind in both departments. And what is very instructive to anyone who will study both branches of the Harmsworth activity, will be the fact that the same features characterise both its secular and religious productions, with the single exception of the betting news—which is fundamentally more respectable than much to which the signatures of well-known clergymen are appended in its religious weeklies. In the main, then, it is Christians who buy these popular newspapers described in the quotation given. Proprietors must depend upon Christian support for their circulation, and they must, therefore, be in the main, far from repugnant to Christian sentiment. Otherwise, religious influence is still quite strong enough to suppress them. Some time ago, when it was proposed to establish a seven day's paper by running a Sunday edition, religious influence was strong enough to secure an abandonment of the project; and were Christianity really on the side of a rationally healthy sentiment, our daily and weekly newspapers would be much superior to what they are.

The faults of the "Yellow Press" are really characteristics of the religious press of this country—indeed, its faults were current in religious literature long before these faults became the common features of the press. There is no fair play in the ordinary newspaper, we are told. Granted; and no one knows this better than the Freethinker. But was there ever at any time anything like fair play in Christian controversial literature? Why, as a matter of fact, a more mendacious literature the world has never seen. Most active Freethinkers have tried until they were sick of trying to get their corrections of Christian misstatements corrected in the religious papers in which the misstatements appeared. During the Torrey agitation I sent one or two carefully-worded corrections of its own paragraphs to the *Christian World*—with the usual result. Meanwhile, the editor went on publishing eulogistic descriptions

of the work of one of the most unscrupulous liars on the evangelistic platform. Innumerable instances have also been given in these columns in which religious papers, and papers like the *Daily News*, that are avowedly supporters of religious interests, have garbled reports of lectures and addresses so as to prevent injury to religion.

The ordinary press, then, is really copying the religious press. Its faults are fundamentally the faults of a community mentally emasculated by a Christian training. For years the ordinary newspaper has studiously ignored the Freethought propaganda. Why? Not because the newspaper staffs were rabidly religious, but simply for fear of offending its Christian readers. For years, too, meetings and efforts on behalf of Secular Education have been carefully concealed from the knowledge of the outside public. Again, for precisely the same reason. Newspaper proprietors are compelled to study circulation; and circulation in Christian England means playing to the prejudices of a religious and ill-educated public.

While I write there lies before me a copy of an East-end paper that has been fair enough to print some correspondence of a Freethought character. With what result? Why, with the result of letters from outraged subscribers, who solemnly warn the editor that he will ruin his paper if he allows attacks on Christianity to appear. These correspondents simply mean that they will decline to subscribe to a paper that gives a view of Christianity that is not their own. This they believe to be their duty as good Christians. And so it is, if their religious leaders are right in their teaching. For with them the teaching and practice has been that only one side is, if possible, to get a hearing. The Roman Church has its Index. The Protestants have no official Index, but they have been the instrument of boycott, which they use without mercy. Congregations are warned off certain papers and books in the name of Christian morality. Books are excluded from libraries, newsagents boycotted who display Freethought literature; and is there any wonder that newspaper proprietors, who cater for the same public, dare not be honest and straightforward in their presentation of daily events?

Newspaper writers and newspaper proprietors are really made of much the same stuff as other people. The author of the august editorial "we" eats his meals, and dons his clothes, and feels, and thinks, much the same as do ordinary mortals. They have no greater leaning to evil courses than have other people. But like most other people, whether they are intellectually honest or not depends largely upon whether mental crookedness or straightness is made the easier. And it is certain that so long as the public make the path of the coward and the hypocrite one of roses, and that of the honest man one of thorns, the latter will continue to be a comparative rarity. If Christians really want a straightforward and thoroughly honest newspaper, it could be secured in a very little while. Only let them cease to protest against the appearance of anything that does not agree with their religious sentiments, and editors, growing bolder by experience, will gradually make their papers what they ought to be—organs of public opinion, epitomes of the whole of the public mind. Let them welcome all expressions of opinion—irrespective of the view taken—as so much gain to the nation's mental output, and not only will newspapers gain in quality, but their readers may develop a growing relish for something better than snippets of sensational news filtered through the brains of catchpenny journalists. With mental vacuity all evils are possible. And the only cure is to accustom the people to a healthful mental diet.

But do Christians actually want a really more intellectual press than they have? Personally, I doubt it. What they really want is a press that will eliminate certain aspects of secular information in favor of greater prominence for religious news. They might like to see betting news suppressed—although Christians as well as others support betting

—but only to make room for the quite as dangerous, and certainly as dishonest, excitement of sensational evangelism. Their ideal newspaper would be one as full of garbled reports and misleading stories as any that are found in the "Yellow Press," and with the inevitable consequence of creating a degenerate mental type that is a nation's greatest danger in periods of stress and storm.

C. COHEN.

Christianity and the Brotherhood of Man.

CHRISTIANITY enjoys the great distinction of being a universal claimant. All good proceeds from her alone. To her we owe everything that makes life worth living. From her have come all the reforms that have ever taken place. "Every virtue we possess, and every conquest won, and every thought of holiness are hers alone." And Christianity is Christ, and Christ is God incarnate. So we are continually assured by the theologians, Old and New. Particularising, they lay hold on what they describe as the two most precious truths in the world, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, and say, "For these we are exclusively indebted to Jesus Christ." As this is a clearly-defined, unambiguous claim, let us critically test its validity.

The first discovery of criticism is that neither the Fatherhood of God nor the Brotherhood of Man was revealed or taught by Jesus. It is true that Jesus is reported as calling and addressing God as Father; but it is not true that he ever spoke of him as the Father of the race. Nor did he once refer to man as being by nature God's child. On his lips, the Fatherhood of God extended only to himself and his disciples. Believers in him alone received "the right to become children of God" (John i. 12). Sonship was the reward of faith, not a fact of Nature.

In Jesus' estimation, not all Jews even were justified in calling God their Father. During a dispute with him, one day, some of them made the retort: "We were not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God. Jesus said unto them, "If God were your Father, ye would love me" (John viii. 41, 42). But if the bulk of the Jews were not included in the family of God, surely the Gentiles had no possible chance of inclusion.

Furthermore, we must not lose sight of the fact that the mission of Jesus was only to his own people. After his resurrection, he is represented as giving this sublime commission to his apostles, "Go ye, and make disciples of all the nations"; but there is strong evidence that such words never fell from his mouth. "In my judgment," says Harnack, "the real facts of the case lead us to conclude that Jesus never issued such a command at all, but that this reading of his life was due to the historical developments of a later age." When the twelve apostles were chosen and commissioned, they were specially instructed (Matt. x. 5, 6) to have nothing to do with either the Gentiles or the Samaritans. Their mission was confined to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Indeed, in Matt. xv. 21, Jesus is made to say of himself that he "was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Of course, as Harnack so truly observes, "when our Gospels were written, a Lord and Savior who had confined his preaching to the Jewish people without even issuing a single command to prosecute the universal mission, was an utter impossibility. If no such command had been issued before his death, it must have been imparted by him as the glorified One." The truth is that to Jesus the Gentiles, being outsiders, were not to be considered. They were objects of scorn and contempt (Matt. xviii. 17).

With these facts before us it is undeniable that in the teaching ascribed to Jesus there is not the faintest trace of the doctrine that God is the Father of all mankind, and that all men are brothers. Even granting that the universalistic utterances put into his mouth are genuine, which the critics do not allow, then both the Fatherhood and the Brother-

hood would be blessings to be realised and enjoyed only by believers. I go further still and maintain that, on the assumption that the four Gospels are absolutely trustworthy documents, Jesus did not teach anything even remotely resembling a doctrine of universal human brotherhood.

Crossing over to the Epistles, we soon learn that our reading of the Gospels is correct. There is one passage (Eph. iv. 6) which seems to favor the idea of the universal Fatherhood of the Deity; but on examining the context we find that the writer is speaking of the Church, and that in saying, "Father of all," he clearly meant, of all within the Church. But that is by no means all. In the Epistles of Paul believers even are children of God only by adoption; and by *adoption* we are to understand the conferring of virtual sonship on those who are not sons by birth—an *artificial* sonship, resulting naturally in an equally artificial brotherhood. Such is Paul's teaching. Christians are merely adopted, not real, children of God. John tells us that the sonship of believers is the outcome, not of adoption, but of a spiritual birth, whatever that may mean. He unfolds a beautiful conception of brotherhood, with its privileges and obligations; but it is not the Brotherhood of Man, but of believers, that he commends with such glowing zeal. The brothers whom he so earnestly exhorts to love and serve one another are "brethren in the Lord," not by any means in the bond of natural consanguinity.

I have been led to put such stress on this point because Christian apologists so persistently assert that the Brotherhood of Man is a truth for which we are directly indebted to Jesus Christ; but I have clearly shown that such an assertion does not derive even the ghost of support or justification from the New Testament. On the contrary, both the Gospels and the Epistles are steeped in the notion, not that mankind are God's children, and brethren, by nature, but that they may become both by divine grace. It was Christians, not humanity as such, that constituted a brotherhood; and there is one text (1 Peter ii. 17) in which this is definitely stated: "Honor all men; *love the brotherhood.*" The New Testament does not contain the faintest hint that the human race itself forms a natural brotherhood. According to its uniform teaching, the sense of solidarity is possible only to those who become spiritually one in Christ. The family of God on earth consists exclusively of believers, of the members of the Church; and throughout the book of the Acts these are distinguished as *the brethren*. For about a century and a half "brethren" remained the general term applied to them, and its use was gradually discontinued in consequence of the "formation of a special class of clerics who called one another [as they still do] 'brethren,' and did not address the laity by this title *except* [by a paltry survival of the old tradition] *in their sermons.*"

Is it not now beyond all reasonable dispute that a brother in the New Testament, and in primitive Church usage, does not signify a brother-man, but invariably a brother-Christian, a brother in the Lord? Consequently, it is perfectly absurd for orthodox divines, who believe that Christianity in its entirety is divinely revealed in the New Testament, to claim the Brotherhood of Man as a distinctively Christian doctrine. Until the latter half of the second century theologians never spoke of men, as men, in terms of solidarity; and it is a strangely significant fact that when first mentioned by a Father, the Brotherhood of Man is represented as resulting, not from the Fatherhood of God, but from the Motherhood of Nature. It was Tertullian, in addressing Pagans, who first so characterised it: "We are your brethren also, in virtue of our common mother Nature."

Let us now turn to Paganism, and ascertain what message it had to deliver as to the natural relations of man to man. In Farrer's *Paganism and Christianity* we find the following statement:—

"It is utterly false to say that the idea of the brotherhood of all men rests on the teaching of Christianity. It was one of the dominant ideas of Philosophy, espe-

cially of Stoicism, long before the foundations of the Church were laid. Marcus Aurelius rises from the conception of the political community to that of the wider community of humanity, with a breadth of spirit that at no time of her history has belonged to the Church, regarding as she ever has done all who are ignorant of or indifferent to her teaching as aliens and enemies and outcasts" (pp. 174, 175).

Sublime is the only adjective that can be applied to the language of Aurelius. "My city and country as far as I am Antoninus is Rome," he says, "but so far as I am a man it is the world. The things then that are useful to these cities are alone useful to me." "The world is my parish" is a saying often quoted in praise of the founder of Wesleyan Methodism; but Seneca had expressed the same sentiment seventeen hundred years before John Wesley was born. These are that great philosopher's words:—

"We ought to devote our soul to no particular place. This is the conviction with which we must each live: I was not born for one corner, my country is this whole world."

Zeno of Citium, the founder of the Stoic school, lived at the close of the fourth century before Christ; and Plutarch, referring to the lost work of his, called the *Republic*, says:—

"The much-admired *Republic* of Zeno aimed singly at this, that neither in cities nor towns we should live under distinct laws one from another, but should look on all men as our fellow-countrymen and citizens, observing one manner of life and kind of order, like a flock feeding together with equal rights in a common pasture."

Epictetus also rose exceedingly high in this sentence:—

"Never, in reply to the question to what country you belong, say you are an Athenian or a Corinthian, but that you are a Cosmopolitan."

Paganism called men to the service of humanity; Christianity, to the service of God in the Church. Paganism advocated a law of Nature, which could be applied to all classes and nations; Christianity enunciated a peculiar law of grace, specially revealed from heaven, and applicable only to the saints. We are often reminded that Paganism exalted selfishness and practised it. Indeed, Lactantius went the length of charging Cicero "with advocating the practice of liberality only towards persons who could give something in return." But this was a gross misrepresentation of Cicero's teaching; the only thing the great orator discouraged being indiscriminate charity, not charity without reference to any possible returns, and on its own merits alone. It would be quite as fair to charge the apostle Paul with encouraging selfishness when he wrote thus to the Galatians: "So, then, as we have opportunity, let us work that which is good toward all men, *and especially toward them that are of the household of the faith*" (Gal. vi. 10).

The conclusion to which the foregoing discussion inevitably leads us is that the brotherhood of all men was systematically taught by Pagan philosophy for upwards of three hundred years before Christ was born; that neither Jesus nor the apostles ever referred to it; and that in the orthodox theology of the Church it has never had, and logically never can have, a place. It is pre-eminently a scientific truth; and if the Church as a whole borrows and assimilates it, she will do so, not by the sanction of Scripture, nor on the authority of Councils, but simply in order to preserve its own life.

J. T. LLOYD.

The Papacy and Modernism.

SOME little time ago, a small group of Italian priests addressed an open letter to the Pope. This striking manifesto was called forth by a remarkable discourse delivered by Pius X. last April, in which his Holiness denounced, in the strongest terms at his command, the liberalising tendencies manifested here and there throughout the Catholic Church. Such men, for example, as Murri and Fogazzaro in Italy, Loisy and

Laberthonniere in France, and Tyrrell in England, were condemned as rebels, because they want a Gospel—

"Stripped of the explanations of theology, of the definitions of Councils, of the maxims of asceticism, and who demand an emancipation which will enable them not to revolt, so that they may not be cut off, and yet not to submit, so that they need not abandon their own convictions; and, finally, an adaptation to the times in everything—in speech, in writing, even in the preaching of a charity without faith; which while extremely tender to the unbeliever, is opening up the path to eternal ruin for all."

Now, under the lash of this papal declaration, the Liberal Romanists smarted most painfully; and it was while they were thus suffering that they penned the open letter, in which they earnestly pleaded for greater liberty of thought and expression; or, in other words, for permission to adopt the methods of literary criticism in their study both of the Bible and of theology. Of course, such a request could not possibly be granted; and those who preferred it were already disloyal to Rome. It is the very genius of the Papacy that it insists on complete and unconditional submission to its own authority in everything. Consequently, in due time, the Pope has given emphatic expression to this central position of Roman Catholicism in the long Encyclical now so ardently discussed throughout Christendom. Upon this allocation the so-called progressives make an uncompromising and violent attack, describing it as an instrument that will be fruitful of untold harm. I, on the contrary, agree with those who pronounce it "the greatest utterance that has ever come from the chair of Peter." It is the only reply to the open letter that a loyal Pope could make. From every religious and theological point of view, it is an ideal deliverance.

Let us calmly reason the matter out. What is Modernism? It is only another name for rationalism; and rationalism is the very opposite of Catholicism. The modern world began with the revival of letters some six centuries ago. The Protestant Reformation was a modern movement. It marked the very commencement of the disintegration of Christianity, a process which has been slowly going on ever since. Modernism signifies that subtle power which makes for the triumph of knowledge over ignorance, of truth over superstition, of reason over religion. It denotes the re-birth of science after fifteen hundred years of suspended animation. I have called the Protestant Reformation a modern movement; and everybody knows that to-day Christianity, in any historical sense, has practically ceased to be in almost every Protestant community. Well, is not the Papacy aware of all this? Has not the Pope eyes to see and brains to judge?

A French Catholic declares, in the *Church Times*, that "the present Pope has so utterly ruined the French Church that it is no longer a factor in the national life." That is an entirely erroneous statement. The French Church has been destroyed, not by Pius X., but by French Freethought. Frenchmen have abjured Christianity simply because they are Modernists. It is their modernity that accounts for the fact that "the majority of Frenchmen have ceased to take any interest in what the Pope may do or say," so that, by them, "he is now regarded as a negligible quantity." The Papacy has lost France, not as the result of any mistaken policy of its own, but because, in France, modernism has won a conspicuous victory over mediævalism.

Now, it is to this modernism, which has so effectually killed Catholicism in France, and which is now so seriously threatening it in Italy, Great Britain, and America, that the present papal Encyclical offers such uncompromising and vehement opposition. This Pope is wise in his day and generation. He well knows how very true is the adage, "Give him an inch and he will take an ell." To prevent the wedge of Freethought from completely undermining the Church, he must rigorously keep out the thin end of it. He thoroughly understands that if a little licence is allowed now great liberty will soon be

taken. And, undoubtedly, his Holiness is quite right. His motto rightly is, "All, or nothing." As the French Catholic referred to says:—

"Either we must accept every legend, every superstition, every conclusion of scholastic theologians, or leave the Church. This is no exaggeration; read the Encyclical, and you will find that nobody must dispute the authenticity of any relics, or question any local tradition. The holy house of Loretto, the legend of which is known to rest on a fraud of the sixteenth century; the cultus of St. Philomena, who is known to be an imaginary person, and whose so-called relics are known to be those of a person who was neither a saint nor a martyr; these, and similar impostures, are now to be accepted by all Catholics; indeed, the Pope has already done his best in practice to promote them."

But this French Catholic is laboring under a strange misapprehension when he says that—

"Never before has the Papacy so definitely and so explicitly committed the Church to the absolute rejection of all modern modes of thought and of the results of scientific and historical research, or so definitely and explicitly tied her to the modes of thought and the scientific notions of a past age."

In point of fact, the papal policy has never changed. What it was in the thirteenth century that exactly it is to-day; and it is a perfectly logical policy too. Suppose that a Catholic is permitted to critically examine the rise of the holy house of Loretto, or the cultus of St. Philomena, on what ground could he be forbidden to examine the life of Christ in the same critical spirit? Once historical criticism enters the Church it will be impossible to confine it within arbitrarily defined limits.

The *Church Times* is of opinion that the Encyclical must be "condemned as futile," but I feel certain that the *Church Times* is wrong. It is all very well to say that "at all critical ages of movement the best servants of the Church have been the modernists." In a sense, it may be true that "St. Augustine was a modernist when he wrote the *City of God*," that "St. Thomas Aquinas, assimilating the revived Aristotelian metaphysic, was the prince of modernists," and that "the Jesuits of the sixteenth century were extravagantly modern." But it is not honest to confuse the philosophical modernism of those old divines with the scientific modernism of the twentieth century. The present modernism is steeped in free thought and free speech; and once it gains a footing in the Church it will not rest until it has accomplished its destruction. The Pope is far-seeing enough to realise this; and it will not be his fault if the House of God is wrecked by it. But the Papacy is not going to fall immediately. Indeed, it is the only Christian organisation that is assured of a future. For the overwhelming majority of Catholics, this Encyclical will prove an absolutely authoritative pronouncement. For many ages yet there will doubtless be myriads of people to whom the Pope will speak as the very "representative of God on earth." Already the Nonconformist Churches are being converted into social and political clubs, while the Established Church is composed of two main sections, the one gravitating towards Rationalism, and the other towards Rome. The future belongs to the Church of Rome and Freethought, and the fight of the future will be between Mediævalism and Modernism, between faith and knowledge, between the black night of superstition and the bright day of reason, between the blind dogmas of theology and the radiant facts of science; and it requires no great prophet to predict how the battle will end.

CELTICUS.

We live in a world which is full of misery and ignorance, and the plain duty of each of us is to make the little corner he can influence somewhat less ignorant than it was before he entered it.....If wife and child, and name and fame, were all lost to me, one after another, still I would not lie. The most sacred act of a man's life is to say and to feel, "I believe such-and-such to be true."—Huxley.

Acid Drops.

The Bishop of London has carried that wonderful head of his to America. He arrived at New York on September 24 from Canada, and was promptly interviewed. Being gifted with powers of intuition, entirely independent of experience, his lordship assured everybody interested in the matter that "there was no danger of Agnosticism spreading in the United States." So *that's* all right. We expect to hear that all the Freethought journals and platforms in America have collapsed.

The next day the Bishop preached in Trinity Church, New York, and "had among his audience some of the most famous financiers of America." We don't suppose he imitated the language of Jesus on a somewhat similar occasion. It would never do for a £10,000 a year Bishop to call other rich adventurers "a den of thieves." They might turn round and say, "What price Ingram?"

After preaching that sermon, the Bishop of London travelled to Washington, where he was the guest of President Roosevelt. The news was gravely telegraphed to England that his lordship played a tennis match with "Teddy." Fancy reading something like that in the New Testament! It might run in this way: "And Jesus went on his motor-car to the temple, and preached unto a number of rich merchants, who bought and sold figures on pieces of paper, and their hearts yearned unto him. And thereafter he went to the house of Pilate, where he stayed until after the Sabbath, and on the afternoon of the next day Jesus and Pilate played together a game which is called tennis in that place. And Simon Peter, his disciple, marked the game; and the rest of the disciples did see unto the balls and minister unto the players; excepting Judas, who sat apart, and held what is called the stakes."

The German Emperor has given the Blessed Redeemer another patronising pat on the back. Speaking at a banquet in Westphalia, his Imperial Majesty told his auditors that the complete unity of the German people could only be realised "in the central person of the Redeemer," who, he added, "still goes up and down among the nations." Then, we fear that "the complete unity of the German people," while a consummation most devoutly to be wished, is an inconceivably long way off; and we beg to remind his Majesty that the metaphor he employed was an unfortunate one, because the only person spoken of in the Bible as "walking up and down in the earth" has for his fondly cherished object not the unifying but the devouring of the people. We are of opinion that the Redeemer of the world will not thank the Great Emperor for his silly patronage.

The Kaiser can talk nonsense by the yard. For fear his loving subjects would not understand whom he meant by the Redeemer, he put in this explanatory clause—"the Man who has made us brothers." Thus his Majesty used a historical lie of the deepest dye to explain a purely fictitious character!

We looked into the *Christian Commonwealth* again last week, and found it thriving, apparently, on Mr. Campbell and the New Theology. In an address "To Our Readers" we see that our contemporary is doing so well that it has to get printed on "one of the famous Hoo machines capable of an output of 24,000 copies an hour," with other expressions that might lead an unwary reader to think that the *C. C.*'s circulation was several times 24,000—which we are quite sure it isn't. However, the *C. C.* is a liberal paper, as Christian papers go, and we wish it well.

The *C. C.* is going to publish "a series of brief confessions of faith by well-known people" under the heading of "What I Believe." This is so like the good Christians! Always talking about what they believe! Whereas the only thing of any importance is what they know. And that is often precious little.

On the next page we noticed an article by M. A. Canney on "The Church of England and the New Theology," in which the Emerson societies, the Tolstoy societies, the Ruskin societies, the Ethical societies, the Labor party, the Labor Church, and the Socialists, are called upon to help the New Theologians in restoring the religion of Jesus Christ; which is a strange piece of impudence; or rather it would be strange if we did not know the peculiarities of the Nazarenes. Emerson was not a Christian, in any honest sense of the word; Ruskin was not a Socialist, though many Socialists try to make out that he was; the

Ethicists, as far as we understand them, care no more for Jesus than for Plato or Socrates, and certainly do not believe in "the religion of Jesus Christ"; while the Socialist societies are avowedly only concerned with economic questions.

Mr. Canney is good enough to say that "the world is badly organised," but that "this is not the fault of God." Of course not—for this God is an imaginary character, the idealisation of good, without any mixture of evil. But we suggest that Mr. Canney should explain *whose* fault it is that the world is badly organised. We might also suggest that man himself—who is most likely to be blamed, poor devil!—is simply a part of the general bad organisation of this planet. And if God isn't responsible for it, we beg the favor of being informed who is. Perhaps, at the finish, it will turn out that nobody is to blame; that the nature of things is beyond the reach of praise or blame, and has to be accepted as it is.

At the end of his article, Mr. Canney talks about "the happy Church of Humanity." But why not be honest and consistent? Why not stick to God and leave Humanity alone? Not so long ago "Humanity" was sneered at by the Churches. How they gloated over Huxley's attack on Comte! Now they talk about "Humanity" as if they invented it!

Mr. Campbell's sermons are still appearing in the *Christian Commonwealth*. Last week's was on "Jacob's Wrestling." We read it through, with some difficulty, and found it mere hocus-pocus. In our judgment, it is a ridiculous and dishonorable evasion of the mental and moral difficulties of the famous old wrestling match of Jacob *versus* Jehovah. If such stories are to be dressed up in sentimental phraseology, as wonderful lessons in the guise of legends, we may as well say plainly that the New Theology is not at all cleverer than the Old Theology, and ever so much more dishonest. It is amusing to see how delicately Mr. Campbell skims over the thin ice of absurdity. You can see he is afraid of going through every minute, but he keeps up a solemn face and affects to be dealing with spiritual grandeurs.

Mr. Campbell's curious sermon contains one *very* curious sentence. "When I speak of God," he says, "I mean much more than a name or even a person. When I speak of God I mean the sum of all human excellence and the goal of all true human aspiration." What is this but a tacit confession that Mr. Campbell's "God" is simply an idealisation?

Mr. Campbell also means by God "the sum of all human excellencies." Everyone has, of course, the right to use a word in whatever sense he pleases, provided he says what it is; Mr. Campbell is therefore quite within his right in defining God as he does. Still, we fail to see the use of it as a basis for religious belief. For modern Theistic purposes "God" must be both Creator and Ruler. And "the sum of human excellencies" neither is the universe nor can it be said to rule it. The truth of the matter is that Mr. Campbell's definition is framed to meet a difficulty, and has all the weakness of such desperate remedies. By hook or by crook religion must be made to accommodate itself to the demand for social and political reform; and Mr. Campbell's definition is the plain outcome of his newly-found Socialism. Whether the devotion of Mr. Campbell and other Nonconformist ministers would survive a political set-back to Socialism is a question on which one may have very strong convictions. And it is certain that advanced social and political movements have rarely found friends among the clergy until they have grown strong enough to make their capture desirable.

We notice that Mr. Campbell still prefaces his sermon with a long personal address to the Deity, which we presume he utters in the usual way with his eyes shut. It is to be hoped that the Deity keeps two other organs shut. There really ought to be a Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Gods.

Mr. R. J. Campbell, though improving, is still offensively arrogant and insulting. In the Preface to his new book, *New Theology Sermons*, the "older theologies" are rudely dismissed as "all a wretched failure"; and, in answer to the objection that the New Theology has no Gospel to preach, he egotistically asserts that "there is no other Gospel." Fancy, the New Theologians are the only men in the world who preach the gospel of Christ! Parker did not preach it, Spurgeon did not preach it, and at the present moment there are not thirty in Great Britain who preach it. Well, the New Theologians need never offer the prayer, "O Lord, gie us a guid conceit o' oursel's."

Rev. James Beaumont Bolton, of 6 Carpenter-road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, formerly vicar of Knowsley, Lancashire, left £15,587. If there is any truth in the story of Dives and Lazarus, we know the deceased J. B. B.'s present address. The same may be said of the Rev. James Albert Owen, of Cheltenham, formerly head of the Cheltenham College Missions at Nunhead, who left £15,674.

Father Tyrrell is intellectually very quick and brilliant; but ecclesiastically, he is much below the average. He realises that the intellectual movements of the modern world are positively hostile to, and necessarily destructive of the dogmas of the Church; but he does not perceive that *mending* such dogmas is logically equivalent to *ending* them. Hence, the courageous Father is, in reality, a Protestant, not a Roman Catholic. From a purely ecclesiastical point of view, therefore, the Pope and his counsellors are vastly his superiors. It may not be possible, as he says, to "re-quickened the failing faith and charity of half Christendom with blood drawn from the veins of the corpse of mediævalism," but it is equally certain that no amount of theological tinkering will ever do the trick.

Let us take an example. Father Tyrrell advocates the discontinuation of the apologetic use of miracles in the accepted sense; but is it not an incontrovertible fact that miracles, in the accepted sense, are the sole foundation on which the fabric of the Church has always rested? The belief in miracles may be utterly unscientific; but it is essential to any historical conception of Christianity as a supernatural religion, and to renounce it is tantamount to renouncing Christianity itself. Father Tyrrell wants to compromise with science; but both Christianity and science firmly decline to ratify any compromise whatsoever. On this point the Pope is right, and Father Tyrrell wrong. The only problem before Christendom is this: *Christianity or Science—which?* To all Catholics the Pope says, "Make your choice." He himself is a whole-hogger for Christianity, and has resolved to give no quarter whatever to time-servers, trimmers, and tinkers.

The Rev. Dr. Griffith John, the well-known missionary, has just sent a message to the organisers of the Missionary Exhibition now being held at Swansea; and in the message are to be found two startling statements, neither of which can be pronounced in the least complimentary to God the Savior. The first statement is as follows: "This is Christ's world, and he wants the whole of it." As a matter of fact, the assertion is wholly false. Dr. John is entirely wrong; the world is distinctly *not* Christ's. If the phrase is elliptical, and should read, "By right, the world is Christ's," we at once ask, Why is it not his in fact? The Bible says that God the Father promised to give it to him, if he would only claim it; but that was thousands of years ago. There must have been great remissness somewhere, either on the Son's part in not putting in his claim, or on the Father's in not fulfilling his promise. Will Dr. John explain?

Dr. John's other statement implies an unintentional slight on the Savior of the world. This is how it is worded: "This is Christ's work, and he wants us to make it our own." That is to say, Christ wishes to enter into partnership with the missionaries in the task—of *making* the world his own. That is certainly a great honor to the missionaries; and this is how Dr. John returns the compliment: "These 840 millions of heathen are very precious to the heart of Christ, and he wants us to help him save them. He cannot save them without our help. I say it with profoundest reverence: *he cannot save them without our help*" (the italics are Dr. John's own). What price Christ now? He is so utterly impotent that he cannot do his own work. Though "these 840 millions of heathen" are unspeakably dear to him, and though with him as God all things are possible, yet neither his omnipotence nor his love is of the least avail! What double-dyed hypocrisy underlies all such silly talk, and how long it takes the people to see through it, and realise its awful hollowness!

The Rev. Lord William Gascoyne-Cecil contributes to a recent issue of the *Times* an article on "Difficulties of Mission Work" in China. He bears out, in the course of the article, all that has been said in these columns concerning the main cause of Chinese hostility to mission work—the interference of the missionaries in civil and judicial affairs on behalf of their converts. The method of operation is simple. According to treaties forced upon the Chinese, Europeans in China can only be tried by their own countrymen, while land owned by missionaries is practically under the control of the country whose subject the missionary is. The consequence is that it is a common trick of Chinamen of a certain class, who are desirous of avoiding their legal

responsibilities, to become "converted" on the first sight of approaching trouble. The emissaries of Chinese justice are then coolly informed that the man is under the protection of the mission, and that any attempt to enforce the law against him will be resented. The result is that mission stations become a danger to the regular administration of justice, a condition of things which no country ought to be either asked or expected to endure quietly.

Reports of ambassadors and consuls have for years dwelt upon the evil effects of this practice, and the Chinese Government has time after time made its protest. The Church Missionary Society says, in its last published report, that the riots in China have "for the most part been connected with interference on the part of Roman Catholic missions with litigation." The Roman Catholics, on the contrary, are equally ready to cast the blame on Protestants. The truth is that it is done by all more or less, and Lord Cecil says plainly that it is "also done by Protestant missionaries"; while missionaries told him plainly that "it gave offence, not merely to your native Christians, but even to their heathen friends, if the missionary did not support his converts." It is an infamous condition of things, and one day the Chinese will be enabled to enforce their demand that Christian missionaries shall not continue to set the laws of the country at defiance. Intolerant the Chinese are not, and never have been, in matters of religion. But a religion that operates as Christianity has done in China invites reprisals—and one ought not to be surprised when they occur.

The *Methodist Times* cannot but allow that "the work of Christianising Japan" has recently suffered a serious "set-back," and that there are those who attribute this set-back "to the impression produced by the reports of Japanese students of the state of things in our great cities." In other words, Japan, being wide-awake and becoming well-informed, declines to accept a religion that has proved itself to be such a gigantic failure in its own home. She takes our science with avidity, because it is sound, but turns her nose up at our religion, because it is intellectually false and morally degrading.

Mr. J. Compton Rickett, M.P., Chairman of the Congregational Union, says that if Congregationalism is to flourish it must address itself to the problems of labor before it is too late. That may be a disagreeable mission; but it is certainly preferable to total extinction. What an eloquent confession of defeat! "When the so-called upper classes forget Sunday and churchgoing, and the wealthy middle classes show similar growing coldness, it is to the working men we must look for the preservation and development of Congregationalism." Anything is better than to be blotted out. What colossal selfishness!

The *British Weekly* solemnly invites the "Almighty Keeper of the Sabbath" to make plain unto men how good is his gift to them of a Day of Rest, to show the Sabbath-breaker the error of his way, and to give light to him who will not accept the day of days "to see the plenteousness of grace which he loses." And the "Almighty Keeper of the Sabbath" breaks not his eternal silence, nor shows the least concern as to what happens to his precious gift. How very inconsiderate of him!

Renfrow Parish Council was asked by one of its members, Mr. M'Phail, to consider the case of a pauper in Crookston Poorhouse who had been put in a refractory cell for refusing to attend divine worship. Mr. M'Phail contended that even a pauper had a right to worship or not as he pleased, and the same view was taken by Mr. Wood. But the chairman, Mr. James Barr, told the Council that they had no right to criticise the actions of the Poorhouse Board—which we take to be nonsense; and the Council thought so too, for it was decided to make inquiries. We congratulate Mr. M'Phail on his public spirit.

The *War Cry* continues to deal with the charges of "sweating" brought forward at the Trades Union Congress. It does so, however, in its own peculiar manner, which is convincing—to a Salvation Army official. Several nameless and dateless cases are cited of people who have been put on their feet through the agency of the Army. It would be strange indeed if, with its extensive operations, something of this kind did not occasionally happen. What people would like to know, however, is what proportion these cases bear to the whole. Meanwhile, the cases cited at the Congress remain unchallenged. And it would be so easy to remove misapprehension. Let the Army agree to an independent inquiry by a competent committee, and the matter would be settled. But, instead of this, General Booth pursues his old game of "bluff," while the heads of the

departments continue to air their anonymous and unverifiable cases. The Army knows its public.

One of the speakers at the Pleasant Sunday Afternoon Conference, held recently at Liverpool, proposed that if dancing were permitted men should dance with men and women with women. Otherwise immoral consequences might ensue. Herein we see the bracing moral influence exerted by a faith in Christianity. And we are emphatically of opinion that all people who take this view of dancing never ought to be permitted to dance with one of the opposite sex. They do run risks—at least their partners do.

All the Nonconformist organs are now busily engaged on the noble task of beheading the Bishop of Manchester, not because he has gone over to Rome, or run away with another man's wife, or murdered his grandfather, or mother-in-law, but simply because he has had the courage to "refuse to join in the movement in opposition to the proposed nomination of a brewer for the Lord Mayoralty" of the city. It is admitted even by the most fanatical that the brewer is an excellent citizen, and has done splendid work; but because of his trade he must never be allowed to become Lord Mayor. The Bishop condemns, in scathing terms, such narrowness and bigotry, and, in consequence, is even more violently anathematised than the poor brewer. Such is Christian charity, such is even Christian fair play, in this twentieth century.

The London *Star* is responsible for the statement that the salary of the Rev. C. F. Aked—John D. Rockefeller's kept preacher—is nearly £5,000 a year. Aked used to pose as a Socialist.

Dr. Aked says that he is a good enough American to feel a hearty contempt for a lie. Well, we have not noticed that liars were less numerous or less respected on the American side of the Atlantic than they are here, although we should be quite pleased to learn that we are mistaken in our impressions. Anyway, we would suggest to Dr. Aked, President Roosevelt as a likely subject for his ministrations. That gentleman has never yet withdrawn his "filthy little Atheist" description of Paine, nor has he suffered in the opinion of Christians in consequence. And even Mr. Rockefeller would not be the worse for a little pastoral attention from Dr. Aked.

Mr. Silvester Horne is of opinion that "there is no possible influence in the commonwealth to give a religious direction to social, industrial, and political movements but the Free Church minister." We wonder what those old birds, the Roman Catholic and the Episcopalian, think of this Nonconformist bantam? Mr. Horne also says, "The men of the great trade organisations despise us." Such bombastic utterance as the one quoted prove that it is not without good warranty.

Mr. Hill, the Labor candidate in the Kirkdale election, seems to have been opposed to religious education in State schools when he was at Govan; but circumstances alter cases, and perhaps there is something in the Liverpool air; anyhow, he went in for simple Bible teaching in the Kirkdale contest, no doubt in order to catch the Nonconformist vote. Not a very pleasant state of things—is it? And half the Labor leaders in the country—all pledged to Secular Education—were helping the ambiguous Mr. Hill.

Mr. F. E. Smith, M.P., at one of the Conservative meetings, denounced Mr. Hill as a consorter with Atheists. He read out to the meeting a passage from Mr. Blatchford denying Bible inspiration and calling the Heavenly Father "a myth," and asked whether Mr. Hill agreed with "Nunquam." This, of course, was not fair play. Socialists are not bound to Mr. Blatchford's views on religion. Even the *Clarion* staff are not so bound. And probably the dapper Mr. Smith knows it.

Mr. Ramsey Macdonald, talking to a *Tribune* representative, said that the Labor party lost at Kirkdale for two reasons; first, their organisation was poor; secondly, they "suffered from the calumnies of the Tories, more particularly their attempts to associate us with Atheism." During the last day or two of the fight (he said) it was much more a sectarian one than a political one. Well, we should be glad, in one sense, to believe it; for, after all, Mr. Hill polled 3,330 votes to the Unionist's 4,000. It would be consoling to know that 3,330 voters in the Kirkdale division of Liverpool didn't care twopence whether the Labor candidate was an Atheist or not.

Someone sends us a marked copy of the *Northern Echo* containing a report of a lecture by Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P.,

on "Robert Owen, Welsh Socialist and Philanthropist." The peculiarity of the lecture was its delivery in the Primitive Methodist Church, Gosforth, in aid of the church funds. That is what the *Echo* says, though it seems almost incredible. Mr. Robertson is represented also as saying of Owen that "though he broke somewhat from the orthodox religion of his day, he never interfered with the beliefs of others." But there is surely a mistake about this. We cannot understand Mr. Robertson's speaking in that way. Owen did not break "somewhat" from the "orthodox" religion of his day; he broke from *all* the religion of his day, declaring that every form of religion was a baneful superstition. His famous declaration to that effect was the turning point of his career. The classes dropped him then, the clergy made war upon him, and he had to organise a missionary effort amongst the people. Of course it is true that Owen did not "interfere" with the religious beliefs of others. But he carried on a crusade against them. And this is all the "interference" that we indulge in even in the *Freethinker*.

Rev. J. E. Rattenbury, who takes the superintendency of the West London Mission, started twenty years ago by the late Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, has "a big heart and a big brain." We have Mr. Hall Caine's word for it—and that's enough. Mr. Caine is a good judge. Who can doubt the bigness of his heart? It must be a grand affair if it matches his head, which resembles an elongated melon.

Mr. Rattenbury sat on the platform in Kingsway Hall and listened to Mr. Caine's eulogy—and many others. In the course of his own speech, he said "he was a Socialist because he believed in the Old Theology." Mr. Campbell is a Socialist because he believes in the New Theology. Mr. Blatchford is a Socialist who believes in no Theology at all. Who could have imagined that there were so many opposite reasons for Socialism?

Rev. Arthur Galton, M.A., is a man of sense, but a laughably bad defender of the Faith. Preaching at Westminster Abbey lately, from the words attributed to Jesus, "Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division," he illustrated the truth of his text by painting several vivid pictures of the exceeding wickedness of the Church in different ages. He gave a graphic description of the St. Bartholomew massacre in 1572. "For three days a storm of murder devastated Paris," "the tide of slaughter overflowed into the provinces," and "the numbers killed amounted to more than have perished in many famous battles, with this difference: that the victims were unarmed men, defenceless women, and blameless children, all attacked by surprise and treachery."

That is bad enough, in all conscience; but Mr. Galton is perfectly fearless, and proceeds thus: "The Eternal City welcomed the news with an outburst of holy merriment and gratulation. The papal cannon roared salutes from the castle of Saint Angelo. Fireworks and illuminations amused the populace during three nights." The Pope "struck a medal to immortalise the exploit, with his effigy on one side, and a destroying angel with uplifted cross and thrusting sword advancing against prostrate Huguenots on the other." Mr. Galton indulged his congregation with harrowing accounts of other atrocities and brutalities perpetrated in the name, and in fulfilment of the words, of Christ. Such are a few of the blessings which Christianity has showered on a thankless world—as enumerated by a Divinely-ordained apologist.

How they love one another! Rev. J. Morgan Gibbon, a well-known orthodox preacher, was to have lectured for the Anerley Congregational Church Literary Society on Nov. 9, but he has been told he must cancel the engagement "in view of the fact that you used the pulpit of a New Theologian for an attack upon the New Theology." The letter of rebuke, in which those words occur, was signed by Annie Warschauer, honorary secretary. It is to be hoped that Mr. Morgan Gibbon will not take the rebuke too much to heart. For the rest, this New Theology backhander shows how much real spirit of toleration there was behind the recent complaint that some young ministers had been pushed out of their pulpits for favoring the New Theology. When it comes to intolerance and persecution—"they all do it."

At a missionary meeting in Bromley, Kent, some children were pressed into the service, and recited to the audience "missionary stories, facts, and figures," *apropos* of various countries they were dressed to represent. If the "facts and figures" were of the same kind as those we are acquainted with, the performance would be calculated to give the youngsters a first-class exercise in stretching the truth—which we hope they will not persist in as they grow older.

Mr. Foote's Engagements.

Sunday, October 6, Secular Hall, Brunswick-street, Glasgow: at 12 (noon), "A Defence of Atheism"; at 6.30 p.m., "What is the New Theology?"

October 13, Manchester; 20, South Shields; 27, Leicester.

November 3, Stanley Hall, London; 10, Liverpool; 17, Birmingham; 24, Stanley Hall, London.

December 1, 8, 15, Queen's Hall.

To Correspondents.

C. COHEN'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—October 6, West Ham; 13, Aberdare; 27, Glasgow. November 3, West Ham; 10, Stanley Hall, London. December 1, Birmingham.

A. HOPKINS.—(1) Mr. Foote would gladly "take his readers with him a little more often for an excursion into the realms of pure literature," as you wish; but, of course, the main object of the *Freethinker* must be first of all subserved. (2) It is impossible to give "the essentials of Nietzsche's philosophy" in a few words. You ask for English translations of his writings. We have in our own library the first three volumes of the projected complete translation, under the editorship of Professor Alexander Tille, of Glasgow University:—*A Genealogy of Morals*, *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, and *The Case of Wagner*. We are not aware of any further volumes having appeared. These three are expensive and stiff reading, but they contain valuable and stimulating thoughts and suggestions—which are the best part of any "philosophy." (3) We deferred writing on Determinism a little longer, in order to avoid what is sometimes called "the personal equation."

T. MAX.—One thing at a time, please. The question is not whether you should be at liberty to sing the praises of whisky, but whether there has ever been a hymn in praise of whisky in an official Secular publication. We want that point settled first. Meanwhile, you are free, as far as we are concerned, to drink all the whisky you like, as long as you do not ask us to join you.

THE TOUZEAU PARRIS FUND.—Ninth *Freethinker* List:—William Hopper, 10s.; Northampton, 2s. 6d.; A. Lewis, 2s.; R. Wallis, 2s.; W. Robinson, 5s.; Alfred Corley, 5s.; Henry Smith, 5s.

C. T. CAPLIN, 114 Graham-road, Southampton, asks local Freethinkers to meet at his address on Tuesday next (Oct. 8) at 7.30 p.m., with a view to making an effort to revive Freethought propaganda in the town.

G. JACOB.—Does it really matter?

A. G. ROYSTON says he became acquainted with the *Freethinker* at our first lecture in Manchester, after our release from Holloway Prison, in 1884. He has been travelling abroad nearly ever since, and only came across the paper again about six months ago, and now he says, "I look forward for it each week as anxiously as I do for pay-day."

J. CHAMBERS.—Thanks.

H. WILLIAMS.—Glad to hear you have been a reader of this journal for the last two years and "always find it interesting and instructive." James Thomson's translation of Leopardi and published in Routledge's "Universal Library" at 1s.—and a wonderful shilling's worth it is.

R. J. HENDERSON.—Yes, a "lovely liar," as you say. With regard to the other matter, we note that you "now understand why the Agnostic writings of eminent scientists are tolerated in public libraries, but not the aggressive 2d. *Freethinker*."

A. E. F.—Sorry we cannot make use of it.

W. HOPPER writes: "I often had a desire to hear Mr. Parris when he was in the forefront of the fight in the old Bradlaugh days, but being then connected with a Methodist Church I never could muster sufficient moral courage to do so, and consequently missed the pleasure. I hope the amount raised on his behalf will be sufficient to lighten the burden of his remaining years."

J. BROUGH.—Mr. Hill, of course, has a perfect right to stand as a "simple Bible teaching" candidate; but if this satisfies the Labor Party, what is the use of their passing resolutions in favor of Secular Education? We quite agree with you in the matter.

PERCY C. STEWART.—Thanks for cuttings and good wishes. The obituary note appears in another column.

W. P. BALL.—Always glad to get your batches of cuttings.

ELIZABETH LECHMERE.—Your cuttings are acceptable.

HENRY STUART.—Shall appear.

E. NORWOOD.—Mr. Foote has for some time entertained the project you suggest. He hopes to publish before long two volumes of his best contributions to the *Freethinker* during the last fifteen years; one directly Freethought, the other semi-literary.

T. E. MILLER.—Glad you are still fighting for the good old cause.

W. D.—Did you never hear of irony?

JAMES POLLITT.—Please note that all such things should be sent to the editor of the *Freethinker*, and not to Miss Vance. You nearly shut yourself out this week through disregard of this rule.

A. CORLEY.—Glad you so well remember Mr. Parris as "a very able lecturer."

J. R. P. (Charlton).—We cannot quite make out your name. We do not understand your first question. In reply to your second question, Ingersoll has been "answered" hundreds, and probably thousands, of times; but we don't know of any such "answer" worth reading. He was answered by the late Mr. Gladstone and the late Cardinal Manning in the *North American Review*.

F. R. THEAKSTONE.—See "Sugar Plums"—all we had space for on Tuesday.

E. PACK.—A happy idea. Turn your reporter on one or two other reptilia.

W. WHITWORTH.—Mr. Sidney Lee, Professor Churton Collins, and other eminent biographers and critics of Shakespeare agree that the pious opening of Shakespeare's will, written by his lawyer, is merely formal and has no personal significance whatever. All wills began with the same pious flourish in those days.

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.

Mr. Foote delivers two lectures to-day (Oct. 6) in the Secular Hall, Brunswick-street, Glasgow, and crowded audiences are expected. His subject at 12 (noon) is "A Defence of Atheism," and at 6.30 p.m., "What is the New Theology?" There will be the usual opportunity for questions and discussion after each lecture, and there ought to be plenty on this occasion.

Mr. Foote had a splendid audience at Stratford Town Hall on Sunday evening—Mr. Marshall, of the West Ham Branch, occupying the chair. It was a live meeting from first to last, and the lecture was delivered amidst a running fire of laughter and applause. One very gratifying feature was the presence of a large number of ladies, who seemed to be deeply interested, and sometimes led the cheering. Several questions were asked, and formal opposition was offered by a Christian speaker. Another Christian speaker, who represented himself as saying what the Lord bade him utter, was ruled out by the Chairman as irrelevant—which is often the case with "inspiration." Mr. Foote's reply wound up the meeting, and the crowded audience dispersed into the cool night air, which must have been welcome after the heated atmosphere inside.

The West Ham Branch runs another winter course of Sunday evening lectures at the Workman's Hall, Romford-road. A start will be made this evening (Oct. 6), when Mr. Cohen occupies the platform. Before the lecture there will be half-an-hour's music by Mr. Quinton's string band.

South London "saints" are earnestly requested to go to Brockwell Park this afternoon (Oct. 6) and stand by the Camberwell N. S. S. Branch's platform. Embittered by the progress made by the Branch during the summer, the satellites of the local vicar offered boodigan opposition last Sunday; jeering, pushing, and singing hymns to drown the Freethought speaker's voice. Finally they made an ugly rush, some five hundred strong, towards the platform, but were driven back. As they threaten to come again, the Secular "saints" know what to do.

The Bethnal Green Branch has had a very successful summer season, which will be wound up this afternoon (Oct. 6) by Mr. Cohen, who delivers the "farewell" lecture in Victoria Park.

Mr. Cohen visits Aberdare, in South Wales, next Sunday (Oct. 13) and delivers two lectures, afternoon and evening, in the theatre. District "saints" will please note. There ought to be crowded meetings.

Mr. Wishart is doing some successful "mission" work at Leeds for the N. S. S. Executive. He has been addressing capital audiences, and many of the older "saints" have rallied round the standard. A Branch was formally started on Sunday evening, which is expected to be forty strong within a week. Mr. Wishart will probably work Bradford and other Yorkshire towns before coming south again.

"The principal event of yesterday's session of the Socialist Congress at Essen," a newspaper cutting says, "was a long speech by Herr Bebel, in the course of which he declared himself to be an Atheist."

Mr. Ernest Pack sends us a copy of a curious twopenny-worth he has had printed. The idea occurred to him of hiring a shorthand reporter to take down the address of a very polite and accomplished Christian Evidence lecturer, called Edward Baker. This report gives the gentleman's speech as near as stenography can get to a phonograph; it reproduces grammar, pronunciation—and manners. This intensely interesting document is headed "God's Protectors," and can be bought at Mr. Pack's meetings in Finsbury Park. It will be very valuable a hundred years hence, as showing what Christian Evidence lecturers were like at the end of the twentieth century. Baker is immortalised.

The working-men of Paris are notoriously Freethinkers. Their intellectual superiority to the working-men of London is incontestable. It is not surprising, therefore, to come across the following passage in Sir Charles Wyndham's letter to the *Tribune* concerning his recent visit to the "City of Light":—

"I entered the theatre to be present at a performance of *Electra*, which increased my regret at the difference in the respective tastes of England and France as I watched the wonderful, enthusiastic, and wild reception of this severely classical play at the hands of the proletariat."

Who could imagine a crowd of the London proletariat being wildly enthusiastic over the *Electra*? Or a crowd of any class of Londoners, for that matter. We are overlaid here with Church and Chapel—especially Chapel.

Irving was undoubtedly the most intellectual of all the English actors of his time. It is interesting, therefore, to learn from Mrs. Alice M. Diehl that he was what the good Christians call an "infidel." In *The True Story of My Life*, which this lady has just published through Mr. John Lane, she writes as follows of the great actor with whom she enjoyed a close friendship of twenty years:—

"Externally an actor, within himself he loathed all that was false—he would ever be true to himself at the risk of lifelong penalties of every kind. Thus he told me he professed no particular belief. He had none, had never truthfully arrived at any clear faith in any religion except that taught to each good heart by all that is best in the human soul. 'Sometimes,' he said to me once, 'when I have been in some vast cathedral I have felt an indescribable sense of the great glory that is, but it came and fled as swiftly as a phantom. When I eagerly seized it my hands grasped empty air again!'"

The number of distinguished men whose biographies show that they were Freethinkers would astonish the good Christians.

Rev. E. D. Henry, curate of St. Jude's Church, Swansea, blows his holy trumpet to rouse up "Cowardly Christian Swansea." There is talk about introducing Secular Education in Wales. He calls upon all parties in Swansea to sink their differences on other matters and unite in the battle "in defence of Christian truth," which is to be found in the "divinely inspired book." Evidently he is a very sanguine man. But our object, in this column, is to show his appreciation of the danger to his faith. Just hear him:—

"Throughout Bible-loving Wales, the birthplace and home of many a champion of divine truth, the land of revivals and great religious movements, whose hills have resounded with those hymns and songs of praise which express so clearly the deep religious experiences of her best and noblest sons, is heard the cry of secularism. Christ is bidden to depart out of the educational life by certain religious bodies and communities for reasons best known to themselves, and for which they will have to answer at God's judgment seat."

We like to hear the clergy talking in that way. And we hope "the cry of secularism" will go on ringing in Welsh parsons' ears.

Science and Religion Once More.—I.

DR. THOMAS COLVIN is one of the most highly-respected members of the Roman Catholic community in Glasgow, and his figure is a familiar one at conferences and gatherings connected with the Roman Catholic body in various parts of the country. His contribution to the proceedings at such meetings is usually concerned with the conflict between religion and science. This conflict seems a perpetual one, and indeed can only end with the destruction of one or the other. But as science is allied with nature and with the facts of nature, whereas religion rests on gratuitous assumption, there should be small doubt as to where the ultimate victory will lie.

Dr. Colvin is regarded as an outstanding Roman Catholic layman, and his views on his favorite subject merit some attention. Quite recently he submitted a paper to a Roman Catholic conference held at Dumfries, and this paper, as printed in its entirety by the Catholic press, will form the basis of my present criticism. Needless to say, no criticism is allowed in the columns of the publication in which Dr. Colvin's contribution appeared. The champions of "truth," as represented by the religious and semi-religious press of the country, are desperately afraid lest the people should hear both sides of the question. Much of their time and energy is taken up in persuading the people to refrain from reading "infidel" literature. Infidel literature is, of course, any literature that boldly attacks the orthodox position. Infidel writers must be boycotted, and, so far as possible, absolutely ignored. Where reference to the latter is necessary, prejudice can easily be raised against them in the unthinking religious mind by attaching opprobrious epithets to them. For instance, in the columns of the very paper to which I am indebted for the subject matter of this article, Conan Doyle is referred to as an "apostate." This, with truly Christian courtesy, is how they allude to a man who, from every point of view, is head and shoulders over the individual who penned the slur, merely because Conan Doyle in his manhood became convinced (like many another) that the Roman Catholic nonsense instilled into him while a child is not in accordance with truth. It goes without saying that in Roman Catholic circles a person is only an apostate when he gives up Catholicism for something else. If he forsakes another belief and enters the Roman Catholic Church a more polite appellation is found for him. The claws of the clerical persecutor have been trimmed in modern days, but the spirit which animated the persecutors of old is not yet extinct. Freedom of thought, speech, and action can still be made difficult by seeking to attach opprobrium and disgrace to those who exercise all three. Cardinal Newman once made a fine protest against the "poisoning of the wells," but what a poisoning of the wells of truth there has been on the part of Christians throughout the centuries! There is something despicable in calling a man names—something akin to poisoning the wells—because he cannot bow down before your fetish. But it is always more easy to coin epithets than answer arguments. And it is surely the most significant of circumstances that it should be considered in the interests of religious "truth" to evade discussion and suppress opposition so far as may be. There is only one inference to draw when a "truth" is sedulously reserved from examination or attack. But let us get to Dr. Colvin.

He begins in most excellent vein by commenting (*apropos* an utterance of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman) on the fact that few people do their own thinking, but seem content to allow others to do it for them. He may be assured of this, that no one admits this fact more readily or deplors it more sincerely than the opponents of Christianity. Certainly we are convinced that if all the people would think for themselves, and had the capacity and opportunity to study carefully the facts of history, of science, and of the life around them, the doom of that Church which Dr. Colvin represents

would be very near. Why, it is *thinking* that has destroyed the earlier religions, and it is thinking that is destroying Christianity. The vast majority of *thinkers* for generations back have either been non-Christians or the least orthodox of Christians. Dr. Colvin may urge that in his paper he is arguing only for belief in Deity, and may say that however unorthodox these thinkers were, all but a few of them stopped short of Atheism. Which may be perfectly true without helping the cause of Roman Catholicism very much. One must remember that Dr. Colvin is a Roman Catholic and was addressing an audience of Roman Catholics, and it seems a pertinent question to ask what possible connection there can be between the pure abstraction to which the idea of God has been reduced by philosophic and scientific thinkers and the anthropomorphic conception of God entertained by millions of Roman Catholics.

When I find Dr. Colvin quoting (with seeming approval) from the Prime Minister regarding the defective education of our children, which results in their not acquiring the habit of thinking for themselves, and in their being too ready in after life to accept the opinions, beliefs, and theories of other people, I can only marvel that the irony of his situation did not strike him. For he was addressing a gathering of individuals who, from their infancy, had been taught to surrender their right to think independently on a whole host of subjects. How has the Roman Catholic Church triumphed if not by the complete abnegation of the principle that people shall think for themselves? Unquestioning submission to authority is one of the basic principles of Roman Catholicism, and, I repeat, it will be a bad day for the Roman Church and for all other Churches when the masses think for themselves. Of course Dr. Colvin obligingly explains that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman meant children should be taught the art of thinking in the right direction, with due deference to the opinion of their elders; which seems almost equivalent to saying they must not think for themselves at all. That, at least, is what it comes to in religious matters. I have some knowledge of what thinking in the "right direction" means in the Catholic Church. It means thinking what you have been taught to think.

Dr. Colvin admits that the tendency of the present age is an utter indifference to all forms of religious belief; an admission that may be set beside the recent glowing declaration of a Scotch priest that an immense majority of the people of this country are loyal to Christ. Dr. Colvin says, "People seem to be quite happy and to get on very well in this world without religion." This, all good Christians will agree, is a monstrous injustice to religious believers, and constitutes a real grievance on their part against God Almighty. It is a lamentable thing that the wicked should flourish here below like the green bay tree, and undoubtedly suggests somnolency or senility on the part of Deity. If we may believe in the Old Testament, God was much more vigorous in the exercise of his authority in the old days, and smote the sinner to some effect. But both God and the world are now a little older, and perhaps God has developed more mercy, or more sense, or has become a trifle tired of it all. Of course every good Catholic believes that God, with the aid of his highly useful foil the Devil, will adjust the balance between the just and the unjust somewhere beyond the grave. And what a comfort that must be to the self-righteous! That people can be happy without religion proves at any rate that religion is not essential to happiness. I am sorry that Dr. Colvin apparently subscribes to the vulgar absurdity that those who live without religion *ought* to be unhappy if they have not stilled the voice of conscience. Christians are really amusing. In effect they exclaim, "What a miserable state it must be to live without God!" And if you tell them you are not the least bit miserable they are quite annoyed, and say if you are not unhappy you should be.

Dr. Colvin declares the idea that there is an antagonism between science and religion is one of those ready-

made opinions that are foisted on a credulous public by unscrupulous men to bolster up their fallacies in their campaign against religion. He maintains there is just as much antagonism between science and religion as there is between the study of chemistry and the study of Greek. I have great esteem for Dr. Colvin personally, yet I must candidly say that seldom have I come across a more foolish statement, or been confronted with a more inept analogy. Truly there can be no conflict between the laws of chemistry and the rules of Greek grammar; but whatever Dr. Colvin may say to the contrary, any intelligent person to-day should know that certain facts (not theories, mind) of science are entirely irreconcilable with what are still presented as facts by the Catholic Church. Is there any need to specify these in detail? The Catholic Church teaches the creation story according to Genesis; science has demonstrated it to be false. The Catholic Church teaches the children under its care that the race of man originated in the Garden of Eden with Adam and Eve; science has shown this to be nothing but a Jewish adaptation of a primitive myth. The Catholic Church teaches that man has fallen; science has proved there has been no fall of man, but just the very opposite. Roman Catholic doctrine has all along been based on a geocentric theory of the universe; science has demonstrated our portion of the universe to be heliocentric. Indeed, the discovery that the earth revolved round the sun, instead of *vice versa*, struck at the very vitals of the Christian cosmogony, as the ecclesiastical opponents of Galileo were shrewd enough to see. The Catholic Church muzzled and persecuted the men who attempted to teach the world the truth regarding the above and many other matters, and Dr. Colvin is imagining a vain thing if he thinks the reputation of the Church in her dealings with science can be rehabilitated by quoting from a modern Catholic bishop the opinion that there is nothing in the doctrine of organic evolution and its main factor, natural selection, that is opposed to Catholic faith.

Why, it is precisely science—together with that freedom of thought and speech which humanity has won for itself against the stubborn opposition of the Church—that has made it possible for a Catholic bishop to express such an opinion. He would have been compelled to recant—or burned—two or three centuries back. One would like to have heard the opinion of St. Thomas Aquinas or St. Augustine (not to mention more fervid and less intelligent fathers of the Church) on the evolutionary theory. It may be possible by some metaphysical, or theological, or philosophical verbal jugglery to make it appear that the evolutionary theory is not opposed to Catholic faith. Religion always *has* to be squared with the facts and discoveries of science somehow or other. That is the price it must pay for survival. But the evolutionary doctrine is unquestionably opposed to what the Church has taught and teaches to this hour respecting the origin of man. To pretend otherwise is to throw dust in the eyes of the public. In the view of many people it may well seem fairly conclusive evidence of the antagonism between science and religion that the latter is so keenly anxious to demonstrate the absence of such antagonism. To put the case briefly, science attempts to interpret the facts of nature and of life to humanity; so does Christianity. Their several interpretations are not complementary, but contradictory. One may accept either the one or the other; it is not possible to accept both; they will not blend. Dr. Colvin seems to think the true function of science is merely to register facts and refrain from making deductions therefrom, or at all events to refrain from making deductions that conflict with theological dogmas. This nugatory attitude is one that the Catholic Church has endeavored to force on science right through the centuries. It is an attitude which no scientist who has a regard for truth above all things can acquiesce in save at a deplorable sacrifice of principle.

(To be concluded.)

GEO. SCOTT.

A Phase of Art Perversion.

"I pitied you undergoing those dreadful oratorios; I never knew one that was not tiresome, and, in part ludicrous. Such subjects are scarce fitted for catgut. Even Magnus Handel—even *Messiah*. He (Handel) was a good old Pagan at heart, and (till he had to yield to the fashionable piety of England) stuck to opera and cantata.....where he would revel and plunge without being tied down to orthodoxy."

—From a letter of Edward Fitzgerald's.

THIS excerpt, serving in the van, as it were, is from a "desperate letter" of Edward Fitzgerald to a friend who had been to the Norwich Musical Festival. Oratorios were Fitzgerald's special aversion. He looked forward with dismay to the time when there would be an oratorio for every saint and prophet, including Habakkuk!

There is nothing in this wide world so thoroughly English as the orthodox oratorio. It is something *sui generis*. At the dawn of the eighteenth century, a renaissance for music in this country seemed imminent, and with the advent of Handel as an operatic impresario, everything seemed propitious. But the public, Gallio-like, cared for none of these things, and the Georgian Londoner yielded, as Fitzgerald tells us, to the fashionable piety of England. And so the oratorio came, and dominated English music for nearly a century and a half.

Nowadays, there is a steady reaction against this blind oratorio worship. Still to speak against it is quite another thing. Handel is a national fetish, and the "Hallelujah Chorus" is part of our religious belief. In the new *Grove's Dictionary of Music*, Dr. Ernest Walker writes the article on the oratorio. It is a daring piece of work, and certainly one of the most important contributions to our musical literature since Ernest Newman disturbed Philistine and Wagnerian alike by his *Study of Wagner*. Dr. Walker has quite shocked the staid, old *Musical Times*, which, in reviewing the book, asks "how far an editor is justified in trusting a subject to a writer who is wholly out of sympathy with it."

To understand fully how this particular form of religious sentiment has retarded musical progress, one must read this indictment of the oratorio by Dr. Walker. From the middle of the eighteenth century, down to modern times, English music, under the influence of the oratorio, is a darkness relieved only by the wandering lights of talents that, in happier circumstances, might have been geniuses. Dr. Walker says:—

"This is, indeed, the period of *Kappellmeistermusik*, in *excelsis*. The composers were all honorable men; their visions of things outside the organ-loft were usually fitful and reluctant, but they worked hard and conscientiously, and their music is nothing worse than intolerably dull. They set, with apparently absolute indiscriminatio, well-nigh every word of the Bible; and when they were not writing oratorios of their own, they were still making them out of the mangled remains of other men's music.....all were fish to the net of this insatiable oratorio-demanding public; and most English musicians devoted the greater part of their energies to the task of satisfying it in one way or another."

Our author seems to be a thorough-going Free-thinker. He revels in demonstrating the artistic superiority of the non-religious works of composers. Handel, he says, "is most at home with words that have non-religious associations," and goes farther to show that, in his oratorios, wherever heathens are set directly side by side with Jews or Christians, the music of the former will be the more striking:—

"Compare," he says, "for example, in *Saul* the picturesque power of 'Along the monster Atheist strode' with the lame respectability of the succeeding 'The youth inspired by thee, O Lord'; in *Belshazzar* the music of Daniel has not a tittle of the living force that breathes through that of the Assyrian revellers, and in *Samson* it would be hard to deny that on the whole Dagon's worshippers have artistically the best of it, so far as the choruses are concerned.....the Christian

choruses in *Theodora*.....are no doubt extremely fine, but there is something about such flawless little gems as 'Venus laughing from the skies'.....that comes to us like a fresh breeze into a stuffy room."

Then Dr. Walker speaks of Mendelssohn. He does not think for one moment that there were any "motives" with Mendelssohn as with Handel. "The purity of his aim is beyond question." "But, after all," he continues, "we must never tire of remembering that a musician is to be judged by his music, and not by anything that is not directly deducible from it." Quite so. All music must stand or fall solely by its own artistic merits or demerits. Criticism of religious art is hampered to a quite incalculable extent by forgetfulness of this fact. Of Mendelssohn's great art works, Dr. Walker says:—

"The most extraordinary, subtle, and refined workmanship that is visible in masterpieces like the *Hebrides* overture, and the superb scherzos is non-existent in the oratorios; somehow or other, the fire of inspiration burns less brightly, and the tools seem blunted."

The dulness that pervades the choruses of Mendelssohn's *St. Paul*, is not the dulness of an inferior man, says Dr. Walker, but of a great man working under cramping conditions. "The only portions of the oratorios which promise to live on their own merits," says our author, "are those over which the breath of Mendelssohn's secular genius has passed."

Gounod comes in for a severe handling from Dr. Walker. Indeed, there can be little doubt that the composer of the *Redemption* and *Mors et Vita*, deliberately set himself to produce a particular religious impression, sacrificing everything of the slightest artistic interest, either in material or in technique, in order that the mind of the listener might be swept and garnished for the reception of the religious message. Dr. Walker remarks:—

"Gounod's two oratorios are of great historic importance to English musicians, inasmuch as they represent the latest (and it is very possible and devoutly to be wished, the last for ever) attempt at foreign domination of English music; and we may be thankful that we have escaped with nothing worse than a deep mark on Anglican hymns and anthems—a legacy which, though very regrettable, is without any far-reaching artistic import."

There, that is surely strong for a "highly-respectable" standard work like *Grove's Dictionary*. No wonder the *Musical Times* said that Dr. Walker had an "ill-concealed contempt" for the oratorio.

H. GEORGE FARMER.

The Origin of the Watch Story.

ONE of the lies which has been most frequently employed in the past with the intention of discrediting Freethought leaders is that which tells how one of them (but the story, I believe, has been told of almost all of them in turn) at a public meeting once took out his watch, and invited the Deity, if a Deity there were, to strike him dead within five minutes. So silly a fable, one would have thought, could only have influenced the most ignorant and stupid Christians; but it has undoubtedly, in times past, created a good deal of prejudice against those of whom it was told. The story was related to me once by a man of some wealth and position, who was himself an unavowed Freethinker, though he held, like others of his kind, that it is necessary to maintain Christianity in order to keep the people in a state of due subordination to their masters and rulers. It was Charles Bradlaugh, this gentleman assured me, who had once defied the Deity in this manner. I told him that it was a stock libel that was used against all prominent Freethinkers; but I fear that I did not convince him of its falsehood. I was not then able to show that the story had been told of others, long before Bradlaugh's time. Quite recently, however, I have discovered that it was used in 1836 against Robert Taylor, the so-called "Devil's Chaplain." Of course, it may have

* *Grove's Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, vol. iii., edited by J. A. Fuller Maitland, M.A. Macmillan. 1907.

been an old story even then; but I do not think there is any printed record of it before that time. In the year mentioned, a certain Edward Hancock, who described himself as "a converted Atheist," published, under the general title of *A Candid Warning to Public Men*, two letters—one to Richard Carlile and another to Robert Taylor. They are the production of an illiterate, cantankerous, and generally ill-conditioned creature, who was obviously "on the make." No one would hang a dog on such testimony as his. However, his story is that Taylor once announced that he would, at one of his meetings, "raise the Devil." When the time came, Taylor, according to Hancock, among other equally foolish things, exclaimed: "I defy G— to strike me d—; where is he? Let the Devil appear; I defy him."

Now, it is to be observed that Hancock does not claim to have heard this speech himself. His words are: "That a mortal like you should presume to stand before God and an assembly of people, and defy him to strike you d—!! Will you deny it? You cannot; I have many witnesses who heard you." It was therefore at the best a mere matter of hearsay; so that even if we could believe Hancock himself (which, as I have said, we cannot) we have no reason to put any faith in his informants.

Some readers may perhaps think that such an ancient scandal might have been allowed to rest in the obscurity which had enshrouded it. But the lie will almost certainly be employed again some day, and it will then be useful to be able to point to the fact that it was first invented nearly three-quarters of a century ago, and is now dead and damned beyond all power of resuscitation.

B. D.

I WAS WITH BOOTH.

(With apologies to the memory of Bret Harte).

"I was with Booth," the stranger said.

Said the actor: "Say no more.

It is not often that I'm misled,
I have seen your face before."

"I was with Booth," the stranger said.

Said the actor: "So was I;

So sit you down to my humble spread,
And a foaming mug I'll buy."

"I was with Booth," the stranger said.

Said the actor: "What a shame

That the master lies in the graveyard dead,
And we are unknown to fame."

"I was with Booth," the stranger said.

Said the actor: "Would that we

Could again the stage so proudly tread
With artists such as he."

"I was with Booth," the stranger said.

Said the actor: "Ne'er shall I

Forget those days through the years long fled,
Drink up, for my throat is dry."

"I was with Booth," the stranger said.

"Do not interrupt me more.

'Twas Ballington I was with, not Ned,
The Salvation Army corps."

—Puck.

THE VERACIOUS VERGER.

"In the far corner lies William the Conk; be'ind the organ, where you can't see 'em, are the tooms of Gny Fox, Robin 'Ood, and Cardinal Wolsey. Now, does that guide-book as I sees you 'ave in your 'and, tell you who is lyin' here, sir?"

The Skeptical Tourist: "No, but I can guess."

The Rev. S. D. Gordon, D.D., has just made a most interesting discovery about God—a real, brand-new discovery. How the discovery was made we are, unfortunately, not informed; but somehow Dr. Gordon has found out that "God has a first plan, and then a second-best." We suppose that his first plans have all failed, and that his second-best give him no credit, in which case the failure of the universe is fully explained. Dr. Gordon is quite serious; there is no twinkle in his eye, nor the ghost of a smile on his face!

THE TWO TESTAMENTS.

I do not love the "New Testament," as my readers will have made out already. I am almost alarmed at being so isolated in my taste, as regards this most highly estimated and over-estimated work of literature (the taste of two thousand years is *against* me) but what boots it! Here stand I, I can no other.—I have the courage for my bad taste. The *Old Testament*—how very different! My highest respect to the Old Testament! In it I find great men, an heroic landscape, and a touch of that rarest thing on earth, the incomparable *naïveté* of *strong heart*. Still more, I find a people. But in the New Testament nothing but petty sectarian affairs, nothing but rococo of the soul, everything adorned, cornered, whimsical, nothing but conventicle-air, and (which is not to be forgotten) an occasional tinge of bucolic sweetness which belongs to that epoch (and the Roman province) and which is not so much a Jewish as a Hellenistic trait. Humility and consequentialness side by side; a talkativeness of feelings, which is almost benumbing; passionateness, not passion; painful demeanor; obviously, in this case, every education in manners has been wanting. How can one make so much fuss about one's petty faults, as these pious little people do! Nobody cares a straw for them; God least of all. Finally, they strive even for "the crown of everlasting life,"—all these little people of the province. Wherefore? As reward for what? This is pushing immodesty to its utmost! An "immortal" Peter—who could stand *him*! They have an ambition which makes one laugh.—*Nietzsche*.

We have, in fact, to make our choice between science and suffering. It is only by wisely utilising the gifts of science that we have any hope of maintaining our population in plenty and comfort. Science, however, will do this for us if we will only let her.—*Sir John Lubbock*.

The ghosts told us there was no virtue like belief, and no crime like doubt; that investigation was pure impudence, and the punishment therefore eternal torment. They not only told us all about this world, but about two others; and if their statements about the other worlds are as true as about this, no one can estimate the value of their information.—*Ingersoll*.

In seven years' time the P. S. A. movement hopes to have four million members. It might have twice that number; but we are certain that the number would only be made up of members of other Churches, and we quite fail to see how that adds to the strength of Christianity as a whole. When it shows that it can check the growth of anti-Christian opinion it will have done something to be proud of.

Correspondence.

A QUESTION FOR THE CHURCH CONGRESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

Sir,—Various trifling matters will, as usual, be discussed by the Church Congress, now sitting at Yarmouth. Freethought criticism will doubtless be glossed over. The Bishops might consider whether it is honest to circulate a book by the million as the "Word of God" which contains so much that is absolutely untrue and a great deal that is not fit for general reading. Why anybody should make a fetish of the Bible I have never been able to understand. The British are in some matters the most illogical on the face of the earth. The religion which makes people unprincipled is not worth much. The religion which ignores facts is doomed. Those who have traded on the credulity of the people for so long should assist, not attempt to retard, the work of emancipation and reconstruction. The revolution in thought is inevitable.

J. A. REID.

Obituary.

My dear father, Professor Charles Stewart, LL.D., F.R.S., F.R.C.S., went to his eternal sleep with perfect tranquillity, at 7.20 a.m. on September 27, at the age of 67 years. He was professor of comparative anatomy and physiology at the Royal College of Surgeons of England for a number of years. Though not an Atheist, like myself, he did not believe in Christianity or Revelation, neither did he trouble his head about vain questions.—PERCY C. STEWART.

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.

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Workman's Hall, Romford-road, Stratford): 7.30, C. Cohen, a Lecture. Selections by the Band before Lecture.

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S.: Victoria Park (near the Fountain), 3.30, C. Cohen, a Lecture.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S.: Station-road, 11.30, Guy A. Aldred, a Lecture. Brockwell Park, 3.15, Guy A. Aldred, a Lecture.

KINGSLAND BRANCH N. S. S.: Ridley-road, 11.30, a Lecture.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S.: Parliament Hill, 3.30, Lecture.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N. S. S.: Hyde Park (near Marble Arch), 11.30, a Lecture.

COUNTRY.

BRISTOL BRANCH N. S. S. (I. L. P. Hall, 21 King-square-avenue): 11, Urgent Business Meeting.

FAIRSWORTH SECULAR SUNDAY SCHOOL (Pole-lane): 6.30, Concert by the Fairsworth String Band.

GLASGOW: Secular Hall, Brunswick-street—G. W. Foote, 12 (noon), "A Defence of Atheism"; 6.30, "What is the New Theology?"

LEEDS: H. S. Wishart, 11, Cross Flats Park; 3, Woodhouse Moor; 7.30, City Square.

SOUTH SHIELDS (Captain Duncan's Navigation School, Market-place): 7.30, Important Meeting; arrangements for Mr. Foote's Lectures.

OUTDOOR.

BRISTOL BRANCH N. S. S.: Horsefair, 7.30, W. H. Fox, a Lecture.

EDINBURGH BRANCH N. S. S.: The Meadows, 3, meets for Discussion; The Mound, 7, a Lecture.

TRUE MORALITY:

Or, The Theory and Practice of Neo-Malthusianism,

AS, I BELIEVE,

THE BEST BOOK

ON THIS SUBJECT.

Superfine Large-paper Edition, 176 pages, with Portrait and Autograph, bound in cloth, gilt-lettered, post free 1s. a copy.

In order that it may have a large circulation, and to bring it within the reach of the poor, I have issued

A POPULAR EDITION IN PAPER COVERS.

A copy of this edition post free for 2d. A dozen copies, for distribution, post free for one 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,

J. R. HOLMES, EAST HANNEY, WANTAGE.

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

Thwaites' Celandine Lotion.

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

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

G. THWAITES,

HERBALIST, 2 CHURCH ROW, STOCKTON-ON-TEES

SEASIDE HOLIDAYS.—Comfortable Apartments; bath, piano; pleasant country outlook; twelve minutes sea. Moderate terms.—SMITH, "Nirvana," The Grove, Southend-on-Sea.

Works by "SALADIN."

(W. STEWART ROSS.)

GOD AND HIS BOOK.

New Edition. 380 pp., cloth, gold-lettered. Price 3s., post free 3s. 3d.

WOMAN:

Her Glory, Her Shame, and Her God. In two volumes. New Edition. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt-lettered. Vol. i., 260 pp. Price 2s. 6d., post free 2s. 9d. Vol. ii., 268 pp. Price 2s. 6d., post free 2s. 9d.

JANET SMITH.

A Promiscuous Essay on Woman. Crown 8vo, 224 pp. Price 2s. 6d., post free 2s. 9d.

THE HOLY LANCE.

An Episode of the Crusades, and Other Monographs. Crown 8vo, 228 pp. (uniform with *Janet Smith*). Price 2s. 6d., post free 2s. 9d.

THE BOOK OF VIRGINS.

And Lays and Legends of the Church and the World. Crown 8vo, 224 pp. (uniform with *Janet Smith*). Price 2s. 6d., post free 2s. 9d.

BIRDS OF PRAY.

Bound uniform with *Janet Smith*, etc. Price 2s. 6d., post free 2s. 9d.

THE BOTTOMLESS PIT.

A Discursive Treatise on Eternal Torment. (Uniform with *Janet Smith*). Price 2s. 6d., post free 2s. 9d.

THE MAN SHE LOVED.

A Novel. Recently issued. Crown 8vo, cloth, gold-lettered, 428 pp. Price 3s., post free 3s. 4d.

ROSES AND RUE.

Being Random Notes and Sketches. Large Crown 8vo, gold and silver letters. Price 3s., post free 3s. 3d.

ISAURE AND OTHER POEMS.

Cloth, gold-lettered. Price 2s., post free 2s. 2d.

THE BOOK OF "AT RANDOM."

A Brilliant Dissertation. Large crown 8vo, cloth, gold lettered, 265 pp. Price 3s., post free 3s. 3d.

THE CONFESSIONAL.

Romish and Anglican. An Exposure. New edition. Price 1s., post free 1s. 1d.

DID JESUS CHRIST RISE FROM THE DEAD?

The Evidences for the Resurrection Tried and Found Wanting. Price 6d., post free 7d.

THE WHIRLWIND SOWN AND REAPED.

A Novelette. Crown 8vo., 64 pp., in wrapper. Post free 7d.

POPULAR PAMPHLETS.

One penny each, post free 1½d.

PORTRAIT OF SALADIN (Life-like Photographic).

Cabinet size. By W. Edward Wright. Price 1s. 6d., post free 1s. 7d. Packed safely in millboard.

PHOTOGRAPHS OF SALADIN'S LIBRARY.

Two Views. Cabinet size. Price 1s. 6d., post free 1s. 7d.

PHOTOGRAPH OF THE "AGNOSTIC CORNER."

Showing Saladin, "Thunderstruck," and "Rejected," having tea. Cabinet size. Price 1s. 6d., post free 1s. 7d.

Just Out.

Order at Once.

IN MEMORIAM.**"SALADIN" (WILLIAM STEWART ROSS).**

A Champion of Thought; an Undaunted Assailant of Mendacity Superstition, and Stupefaction.

Born March 24, 1844, at Kirkbean (Scotland); died November 30, 1906, in London.

Brief Selections from his Writings; with Portraits, and an Introduction by C. O. R.

This book is unique, inasmuch as it is printed in English and German page by page. 124 pages, flush cloth, gilt lettering, price 2s., post free 2s. 3d.; better quality, gilt lettering, price 3s., post free 3s. 3d.

May be obtained from—

THE PIONEER PRESS,

2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C.

"LYCEUM" SCHOOL OF LANGUAGES,
59-61 NEW OXFORD-STREET, W.C.—All Languages taught. Translations undertaken. Special terms to Freethinkers. French taught by the Principal, who is French, good English, and classical scholar, and an ardent Freethinker.

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 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 NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS:

OR,

Christianity Completely Undermined.

WITH FAC-SIMILES OF MSS.

By JOSEPH SYMES.

A New Edition. Price THREE PENCE.

Post free, THREE PENCE HALFPENNY.

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

THE SALVATION ARMY AND ITS WORK

An Eight Page Tract

By C. COHEN.

PRINTED FOR FREE DISTRIBUTION.

Copies will be supplied to applicants who undertake to distribute them judiciously. Persons applying for considerable numbers, who are not known at the publishing office, must give a reference or some other proof of good faith. Carriage must be paid by applicants. The postage of one dozen will be 1d., of two dozen 2d., of fifty copies 3d., of a hundred copies 4d. Larger quantities by special arrangement.

FROM FICTION TO FACT.

By FRED. BONTE.

(LATE A PRISON MINISTER.)

The History of a Conversion from Catholicism to Secularism.

Second Edition—Revised and Enlarged.

"One of the most remarkable pamphlets which have been published of recent years.....A highly-instructive piece of self-revelation."—*Reynolds' Newspaper.*

SIXTY-FOUR PAGES.

PRICE ONE PENNY.

Order of your Newsagent at once.

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

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

WORKS BY G. W. FOOTE.

- ATHEISM AND MORALITY 2d., post ½d.
 BIBLE AND BEER. Showing the absurdity of basing Teetotalism on the Christian Scriptures. Careful, thorough, and accurate. Freethinkers should keep this pamphlet by them. 4d., post ½d.
 BIBLE HANDBOOK FOR FREETHINKERS AND INQUIRING CHRISTIANS. A new edition, revised and handsomely printed. Cheap edition, paper cover, 1s. 6d.; cloth 2s. 6d., post 2½d.
 BIBLE HEROES. New edition. Each part, paper 1s., post 1d. Superior edition (200 pages), complete, cloth, 2s. 6d., post 2½d.
 BIBLE ROMANCES. Popular edition, with Portrait, paper 6d., post 2½d. Superior edition (160 pages), cloth 2s., post 2½d.
 CHRISTIANITY AND PROGRESS. Second and cheaper edition. Recommended by Mr. Robert Blatchford in *God and My Neighbor*. 1d., post ½d.
 CHRISTIANITY AND SECULARISM. Four Nights' Public Debate with the Rev. Dr. James McCann. Paper, 1s.; cloth 1s. 6d., post 2d.
 CRIMES OF CHRISTIANITY. Hundreds of references are given to standard authorities. No pains have been spared to make the work a complete, trustworthy, final, unanswerable indictment of Christianity. The Tree is judged by its Fruit. Cloth (214 pp.), 2s. 6d., post 3d.
 COMIC SERMONS AND OTHER FANTASIAS. 8d., post 1d.
 DARWIN ON GOD. Containing all the passages in the works of Darwin bearing on the subject of religion. 6d., post 1d.
 DEFENCE OF FREE SPEECH. Three hours' Address to the Jury before Lord Coleridge. With Special Preface and many Footnotes. 4d., post 1d.
 DROPPING THE DEVIL: and Other Free Church Performances. 2d., post ½d.
 FLOWERS OF FREETHOUGHT. First Series, cloth, 2s. 6d., post 3d. Second Series, cloth 2s. 6d., post 3d.
 GOD SAVE THE KING. An English Republican's Coronation Notes. 2d., post ½d.
 HALL OF SCIENCE LIBEL CASE, with Full and True Account of the "Leeds Orgies." 3d., post 1d.
 INFIDEL DEATH-BEDS. Second edition, much enlarged. 8d., post 1d. Superfine paper in cloth, 1s. 3d., post 1½d.
 INTERVIEW WITH THE DEVIL. 2d., post ½d.
 IS SOCIALISM SOUND? Four Nights' Public Debate with Annie Besant. 1s., post 1½d.; cloth, 2s., post 2½d.
 INGERSOLLISM DEFENDED AGAINST ARCHDEACON FARRAR. 2d., post ½d.
 JOHN MORLEY AS A FREETHINKER. 2d., post ½d.
 LETTERS TO THE CLERGY. (128 pp.). 1s., post 2d.
 LETTERS TO JESUS CHRIST. 4d., post ½d.
 LIE IN FIVE CHAPTERS; or, Hugh Price Hughes' Converted Atheist. 1d., post ½d.
 MRS. BESANT'S THEOSOPHY. A Candid Criticism. 2d., post ½d.
 MY RESURRECTION. A Missing Chapter from the Gospe of Matthew. 2d., post ½d.
 PECULIAR PEOPLE. An Open Letter to Mr. Justice Wills. 1d., post ½d.
 PHILOSOPHY OF SECULARISM. 3d., post ½d.
 REMINISCENCES OF CHARLES BRADLAUGH. 6d., post 1d.
 ROME OR ATHEISM? The Great Alternative. 3d., post 1d.
 ROYAL PAUPERS. Showing what Royalty does for the People and what the People do for Royalty. 2d., post ½d.
 SALVATION SYRUP; or, Light on Darkest England. A Reply to General Booth. 2d., post ½d.
 SECULARISM AND THEOSOPHY. A Rejoinder to Mrs. Besant. 2d., post ½d.
 THE BOOK OF GOD, in the Light of the Higher Criticism, With Special Reference to Dean Farrar's Apology. Paper. 1s.; cloth, 2s., post 2d.
 THE GRAND OLD BOOK. A Reply to the Grand Old Man. An Exhaustive Answer to the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone's *Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture*. 1s.; bound in cloth, 1s. 6d., post 1½d.
 THE BIBLE GOD. 2d., post ½d.
 THE ATHEIST SHOEMAKER and the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes. 1d., post ½d.
 THE IMPOSSIBLE CREED. An Open Letter to Bishop Magee on the Sermon on the Mount. 2d., post ½d.
 THE SIGN OF THE CROSS. A Candid Criticism of Mr. Wilson Barret's Play. 6d., post 1½d.
 THE DYING ATHEIST. A Story. 1d., post ½d.
 THEISM OR ATHEISM? Public Debate between G. W. Foote and the Rev. W. T. Lee. Verbatim Report, revised by both Disputants. Well printed and neatly bound. 1s., post 1½d.
 THE NEW CAGLIOSTRO. An Open Letter to Madame Blavatsky. 2d., post ½d.
 THE JEWISH LIFE OF CHRIST. Being the *Sepher Toldoth Jeshu*, or Book of the Generation of Jesus. Edited, with an Historical Preface and Voluminous Notes, by G. W. Foote and J. M. Wheeler. 6d., post 1d.
 THE PASSING OF JESUS. The Last Adventures of the First Messiah. 2d., post ½d.
 WAS JESUS INSANE? A Searching Inquiry into the Mental Condition of the Prophet of Nazareth. 1d., post ½d.
 WHAT IS AGNOSTICISM? With Observations on Haxley, Bradlaugh, and Ingersoll, and a Reply to George Jacob Holyoake; also a Defence of Atheism. 3d., post ½d.
 WHO WAS THE FATHER OF JESUS? 2d., post ½d.
 WILL CHRIST SAVE US? 6d., post 1s.

WORKS BY COLONEL INGERSOLL.

- A CHRISTIAN CATECHISM. One of the most useful and brilliant of Colonel Ingersoll's pamphlets. 6d., post 1d.
 ART AND MORALITY. 2d., post ½d.
 A WOODEN GOD. 1d., post ½d.
 CREEDS AND SPIRITUALITY. 1d., post ½d.
 CRIMES AGAINST CRIMINALS. 3d., post ½d.
 DEFENCE OF FREETHOUGHT. Five Hours' Address to the Jury at the Trial for Blasphemy of C. B. Reynolds. 4d., post ½d.
 DO I BLASPHEME? 2d., post ½d.
 ERNEST RENAN. 2d., post ½d.
 FAITH AND FACT. Reply to Rev. Dr. Field. 2d., post ½d.
 GOD AND THE STATE. 2d., post ½d.
 HOUSE OF DEATH. Being Funeral Orations and Addresses on various occasions. 1s., post 2d.
 INGERSOLL'S ADVICE TO PARENTS. Keep Children out of Church and Sunday-school. 1d.
 LAST WORDS ON SUICIDE. 2d., post ½d.
 LECTURES. Popular Edition. Paper covers, 6d., post 1d.
 LIVE TOPICS. 1d., post ½d.
 MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE. An Agnostic's View. 2d., post ½d.
 MYTH AND MIRACLE. 1d., post ½d.
 ORATION ON LINCOLN. 3d., post ½d.
 ORATION ON THE GODS. 6d., post 1d.
 ORATION ON VOLTAIRE. 3d., post ½d.
 ORATION ON WALT WHITMAN. 3d., post 1d.
 REAL BLASPHEMY. 1d., post ½d.
 REPLY TO GLADSTONE. With a Biography by the late J. M. Wheeler. 4d., post 1d.
 ROME OR REASON? A Reply to Cardinal Manning. 3d., post 1d.
 SHAKESPEARE. 6d., post 1d.
 SKULLS. 2d., post ½d.
 SOCIAL SALVATION. 2d., post ½d.
 SOME MISTAKES OF MOSES. 136 pp., on superfine paper, cloth 2s. 6d., post 3d.; paper 1s., post 1½d. Only complete edition in England. Accurate as Colenso and as fascinating as a novel. Abridged Edition, 16 pp. 1d., post ½d.
 SUPERSTITION. 6d., post 1d.
 TAKE A ROAD OF YOUR OWN. 1d., post ½d.
 THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. 3d., post ½d.
 THE COMING CIVILISATION. 3d., post ½d.
 THE DEVIL. 6d., post 1d.
 THE DYING CREED. 2d., post ½d.
 THE GHOSTS. Superior Edition, 3d., post ½d.
 THE HOLY BIBLE. 6d., post 1d.
 THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH. 2d., post ½d.
 THE LIMITS OF TOLERATION. A Discussion with the Hon. F. D. Coudert and Gov. S. L. Woodford. 2d., post ½d.
 THE THREE PHILANTHROPISTS. 2d., post ½d.
 WHAT IS RELIGION? Colonel Ingersoll's Last Lecture. 2d., post ½d.
 WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED? 2d., post ½d.
 WHY AM I AN AGNOSTIC? 2d., post ½d.

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