

# THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXVII.—No. 41

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1907

PRICE TWOPENCE

*The idea of Progress as the law of life, accepted and developed, verified by history, and confirmed by science, is the banner of the future.*—MAZZINI.

## Atheism and Socialism.

WHEN men or parties lose a battle they seldom admit that they were defeated simply because they were not strong enough to win. They generally assign some other reason. Something did not happen that ought to have happened, or something happened that ought not to have happened. Had it not been for some accident or other the result would have been very different. Thus our poor human nature tries to indulge its vanity at the expense of its reason and welfare.

It is assumed by the Labor party that Mr. Hill must have won the Kirkdale election on a straight issue, though it is not easy to see any reason for believing that the Unionist candidate could be beaten. The figures are, on the whole, just what might be expected. But the gratuitous assumption that the Labor candidate was bound to win the seat, barring accidents, has led Mr. J. Ramsey Macdonald, Mr. J. Bruce Glasier, and others, to assert that Mr. Hill was defeated by religious bigotry. The cry of "Atheism" was raised against him. Leaflets were circulated containing plain denials of the leading doctrines of Christianity by Mr. Robert Blatchford. The *Clarion* was represented as the organ of Socialism—its editor advocated Atheism—therefore Socialism and Atheism were virtually the same thing—and consequently Mr. Hill was really the candidate of Atheism.

Mr. Hill was known to be a deacon of a Nonconformist chapel, and he had thrown over Secular Education in favor of Simple Bible Teaching. This is the other side to the cry of "Atheism." We do not believe that cry was as mischievous as Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Glasier maintain. It is very unlikely that the Labor candidate lost through sheer misrepresentation. We are accustomed to that element in English politics. Every political party misrepresents every other political party. We are not aware of any exception. And the various misrepresentations fairly counterbalance each other, leaving elections to be decided by the relative strength of the contending parties.

It is natural, perhaps, that Mr. Blatchford should accept the theory that he is responsible for Mr. Hill's defeat. It is not unflattering to be considered the "bold bad man" of a conspicuously unfortunate situation. We are glad to see, though, that he is sincerely impenitent. His personal declaration is quite refreshing. He considers religion as the enemy of human progress, and he means to go on attacking it. Socialists who cannot see that Chris-

tianity stands in the way of Socialism have to be converted. That is his answer to the Christian Socialists. And it is as reasonable as it is honest. Those gentlemen hold themselves perfectly free to advocate Socialism and Christianity, but they object to his advocating Socialism and Atheism. It is Mr. Blatchford that ought to be muzzled. Which is a sweet theory, no doubt; only it is spoiled by Mr. Blatchford's inability to accept it.

May we suggest, however, that Christianity ought to be attacked on the ground of its falsehood? Being founded upon certain statements, it is under an obligation to prove them when challenged. That is its first duty. And the first duty of Freethought is to show that those statements are false. Everything else is secondary. The alleged beauty and beneficence of Christianity must not be allowed to occupy the primary position. The first question, and in the long run the all-important question, is this—Is Christianity true? Mr. Blatchford saw this in *God and My Neighbor*, and we hope he will always keep it in view.

The question whether Christianity stands in the way of Socialism is one, we think, that Mr. Blatchford would be mistaken in pressing; though we cheerfully admit that it is rather his business than ours. A question of that sort can hardly be discussed on a definite ground or brought to a definite issue. Moreover, it is a challenge from one section of the Socialist party to another, and might easily breed bad blood; whereas the question of the truth of Christianity can be discussed without personality or partisanship; and if the Christian Socialists lay themselves out for trouble, Mr. Blatchford can throw all the blame upon them without turning a hair on his own account.

Besides, it is not exactly obvious, on the face of it, that Atheism leads to Socialism, or Socialism to Atheism. Some great Atheists have been Socialists, and some great Atheists have been Anti-Socialists. On the other hand, some great Christians have been Socialists, and some great Christians have been Anti-Socialists. All that can be argued, we think, is that Atheists are more likely than Christians to be resolute social reformers. "Atheism," said Bacon, "leaves a man to sense, to philosophy"—and sense and philosophy are better social inspirations than nonsense and credulity. But whether sense and philosophy lead necessarily to State Socialism is a different question altogether. Nor is it the *ipse dixit* of this or that man which will decide the question. It will be decided by reason, by experience, and, above all, by time. And in the meanwhile it should be possible for Freethinkers of any and every school of abstract thought to unite in practice on feasible reforms of the present day or the early future. What stands in the way of this sort of compromise is the easy cheerfulness of theoretical propaganda in comparison with the hard

application of mind which is demanded by definite problems. It was a profound philosopher who said that men often think in generalities to save themselves the trouble of thinking in particulars.

Be all that as it may, we must deny any man's right to identify Atheism with Socialism. Mr. Blatchford is free, as far as we are concerned, to say that Socialism involves Atheism. What we are concerned to deny is the proposition that Atheism involves Socialism. Atheism is primarily intellectual and moral. Socialism is primarily economical and political. They move on different planes. They are not necessarily enemies; neither are they necessarily allies.

Of course the *Daily Express* is following the law of its being in attacking Socialism as "Atheism." Its object is political, and it believes that the end justifies the means. As long as it can discredit Socialism it is indifferent to everything else. If the Socialist spokesmen were all Christians the *Express* would be sneering at superstition and sentimentality. Still, we are glad that its present policy advertises Atheism. By showing how Atheistic some distinguished Socialists are, it at least proves that Atheism is no longer negligible.

The *Daily Chronicle* devoted an article to "Socialism and Religion," and wound up by declaring two things; first, that Mr. Blatchford "carries more weight among British Socialists than anybody else"—which, in one way, at any rate, we are very glad to hear; second, that Socialism, having little chance under any circumstances in England, has no chance at all "when its champions encumber themselves with an anti-Christian propaganda." This may be true at the moment. It will not be true for ever. The very same number of the *Chronicle* gave long accounts of the Holy Jumpers in America and the lunatic Revival at Sunderland; and it seems pretty clear that Christianity is fast going to the dogs.

G. W. FOOTE.

### Religion and the Social Sense.

A WRITER in one of the religious weeklies devotes an article to the thesis that our working beliefs—i.e., those manifested in practice—are not often those which lie upon the surface. The position is sound enough, and it is one that has often been dwelt upon in these columns. It would, indeed, be strange if the statement did not contain a large measure of truth. Those beliefs of which we are conscious are mostly the products of our education and our immediate environment, while our whole organised, essential nature belongs to the past—to that subconscious world which is only just beginning to be explored. It is thus that we find the really essential functions of life independent of our consciously-formulated beliefs. The greatest function of all, biologically—that of the perpetuation of the race—is disguised from us by a whole mass of beliefs and theories of which it is essentially independent. To secure its performance, Nature creates mere sex-hunger—as non-reasoning an appetite as any that exists. But above this and upon this are developed a host of secondary, tertiary, and quaternary feelings and ideas that to most people obscure it altogether. But the deeply-implanted, non-reasoning instinct is always there, always active and insistent. All that takes place is that these organic impulses are expressed in terms of local language, custom, or religious belief; while the non-reflective mistake the more or less impermanent forms for the underlying permanent reality.

One could apply this principle in innumerable directions, for it is coextensive with life. At present, however, I am only concerned with its application to the world of religious beliefs—with their supposed bearing on ethical and social life. To commence with, there is the obvious fact—one that perplexes the writer of the article referred to—that the lives of the people are really *not* governed by the religious

beliefs they profess. Their lives are modified by them—in many cases; but except in occasional instances they do not exercise a dominating influence. The same point has been noted by Emerson in the statement that "No people, at the present day, can be explained by their national religion." But it is true that, while they cannot be explained by their national religion, they can be, and are, explained by their national practices. And the reason for this is not far to seek. Their practice is at every step of their history controlled by the fact of penalties paid for all ill-advised practices and rewards enjoyed for all wise ones. Their religious beliefs belong—entirely, so far as their form is concerned—to a state that has long ceased to exist. One is the expression of an interaction between an adaptive organism and an ever-changing environment, the other represents a mere survival of unwarrantable beliefs with no vital relationship to existing facts.

It is only by bearing in mind this distinction between the permanent and transient, the essential and accidental factors in human evolution, that we can properly understand the right relation between religious beliefs and social life. Once this distinction is clearly realised, it is not difficult to see how, generation after generation, the fundamental human and social instincts are at work modifying religious beliefs to an ultimately more human end. An illustration of this lies easily to hand in the development of the idea of God. Originally all that we have in the conception of the idea of power. The gods are there; their existence is to be accepted as a fact; and they are to be obeyed merely because they have the power to punish if they are not. Between man and his gods moral relations simply have, then, no existence. But the developing social sense of mankind gradually reaches the principle that the only ultimate justification for the exercise of power over people is ethical. To enforce obedience with no other object than the mere expression of power is senseless brutality. And with the growth of this conception, purely social in its origin and application, we can trace its influence upon the belief in Deity. The idea of mere power takes a subordinate place, that of justice assumes form, until finally we have the picture of a God ruling the world for the benefit of the governed in terms of justice to all. But all this has no real, no essential, connection with the religious idea. It is merely the operation of the social consciousness on the religious conception. In the conflict of the transient with the permanent, the former is necessarily modified or disappears.

This is really all that is meant by the evolution of religion—so called. For, in strict accuracy, there is no such thing. Religion is as complete among savages as among ourselves. In one sense, more so; for, while we know no more than the savage concerning Deity, our consciousness of our ignorance is infinitely stronger. All that takes place is an elaboration of ritual on the one side, and, on the other, a modification of religious beliefs in terms of social betterment. But far from our religious beliefs gaining strength during this "development," they become weaker and more nebulous. It is fast becoming the exception to find a man with really strong, definite religious conceptions, while all the talk of "social Christianity," or of a Christianity based on social service, illustrates the weakening of religious belief before the pressure of a developing social consciousness.

Social instincts, then, are supreme—in the long run, at least—and are, moreover, fundamentally sound. An unhealthy social instinct would be a contradiction in terms. The conditions for its development do not, and cannot, exist. There may exist the abuse of certain social feelings, but, fundamentally, they are sound and virtuous. And this fact explains why it is that, on the whole, moral and social right-doing gain in strength with the passing of generations. Over and over again we have superficial thinkers like the Rev. R. J. Campbell pointing to this truth as evidence of the government of the world by a "divine intelligence." It proves nothing

of the kind. That right-doing gains ground in the long run, and is beneficial, proves only that right-doing is right-doing. Conduct is one of the methods by which the human animal is brought into adaptation with its environment, and the increase in moral feeling and action proves no more than stripes on the skin of a tiger. Both are fundamentally expressions of adaptation. Yet the men who would see that the design argument is ineffective in the one case use it quite confidently in the other. If they were to pause awhile in their career as teachers of morals to learn something of the nature of morality, they might realise the truth of what has been said above, and that it lies in the nature of things that the mental and moral nature of man should be subject to the same laws of growth as his physical structure, and for precisely the same reasons.

Unfortunately, the truth is obscured by the manner in which social and moral truths find expression. By an historical accident religion generally, and in England the Christian religion, has long held a politically commanding position. People have grown up belonging to this or that particular church, they have been taught to express all the common virtues in terms of the dominant creed, with the not unnatural result that they have come to regard those virtues as inseparable from the religion. How often does one meet with decent, and otherwise intelligent, people, who express the assurance that it is religious belief that lies at the root of all benevolent action and all righteous conduct. Only the other day the Bishop of Manchester made this avowal, and the audience of clergymen whom he addressed doubtless all agreed with him. Yet nothing could be further from the truth. We are all human before we are religious, social before we are sectarian; and though our humanity may sometimes be deformed by religion, and our sympathies narrowed by sectarianism, neither can be altogether suppressed. Sympathy with injustice, care for the hungry or the distressed, is not, and cannot be, an expression of pure religion; they are the outcome of socialised natures, the products of thousands of generations of gregarious existence. Domestic and family affections, the feeling of one person for another, are obviously independent of any particular creed, and are common to human nature wherever it is found. That people should ever believe otherwise, is decisive proof of how much religion degrades the humanity it professes to elevate.

The principles of adaptation and of the survival of the fittest are as applicable to the world of mind and morals as to that of physical structure. In both cases utility is the condition of development, and in both cases injury paves the way for destruction. Had religious belief been of real benefit to the race, it would by this time have been so essential a part of our nature as to defy eradication. It would exist independent of instruction, and therefore secure from attack. That its persistence is only secured by the strenuous efforts of thousands of instructors, and that even then it is gradually losing its hold on the better and bolder minds of the race, is tantamount to its complete condemnation.

C. COHEN.

### The Faith Once For All Delivered to the Saints.

THE Bishop of Norwich, interviewed by the editor of the *Christian Commonwealth*, states that he holds "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints"—which statement is a clear indication that his lordship is not in favor of the idea that Christianity either needs, or is capable of, any reconstruction, so as to make it more acceptable to the people of the twentieth century. The Bishop believes that "Christianity in its essentials is not something which can be modified by modern thought," being "not man-originated, but God-revealed." Such a position is as intelligible as it is logical. It is true that the Chris-

tianity of to-day cannot easily be identified with the Christianity contained in the New Testament, but this, we are told, is due to the fact that the organised Christianity of the present is only that of the New Testament properly unfolded, developed, understood. The whole of it is wrapped up, or buried as in a mine, in the tiny document, but it took the Church fifteen hundred years to unravel or dig it out. This is the orthodox Protestant position; and, if the inspiration and infallibility of the New Testament be granted, it is an absolutely impregnable position. The Eastern or Greek Church worked the mine, and got out of it the true doctrine of the Trinity and of the Person of Christ. The Western or Latin Church, headed by Augustine, worked the mine, and bore out of it correct views on man's lost estate and his redemption by sovereign grace. But the genuine *method* of salvation could not be brought into the clear light of day except by an earthquake, which split the Church in two. The name of that earthquake is the Protestant Reformation; and it is to the Reformed Church that Christendom owes its possession of the imperial doctrine of Justification by Faith.

The Catholic position is somewhat different. While the Protestants aver that the Bible is perfect and the Church imperfect, the Catholics contend, on the contrary, that the Bible is imperfect and the Church perfect. According to the latter, the whole of Christianity is not in the New Testament except germinally, in the same manner as the oak is in the acorn; while, according to the former, the revelation of Christianity was completely made to the apostles, who were *fully* inspired to write it down once for all, and the Church has been only *partially* inspired to discover the revelation, by slow degrees, as deposited in the sacred volume.

These are the two main positions, and both are defensible on grounds of intelligibility and logic. The history of Christianity, as a theory, is fully accounted for by either. Whether as a scheme of salvation fully revealed in the New Testament and gradually discovered there by the Church, or whether as such a scheme progressively made known to a continually inspired Church, Christianity is theoretically an explicable religion; and the study of it is an interesting philosophical pastime. But the moment we descend from the cloudland of futile, though fascinating, speculation, and begin to tread the solid ground of history, we experience a total disillusion. The faith once for all delivered to the saints, so firmly held by the Bishop of Norwich, is a faith beautiful only in conception and logical only in form. As a faith on trial it has been a bitter disappointment.

The Bishop of Norwich was asked an exceptionally humiliating question. It was even an insulting question. He was asked, not "Do you believe the faith has triumphed?" or, "Do the facts of history justify your holding such a faith?" but, "Would you say that religion is retaining its hold on the nation?" The question was silly, as well as insulting, especially as put to a man who believes that Christianity is, "not man-originated, but God-revealed." But his lordship's answer is more foolish than the editor's question. Here it is:—

"It is difficult to say. Probably there is quite as much religion in England to-day as there was last century or the century before. There has been of late years a falling off in the attendance upon the ordinances, but it does not necessarily follow that because people do not go to church they have not religion in their hearts. The clergyman who goes into the homes of the people, whether they are church-goers or not, usually finds religion there. I doubt whether, relatively to the population, there is more unbelief to-day than there was in the seventeenth century."

A believer in the divinity of Christianity ought to be profoundly ashamed of such a statement. A Divinely-ordained minister not quite sure whether his God-revealed religion is holding its own in the land or not! Is not that a virtual confession that, as a *God-given religion*, Christianity is a colossal failure? "Probably" there has not been a serious falling-off

of interest in religion; "probably" the decline of faith is more apparent than real; but that is not the point at all. The question to be faced is, Why has there been any falling-off or decline at all? Why did not the God-revealed religion, impelled by God-given power, go forth and take complete possession of the world at once? Not all the bishops in Christendom can satisfactorily dispose of that problem. Secularists are the only people who understand the mystery, and they understand it because to them Christianity is exclusively "man-originated."

Let us drive this point as far home as possible. The Bishop says that immorality seems to him "to be far more rampant than unbelief," which, though tantamount to admitting that unbelievers are not necessarily immoral, only renders the situation all the more inexplicable. Why are there unbelievers, and why are there others than unbelievers who are immoral? It is the existence of unbelief and immorality that is so impossible of explanation by believers in a "God-revealed" religion. Someone said the other day that, away off in Japan, a miserable drunkard was reclaimed through becoming a Christian. Possibly; but the puzzling fact to a believer is why there are fewer drunkards in Heathen Japan than in Christian England. A reclaimed drunkard, a reclaimed thief, or a reclaimed sensualist does not prove that Christianity is "God-revealed"; but the presence of so many millions of unreclaimed drunkards, thieves, sensualists, and other scoundrels, does afford at least a strong presumptive evidence that it is but "man-originated." "Explain the changed lives," the Christian apologists sternly demand. Well, that we can easily do, even on the supposition that Christianity is nothing but a man-made religion; but we return the apologists' complaint by asking, Will you please explain the countless myriads of unchanged lives, on the assumption that your religion is "God-revealed"? We maintain that so-called conversions are invariably the outcome of special efforts put forth by interested friends, and that there attaches to them no psychological mystery whatsoever. We hold that they take place in accordance with and by means of purely natural laws. Dr. Torrey once led a little girl of nine to give the game away. "Do you want to be a Christian?" he asked. "Yes," she replied, "that is what I came for." "Are your parents Christians?" was the next question. She answered: "Mother came last night and got changed, and father is coming to-night to get changed; and my two sisters are down in front getting changed; and I want to get changed too." They all went to the conversion-mill when the machinery was in full swing, and got changed because they wanted to get changed. Yes, we can explain the conversions without any reference to supernatural agency; but can believers explain the non-conversions, which are always in the majority? The non-conversions with God are infinitely more inexplicable than the conversions without him. If the record is reliable, Paul got converted independently of the conversion-mills, and while he was fully bent on smashing up the whole lot of them: why did not, or why cannot, God convert all others in the same direct manner?

In theory, the "God-revealed" religion may be exceedingly perfect and beautiful; but what is the use of a perfect and glorious theory if it breaks down in practice? If there be a God, who is an omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, and all-merciful person, why is the world still unsaved, still ungodly? The orthodox believer is at a loss what answer to make. Sometimes he says: "In his infinite wisdom he has somehow seen fit to do the saving work through human agencies. It is wholly incomprehensible, but clearly such is his way." Of course, this is worse than no explanation at all. The New Theologians imagine that they remove the anomaly by doing away with the Divine personality. In point of fact, they only succeed in jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire. With their pet doctrine of the Divine Immanence, instead of casting mountains into the sea, they merely add to their height. The

activity of their immanent God is necessarily limited, and cannot be distinguished from the activity of the being in whom he is supposed to dwell. The God of the Old Theology may be culpably negligent, but the God of the New Theology is contemptibly impotent. The former could save the world if he would, while the latter could not even if he would. Unable to choose between these two wholly irreconcilable deities, we prefer to go our way without either. Man's real salvation must come from himself, and the reorganisation of society is a task which society itself is alone capable of accomplishing.

J. T. LLOYD.

### Omnia Mutantur.

GALILEO'S dictum, "the world does move," receives ample confirmation when we compare the present attitude of Religion to Science with that of a century ago.

Time was when Religion—haughty, powerful, and insolent—could afford to denounce Science as man's worldly pride and arrogance, and as contrary to divine revelation.

Within living memory—not to go farther back—the men of God, from the begowned oracle of the cathedral to the black-coated, atrophic-minded evangelist of the tin bethel, would, with all the assurance born of ignorance, pour forth their vituperative denunciations upon the head of the great Darwin and his theories of Natural Selection.

Since then, Christian apologists have discovered that Professor Moses knew all about Evolution 6,000 years ago!

To-day, Science is the final Court of Appeal, and Religion waits, cap in hand, grateful for the crumbs which fall from the rich man's table. And what dry crumbs she receives! In response to her pleadings for a God, one of the feasters at the banquet of scientific knowledge, after denying the truth of the Virgin Birth and the Atonement, and calling her dogma of physical resurrection "a legend," throws her—a catechism! *Sic transit gloria mundi!*

Yet do we find that the multitudinous blunders of Religion, which Science has corrected, has made the Church more modest in her claim for adherence. On the contrary, it is commonly asserted from the pulpit that Science has become less aggressive, less antagonistic to religion. It stands before the problem of the first great cause in reverent silence. The Church has never changed, oh dear no; the truths of God are eternal, and his Church infallible. Of course, the reverse is true. The Church, in its severe struggle for survival, has developed the instinct of self-preservation to an abnormal degree. With its customary acuteness, it takes under its wing every reform which has gained general acceptance—no matter how vigorously it was opposed before—and arrogates to Christianity its origination. Quite a recent instance is the Church's claim that the elevation of women was due to Christian influence—an insolent claim, which received its quietus from Mr. McCabe in his usual scholarly fashion.

Truth and Reason have always been the Mecca of Science, while the Church, in order to continue its existence, has been forced to permeate its teachings with this spirit. But this very means of prolonging its life has rung the death-knell of Religion. As sure as Religion commences to peruse its teachings with an element of Reason, so sure does the process of disintegration begin.

Rome, with maturer judgment and foresight, holds aloof from the Spirit of the Age, and it is against the myrmidons of Roman Catholicism that Rationalism will win its final victories. But is there any fundamental reason why Science should be antagonistic to Religion? Does the study of zoology, anthropology, physiology, biology, astronomy, and the various sciences, necessarily lead the student from the fold of Faith? I think the answer must, in both cases, be in the affirmative, and for the important reason

that, whereas Science always seeks a natural explanation of natural phenomena, Religion takes refuge in what Spinoza called "the asylum of ignorance"—God. Also in the contemplation of Nature, "red in tooth and claw," one looks in vain for the guiding hand of the Father of Love! Personally, as a humble student of astronomy, I have never heard a lecturer on the science attribute the cause of any celestial phenomena to God. He would simply be laughed at if he did. The scientist finds a cause for every effect, or admits his ignorance. That galaxy of stars, the Milky Way, which spreads its luminous band from horizon to horizon, certainly does not suggest a creator who would subdivide like an amoeba into equal parts, and select one part to take human form, suffer, and die, to appease the wrath, and satisfy the justice, of the remainder.

Truly, in the Trinity there not three Incomprehensibles, but one Incomprehensible; and that is, how on earth fools can teach, and bigger fools believe, such a farrago of nonsense! Certainly a study of Science would dispel such inane conceptions of a deity as this. The anthropomorphic deity of the Old Testament, with his petty jealousies, vindictive bloodthirstiness, and foolish intervention in human affairs, can receive no more support from Science or Reason than can the New Testament Jesus with his miracles and code of future rewards and punishment. By the very nature of the case, all attempts to reconcile Religion with Science are predestined to failure. Religion is man's childhood efforts to explain natural phenomena. It is, in fact, primitive science, and to attempt to reconcile the guesses of barbarism with the results of man's maturer mind and accumulated knowledge, is a palpable absurdity. Gradually, on the intellectual horizon, the night-clouds of superstition are vanishing, and Man, disdaining the star of Faith which led the shepherds of the New Testament legend to the false Savior, is following the radiant Sun of Reason, which is guiding him to Man's only real savior, comforter, and friend—Science!

ALFRED GERMANY.

### Acid Drops.

The "occult" gentry may be poor performers, but they are good advertisers. They get a look in at nearly all murder investigations. Some of them pretended to see in a vision how the soldier killed the artist in that unspeakable West-end case. But it turned out, in the end, that they were as far off the truth as it was possible to be. They had an innings in the Miss Money case, but they couldn't shed a ray of light upon it, and it remains a mystery to this day. Of course, they were sure to assert themselves in the Camden Town horror. A sensational report went round the press about a clairvoyant who was taken by the police to the murdered girl's room and laid in her bed, where he fell under "influence," and in "a rapt, tense voice" gave a vivid description of the actual commission of the crime, described several persons implicated and mentioned their names. Of course it was a concoction. A leading Scotland Yard official told the *Daily News* representative that it was simply absurd. "You know our methods," he said, "and calling in clairvoyants is not one of them. We know nothing whatever about the alleged vision." Another bubble pricked!

Rev. F. B. Meyer is not exactly a humorist, but he threw a lot of people into convulsions of laughter the other day. He was addressing a large Liverpool audience on the subject of "Enthusiasm." They were mostly young people, and at one point of his address he exhorted them in this way: "Young men and young women, you must embrace—." No doubt he meant to say "the opportunity," but he lost the opportunity of saying it, for the audience rose at the unintended joke. Mr. Meyer knows now that, in the case of some sentences, it is important which end is put first.

The Bishop of Liverpool visited the opening Assembly of the Baptist Union, and was invited to speak before the President delivered his address. He said that Anglicans and Nonconformists were "at one on the great cardinal doctrines of Christianity." Common Christianity was historic Christianity. Its great facts were enshrined in

the Apostles' Creed—"that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, that he died for their sins according to the Scriptures, that he rose again from the dead in a real sense, and ascended up into Heaven, and that he would come again to judge the quick and the dead." The Bishop added that these great facts were "unassailable"—and the Baptists roared out their applause. They all overlooked the fact that the New Theologians, including the Rev. R. J. Campbell, deny the Virgin Birth of Christ, and declare it is not an essential part of Christianity.

When the Bishop of Liverpool had finished his speech the whole Assembly rose, and, with the Bishop leading, recited the Apostles' Creed. This, then, is "historic" and "common" Christianity. This is the bed-rock hocus-pocus on which all Christian Churches are agreed. We say hocus-pocus advisedly, for the Apostles' Creed is all supernaturalism. It does not contain one intellectual proposition or moral principle, or a single sentence of the slightest natural value to any man, woman, or child on this planet. Yet it is this Creed which the Nonconformists are willing to admit as the criterion of their "Simple Bible Teaching" in the public schools. Dr. Clifford himself, we believe, accepts this policy. Yet he has the "face" to pretend that he is really in favor of Secular Education.

The Mayor of Yarmouth (a Churchman) welcomed the Church Congress, and the Recorder read an address on behalf of the Corporation. This address was engrossed and sealed with the common seal of the borough, and we suppose it will figure henceforth in the Church museum, or art gallery, or whatever they call it. The Corporation hoped that the Congress discussions would "prove of considerable value." Perhaps this was meant sarcastically; otherwise the Corporation of Yarmouth is a very sanguine body of men.

Next the local Free Churches came along with a greeting. "We are heartily with you," their address said, "in your efforts to promote the social and moral well-being of the nation." But that is not the special business of the Church of England, or of any other Church. It is not really the business of the Churches at all. Their duty is to prepare people for the next world; and if there is no next world, or they cannot prepare people for it, they should disband and let all their employees engage in some useful and honest occupation.

Rev. E. Cornwall Jones, President of the local Free Church Council, added some personal words to the official address. This gentleman mouthed the old platitudes about "the duty of Christians to unite." How comical it sounded in view of the over-increasing bitterness of the quarrel over elementary education! He also said that "the land was hungering for faith"—a perfectly imbecile observation. But he said *one* sensible thing. He observed that they were "being confronted with secularism." That's true, anyhow. And the time has gone by for answering Secularism with imprisonment. Cleaner weapons must be used now, and the Churches have great difficulty in finding them.

The Church Congress was next welcomed by the District Association of the National Union of Teachers. Their address was the most snuffling performance of all. It was pious, piety, from the first word to the last; and it wound up by wishing the Congress a "sanctified success." These sanctimonious imparters of reading, writing, and arithmetic to little children, took themselves with immense seriousness. "We are proud and happy," they said, "to affirm our faith in the principles of religious education, and our experience of its effect in hallowing and heightening the efficacy of the civilising and moralising work done in the schools." It is a pity they were not able to affirm their faith in better English. The sentence we have just quoted is inaccurate and transpoutine. Having said that, we have a more important word for these teachers. They talk about their "civilising and moralising work" in the schools. Wouldn't it be better if they taught secular subjects more effectively? They certainly don't seem to succeed in the "civilising and moralising" part of their business. All the boys of England have been thrown into their hands for nearly forty years. And what is the result? Are the boys better behaved than they used to be? Nothing of the kind. It is proverbial that their manners are quite shockingly worse. The hooliganism of young people to-day is a positive affliction. It would be a great advantage to them if they could be educated as Japanese children are. What they want is not talk about "hallowing" and "sanctification," but steady discipline in conduct and behavior. Instead of clap-trap Christianity, they need wise ethical training. In Japan, the children do get the wise ethical training. In England they get the clap-trap Christianity.

Just look at one significant point of difference. The cane is an official instrument in English schools. Every school-master—and in practice every teacher—has a legal right to beat the children entrusted to his care. In Japan, the beating of children is strictly prohibited; and any Japanese teacher who so far forgot himself as to strike a child would lose his situation on the spot. Behold the Christian picture on the one side! Behold the Heathen picture on the other!

Not satisfied with the Teachers' official address, Mr. R. C. Jones, their local President, added the inevitable "few words" of his own. He spoke of "the essential interdependence of religion and education," and said that he and his colleagues were an "ally" of the clergy "against the twin terrors of an irreligious education and debasing materialism." This sounding mouthful was greeted with loud applause. It would be in such an assembly. For it was simply a trade flourish.

At length the Bishop of Norwich got upon his legs and acknowledged all these welcomes. He mouthed about "our great fabric of civil and religious liberty"—as if the Church had ever done anything but oppose its construction. He said that "the great object they had in view was to promote the great cause of religion and morality in the land." It was very kind of him to take morality as well as religion under his wing, but he will have (sooner or later) to give up the one that doesn't belong to him. Moreover, he must be told that religion and morality are not *one* cause but *two*. In nine cases out of ten they are really opposed to each other. And when they are made to dwell in the same house, it is not a union of sympathy, but a union of conquest; religion holding morality as its serviceable slave.

The Bishop of Norwich went on to say that the Free Churches and the Church of England "are both engaged in combating vice, unbelief, and indifference." There you are! That is the style of these clerical gentlemen! They couple vice and unbelief. They try to create the impression that moral health is impossible without their spiritual medicines. And the reason is plain. They live by dispensing the said spiritual medicines. We quite understand them.

"To us," the Bishop of Norwich said, "secular education is a monstrosity." Of course it is. So is a policeman in a thieves' kitchen.

Just look at the subjects the Church Congress fell to discussing first! (1) Endowments, (2) Inadequacy of the Voluntary System, (3) Easter Offerings, (4) Vestments. It was a trade debate.

Talking about vestments, we see by the *Eastern Daily Press* that the Archbishop of Canterbury figured in the Church Congress procession through the streets of Yarmouth. He was in full fig, and his "train was borne by two little boys." Fancy the head of "God's Church" in England indulging in such tomfoolery!

Naturally, the English Church Union held a meeting of its own in the Town Hall, Yarmouth, with Lord Halifax in the chair. His lordship had a good deal to say about the Education question. "They were quite sure," he observed, "that an attempt would be made next year to establish undenominational religious teaching at the public expense, that was at their cost and his, to the exclusion of all other religious teaching." He contended—and we think rightly—that "undenominational religious teaching was just as much a positive religious system as any other," and that it was "practically a religious system which suited Nonconformists." This is the view we have expressed all along in the *Freethinker*, and it is absurd for the Nonconformists to pretend not to see it. Anglicans and Catholics have no alternative but to fight against the Nonconformist policy to the bitter end. Lord Halifax declared, amidst loud applause, that neither the Church of England nor the Roman Catholics were going to submit to any such injustice. And he added, amidst further loud applause, that "If Parliament attempted to pass any measure on the lines of the measure proposed last year, the country from one end to the other would be covered with passive resisters." Churchmen will not submit tamely to Nonconformist domination; they will go on the warpath; and Dr. Clifford will probably be surprised at the way in which they will prove that they have learned his lesson of passive resistance, and are able to better the instruction.

We should be delighted to see Churchmen playing the game of passive resistance, and Nonconformists sending them to prison. It would discredit the Nonconformists for

ever—which would be a great gain to the public life of England; and it would drive Churchmen towards Secular Education as the only way out of their difficulty.

That the Church of England is returning to the Catholic Faith is clear from the fact that at the Church Congress meetings just held the Catholic element was much stronger than the Protestant. Lord Halifax, who seems to be a leader of the Catholic party, was fiercely attacked; but the opposition proceeded, we are informed, "from a small knot of persons, and looked like an organised attempt to howl him down." But this steady growth of Catholicism only proves that Catholicism is the one form of Christianity that has real vitality in it. Christianity has always insisted on the total surrender of the reason. Its sole appeal is to authority, and all its genuine professors are intellectual slaves. Catholicism will flourish as long as there are people who, like Newman, are prepared to live in perpetual bondage. Protestantism is at best but a compromise; and compromises cannot endure. That is why Protestantism is dying; it is committing suicide. Catholicism will not die until the masses of the people are sufficiently educated to claim the right of intellectual independence; and this we shall have to work for for many generations yet. Superstition dies hard.

The warmest discussion at the Church Congress was on Socialism. One of the speakers referred to Jesus Christ as the greatest Socialist the world ever saw. This is rather odd, seeing that he went about preaching, and let rich women minister unto him of their substance—as they are still apt to do in the case of "taking" revivalists. Some of the speakers said that State Socialism implied a State Church, and argued that this would be a good thing for the parsons. Well, if State Socialism meant what these clerical gentlemen asserted, every Freethinker would have to be strenuously opposed to it. We shall look out for what the Socialist organs have to say on this discussion.

Canon Henson speaks of the "authentic claims of God"; but how does he distinguish between the authentic and the spurious claims? God's claims are much fewer in number to-day than they were a hundred years ago; and if they continue to be surrendered at the same rate in the future, it is certain that in another hundred years there will be none left; and with his claims God himself will be bowed out of being.

Dr. Clifford says that the final appeal of Christianity is not to the intellect, nor yet to the judgment, but, "always to the will." If he had substituted *emotion* for *will*, his statement would have been entirely correct. But is not the attempt to *move* people by any other force than their intelligence the very quintessence of cowardice? And is there not an element of fraud in it as well? In that sentence, Dr. Clifford unwittingly gives the show away, as he often does.

"An Old Supernumerary" shows both his age and his superfluosity in an angry letter to the *Methodist Times*, in which he severely rebukes Dr. Agar Beet for admitting that there are errors in the Bible. Of course, the whole of the Old Testament and the whole of the New must be looked upon as constituting God's Holy Word. To doubt this is rankest impiety. Fortunately for the world, this irate old parson is now safely on the shelf, a superfluous person, in a most literal sense "an old supernumerary." Very slowly, but also very surely, the ancient idol is coming down, and in this we all rejoice.

In a remarkable article entitled "Our Working Beliefs," "J. B.", of the *Christian World*, discusses Christianity in terms of pure naturalism. He gives an admirable account of the rise and progress and decay of various creeds, and declares that the working beliefs of the Church have always been other than her professed ones. He speaks highly of Paganism, especially Stoicism, and calmly asserts that "we find the Early Fathers borrowing at large both their moral and political conceptions from the Stoics." Then he adds: "And how much of the Church's religious thought was waiting for it, ready made." He refers to "Christian doctrine as arising naturally in the human spirit." Of course, in a last short paragraph, to save his own head, he unsays, flatly contradicts the whole of the preceding paragraphs, and descends from pure reasoning to a vicious species of special pleading—a trick common to most Higher Critics and New Theologians.

Sir Evelyn Wood is writing for the *Times* a history of the Indian Mutiny. His account of the causes of that outbreak is good enough as far as it goes, but it might well go a little

further. He duly notes that religious prejudice played its part, and that "missionary activity" also operated. It would have been well had some instance of this "missionary activity" been given. Its absence is our reason for saying more upon the subject. The maintenance of religion had always been one of the functions of the native rulers of India—as it was with all governments until recent times. When the Honorable East India Company acquired territory in India, its charter gave it the power to raise taxes as one of the functions of a governing body. From these taxes the Company regularly gave grants to the native religions, thus following a time-honored custom, and maintaining a position of neutrality. All went well until the zeal of Protestant missionaries induced them to protest against the practice, and to remind the Company that "Idolatry is not only a curse to mankind, but that any approval or countenance lent to it, directly or indirectly, is represented in the Word of God as an offence against heaven."

The missionaries further charged the government with encouraging "the vilest characteristics of Hindoo idolatry," and with directly subsidising "a large idolatrous establishment, which tends to perpetuate intellectual and moral debasement." A little later, a missionary Conference held at Bombay drew up a memorial to the home government demanding that all annual grants be withdrawn from non-Christian places of worship, and added, "Even if treaties bind us to support heathen temples, the obligation forbidding such treaties is far superior as imposed by God himself; which obligations cannot be set aside without drawing down the displeasure of the Almighty." What with agitations both in India and in England, the missionaries achieved their purpose, thus leaving the native religious leaders, together with a large number of the laity, with the sense of a grievance, which, from the native point of view, was real enough. These particulars, with others of a similar character, are duly set forth in Parliamentary Papers issued between 1852 and 1858; and Sir A. C. Lyall, in an article published in the *Fortnightly Review*, during 1872, plainly states that this agitation had a powerful influence in precipitating the mutiny.

The Bishop of Manchester evidently thinks very little of English people as a whole. Speaking at the Yarmouth Church Congress, he said that other countries—America, France, Canada—could depend upon the prevailing secular conditions for developing those "Altruistic" virtues necessary to well-being. In England, the only thing we had to depend on was religious organisations. Therefore, was his lordship's triumphant conclusion, "English statesmen were less able than the statesmen of other countries to dispense with the help of religious communities in the work of education." Well, if this be so, we can only say that if the Englishman needs supernatural influence to reach the standard of social decency realised by other countries unaided, he must be a poor creature indeed. Of course, we do not agree with the Bishop, and we realise that a belittling of the power and dignity of human nature is of the very essence of essential Christianity.

Continuing, the Bishop declared that, "in spite of the vote of the Trade Union Congress, there was no sort of desire in the country generally for secular education." But, at least, the Congress voted in favor of it by an enormous majority, and the delegates were *bona fide* representatives of a larger body of people than any other gathering in the country. And if the Bishop feels so sure on this point, let him agitate for a *plebiscite* to be taken. He would soon find himself undeceived on that point. The real evil is, that we have no statesmen at the head of affairs who are bold enough to resolutely grapple with the difficulty and settle it once and for ever. The speaker also denied that teachers, as a body, objected to give religious instruction. Well, they are hardly likely to inform clergymen that they do, seeing that such an avowal usually means loss of promotion and other inconveniences. The truth is, that teachers, as a body, do not want religion in the schools; and no one could emphasise this better than Dr. Macnamara, if only he had the courage to tell the truth. Even the Bishop himself shows he has grave doubts about the accuracy of his own utterance, for he goes on to say, that if teachers are appointed without reference to their religion, "it followed that a school might be staffed by teachers who did not desire to give religious instruction." But if teachers desire religious instruction in schools, how on earth is this to happen? The very expression of the fear proves that the Bishop realises that if teachers felt they ran no risk in the matter, they would, "as a body," put religion on one side and attend to their legitimate business of secular instruction.

Mr. F. Peake, the stupid secretary of a stupid organisation—the Lord's Day Observance Society—has addressed a

letter to the directors of English railways *apropos* of the present trouble between the companies and their employees. He asks them to consider that Sunday on the railways does no good to either the companies or the public. Sunday excursions, he says, promote drunkenness, encourage neglect of public worship, and are destructive to Godliness and to righteousness. Now, we are quite willing to admit that Sunday excursions tend to the neglect of attendance at Church, and also to diminish what Mr. Peake calls "Godliness." But this is strictly his concern, and that of the narrow-minded busybodies who constitute the society of which he is secretary. But we do not admit that they tend to either drunkenness or unrighteousness. People simply cannot, on the whole, get so brutishly drunk on excursions as they could hanging about the streets of town or city on a Sunday. And, as a matter of fact, they do not. And if Mr. Peake can bring himself to the severe mental task of realising that a diminution of drunkenness and an increase in Sunday entertainment and recreation have developed side by side, he will also realise how far are the facts from supporting his contention. What is true of drunkenness is equally true of righteousness. Taking one thing with another, it is true that the person who misbehaves during an excursion would misbehave if he or she stayed at home. And certainly a few hours at the seaside or in the country will do far more to encourage the growth of cleanly minds than spending the day in an aimless manner in a town, where sheer mental vacuity provides the condition for the development of all manner of evil characteristics. Mr. Peake may mean well; but when history is written in a proper scientific manner it will be realised that he and his kind are responsible for not a little of the more unpleasant side of English life.

Just fancy! "There is no Atheism in England. Why should there be? The English are a nation of idolators. Covetousness is their god, and covetousness, so we read, is idolatry." So the inerrant *Daily Mail* assures us by the mouth of one whom Mr. F. W. Saunderson calls "my friend Eugène, a cultivated Frenchman of to-day." This will be news to our benighted readers; but, as it comes from the *Daily Mail*, it must be true—after a fashion.

The Bishop of London congratulated the Canadians upon being "a really religious and God-fearing people," and upon their immunity from the terrible curse of "Secularists preaching that there is no God and that the Bible is a pack of lies." Among those who listened to his lordship there were doubtless not a few who remembered that only a few months before a prominent Canadian Secularist had prosecuted the notorious Dr. Torrey, and obtained from the revivalist a humble apology and all his costs. There are Secularists in Canada, and they are given to preaching too.

The Bishop of Norwich says he "has never met an Atheist yet." Neither bishops nor ordinary clergymen ever go where Atheists are to be found. There are whole streets in London in which no parsons of any kind have been seen within the last four years. If they were to visit such streets, they would meet Atheists by the score. None are so blind as those who do not wish to see. Mr. Campbell frankly admitted the other evening, at Bradford, that in practically "every part of the civilised world an overwhelming majority of the population was alienated from Christianity."

The Archbishop of Canterbury surpassed even himself in his Church Congress sermon at Yarmouth. In his irresistibly persuasive peroration, he exclaimed: "There is nothing secular except sin." What will Secularists do now? They always knew that they were great and miserable sinners, doomed to the hottest hell hereafter; but now they are coolly informed that all their interests in life are covered by this one word, *sin*. Secularism is nothing but the philosophy of sin. Sin is the soil out of which it grows, sin is the atmosphere that surrounds it, sin is the food on which it is nourished, and sin is the only fruit it bears. Think of it! Ponder it! It *must* be true, for it comes from the mouth of the first subject of our Realm, who is paid £15,000 a year to perpetuate the name of the poor and homeless carpenter.

Yet one more clerical pronouncement in favor of Secular Education. At the Baptist Conference, the Rev. D. J. Hiley said he "was coming more and more to the belief that the only adequate and fair solution (of the education question) was the secular one. They might have a hundred reasons for preferring unsectarian teaching, but it took the logic absolutely away from them." We were pleased to see that the statement was received with much cheering. The rev. gentleman also declared that if it was right to have religion in the schools, it must also be right to have a religious test.

Poor Dr. Clifford! If things go on at this rate he will be forced to take an honest view of the case, in spite of himself. And this will be terribly hard after persisting in the opposite course for so long.

The *Christian World* says "there is a deep conviction on the part of some of the strongest and most independent thinkers of our time that Christian morality—at least, as commonly understood—does not fit all the facts of human life." The confession that this is a belief of some of the "strongest and most independent thinkers" is worth recording—especially for the benefit of those who are fond of presenting this view as characteristic of mental and moral weaklings.

The Rev. A. W. Cooke, M.A., assures us that in its original form the phrase, "Blessed are ye poor," doubtless referred to a religious class or sect in Palestine which made a virtue of poverty, but that "inasmuch as this meaning would not be recognised by all, and especially by Gentile hearers, Jesus added the words *in spirit* in order to guard the beatitude against a merely material interpretation." There is absolutely nothing to show that Jesus did anything of the sort; but even if he did, what then? No kind of poverty is a blessing. All poverty—spirit-poverty much more than pocket-poverty—is a curse: it is destitution, privation, lack whether in mind or in body, and no amount of quibbling and sophistication can do away with this fundamental fact.

Here is a magnificent ideal to dangle before Sunday-school children: "This Book [of Joshua] is to be absorbed until it is a bit of one's self, and its study is to be continual, nightly and daily." From the life of Joshua the scholars are to learn that "the simple, full, glad doing of what God wishes done is the great law of all action." Just fancy! God wished the cruel extermination of the natives of Palestine, and Joshua was glad to be the instrument of it. God wished the slaughter or subjugation of the Matabeeles, and Cecil Rhodes was glad to do his will. God wished the great British Empire to crush and annihilate the two tiny Dutch Republics in South Africa, and the British Empire was glad to obey. What ineffably repulsive teaching! What shocking stuff on which to bring up children!

Mr. George Nicholls, M.P., spoke at the recent P. S. A. demonstration in Liverpool, and, though an M.P., he used "the ordinary Christian vocabulary with accents of intense conviction." Among the many precious gems that dropped from his lips was the following: "The Sermon on the Mount is not played out." This is a jewel of the first order, and we gladly label it "Genuine." No, O wise philosopher, the Sermon on the Mount is not played out, for the simple reason that it has never been played in.

Mr. Campbell says that Socialism is identical with Christianity; but the Bishop of London told the millionaires of New York that true Christianity would suppress the curse of Socialism. When two men of God so flagrantly contradict each other, are not outsiders justified in drawing the inference that Christianity is anything its professors like to make it?

For the last three months in the year, practically all the Sunday-schools of the English-speaking world are going to make merry over the absurdities, barbarities, immoralities, and atrocities piously related in those rare portions of God's Word known as the Book of Joshua and the Book of Judges. Fancy nourishing the opening minds of millions of young people on such abominable stuff! Surely such a flagrant act of injustice ought to be put a stop to as a distinct violation of the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act.

Dean Lefroy is supposed to be a broad-minded, tolerant cleric; but neither his breadth nor his tolerance embraces Secularism, which he calls all manner of hard names. Secularism is the greatest danger the nation is called upon to face at the present time. But this is the wrong way of stating the case. Secularism is a source of danger only to the Church and Dean Lefroy's profession.

The President of the Baptist Union stated, in his address from the chair, that "Jesus saw always a son of God in every cobbler, and a daughter of God in every maid-servant." Possibly; but will Mr. Henderson tell us on what authority he made such a statement? In which Gospel or Epistle is it recorded that Jesus ever had such a vision?

There has been a quarrel and litigation at Dundee over a child's religion. William Gray, the father, married a Catholic, and became a Catholic himself. Subsequently he

deserted his wife and children, and enlisted in the army as a single man. He also went back to Protestantism. That was about three years ago. Recently he got an officer of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (at whose instigation his wife had been prosecuted and imprisoned for cruelty to the children) to move the Court that the children should be sent to the Quarrier's Home to be brought up as Protestants. This was opposed by the Society of St. Vincent de Paul and a Catholic aunt of Mrs. Gray. The Sheriff said that he himself was a Protestant, but not a bigot, and gave the custody of the children to the Catholic aunt. Of course, the children themselves were not heard. Like other children, they are obliged to have the religion provided for them.

The Mold Urban Council resolved to put down Sunday trading, and issued instructions to that effect to the police. The next Sunday morning a police-sergeant caught sight of a most abominable sinner. It was an abandoned newsboy taking papers round to his customers. He was not crying them—a fact which probably saved his life—but delivering them to his customers at their doors. The wretch was duly brought before the magistrates, and ordered to pay a total of £1 9s., which we daresay represents the amount of his wages for several weeks. It looks hard, but something must be done to stop such terrible wickedness. No doubt the police will do better in future. Beginning with a boy, as usual, they will by-and-bye venture to arrest a man; and when they do that all England will tremble. We shudder to think of his fate.

Mr. R. A. Pickles, President of the National Union of Teachers, speaking recently at Blydon-on-Tyne, said that "the country was becoming thoroughly disgusted with the un-Christian cavilling of the sects. Unless the Anglican hedgehog would consent to sheath his bristles and the Free Church porcupine would agree to flatten his quills, religion would be driven entirely out of the schools." We agree with Mr. Pickles' forecast, and hope for its speedy realisation. But why does he call the cavilling of the sects un-Christian?

We take the following description of the soul from the *Catholic Transcript*. The editor takes stock in it: "The soul of a man is soft and gelatinous, small, practically shapeless, and situated beneath the first rib. Below the Adam's apple in a man, and in a woman at the base of her throat, is a spot of little or no resistance. It is from this place, when the hour of death has come, that the soul must be taken. It does not pass like a shadow. It is not a flight. The soul must be drawn out by an angel sent to perform this operation. And this seat of life is transferred, warm, palpitating, to a body, the counterpart of the one it has left. It is substantial, material, and could be as well caught by the camera as the human face." We should say that the first sentence of this might fitly describe the *Transcript* editor's brain; otherwise it is slightly indefinite.—*Truthseeker* (New York).

Mr. Plowden, the well-known London magistrate, is fond (some say too fond) of a joke. He is not always successful; for instance, when he told a complainant that twelve o'clock at night was a delightful time to listen to a neighbor's piano. But he hits the bull's-eye now and then. When a pauper was asked why he assaulted the labor master, he replied, "If I hadn't struck him he'd have struck me." Mr. Plowden said: "You thought it more blessed to give than to receive." This magisterial blasphemy excited loud laughter—and to redress the balance the prisoner got six weeks. Probably he didn't see the joke.

General Booth doesn't trust to carnal reporters. He carries his own penny-a-liner with him. This gentleman is an adept at the business. Commissioner Nicol sent a rousing report to the *War Cry* of General Booth's visit to Boston. Thousands of people assembled in the Coliseum, and we read that—"The place soon became the arena of great events—of spiritual combats, agonising scenes of repentance, renunciation of evil, and freedom from the shackles of sin." The General was "marvellously upheld," and "had the joy of witnessing one hundred surrenders for the week-end." This is nearly as good as the description of the snap-shot photographers at the railway-station making the framework of the structure "vibrate with the flash of bombs." The Salvation Army is a tectotal body, but does Commissioner Nicol write like that on water?

Walter Herbert Bick, a carpenter, who committed suicide in the Regent's Park Canal at Maida Vale, is reported to have been "a follower of Mrs. Besant." The letter he left behind was mysterious enough for an accomplished Theosophist.



### Mr. Foote's Engagements.

Sunday, October 13, Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, All Saints, Manchester: at 3, "The Growth of God"; at 6.30, "The Pope's Challenge to Freethought."

October 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 13, Aberdare; 27, Glasgow. November 3, Workman's Hall, Romford-road, E.; 10, Stanley Hall, North London; 17, Liverpool; December 1, Birmingham; 15, Workman's Hall, Romford-road, E.—Address: 241 High-road, Leyton.

J. T. LLOYD'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—October 13, Glasgow. November 10, Manchester; 17, Stanley Hall; 24, West Ham. December 22, Holloway.

THOMAS CAREY.—We have so often answered the question, What is the difference between Agnosticism and Atheism, that we must now refer all questioners to our pamphlet, *What Is Agnosticism?* We go into the matter fully there, and it is tiresome to be doing the same thing over and over again.

F. G. ANDREWS says: "I am still doing my little to increase the circulation of your splendid paper, with very fair results."

J. WILLIAMSON.—Glad to hear that the *Freethinker*, introduced to you by a friend some months ago, has opened your eyes, and put an end to your being a Church member and Sunday-school teacher. Thanks for cutting. Write again whenever the spirit moves you. There is no intrusion; we are always pleased to hear from the "saints."

J. JENKINS.—So you have read the *Freethinker* for eighteen years, and are keen on it still. This is the sort of compliment we value. Thanks for good wishes. Paper shall be sent as requested.

W. DAVEY.—Sorry we cannot assist you in showing that the Watch Story originated with Abner Kneeland in the United States. We fancy it is one of those growths likely to arise in Christian soil anywhere.

G. ROLEFFS.—Thanks.

W. P. BALL.—Always glad to receive your useful cuttings.

R. J. HENDERSON.—Yes, the Servian murderers and torturers are apparently all good Christians. Of course we didn't expect the *Express* to advertise the *Freethinker*. You say it is silly to make "Atheist" and "Socialist" convertible terms in view of Huxley, Spencer, Bradlaugh, Ingersoll, and Haeckel. Of course it is.

H. BLAER.—Shall be seen to. Glad to see your excellent letter in the local press on Secular Education.

JAMES NEATE.—We note that the "young bloods" of your Branch want the Victoria Park meetings carried on during October, and that this has been arranged for. We wish your "extension" meetings all success.

W. FOSTER.—The Potteries district may get its turn of Freethought propaganda presently. "Saints" in the district who could co-operate in any way should write to the N. S. S. general secretary, 2 Newcastle-street, London, E.C.

G. WALLACE.—Shall be very glad to have a look at the book. Many thanks. See paragraph this week.

R. IRVING.—J. M. Robertson's *Pagan Christs* is published by Watts and Co. Is the Anglo-Israelite lunacy worth troubling about?

F. NUTTALL.—Surely the S. A. advertisement of sale of children must be a joke. Kindly advise us again, if possible.

T. W. ALLISON.—Roosevelt's love of breeding is a bit off our beat.

J. W. WHITE.—Referred to in our article. Thanks.

A. E. GIBBS.—Thanks for copy of your letter, though we do not wish to reopen the matter in these columns.

Some correspondence unavoidably stands over till next week, owing to Mr. Foote's time-consuming visit to Glasgow.

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.

The *Freethinker* will be forwarded direct from the publishing office, post free, at the following rates, prepaid:—One year, 10s. 6d.; half year, 6s. 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 lectures to-day (Oct. 13) in the Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, Manchester. Both afternoon and evening subjects are new—"The Growth of God" and "The Pope's Challenge to Freethought." Large audiences are expected.

Mr. Foote had the largest afternoon audience, on Sunday, that ever met in the Glasgow Secular Hall. His lecture was followed with keen interest, and there was a good deal of questioning and discussion afterwards—the meeting lasting two hours and a quarter. Unfortunately the weather was wretched later in the day. Torrential rain flooded the streets, and Mr. Foote himself was nearly drenched in hurrying less than a couple of hundred yards from his hotel to the hall. To his surprise he found the place full, every bit of seating accommodation being made use of, and a good few standing at the back. Had it been decent weather there would have been a great crush and many must have been turned away. It was gratifying, in one sense, to see so many ladies who had braved the inclement weather. Once more the lecture was followed by questions and discussion, and the audience seemed thoroughly happy. Mr. Foote was informed that "saints" had come in to his meetings from distant places—from Paisley, Falkirk, Ayr, Lesmahagow, etc. It must have been melancholy work for some of them getting home again.

Mr. Lloyd was announced to follow Mr. Foote at Glasgow. He lectures in the Secular Hall there to-day (Oct. 13), and we hope the district "saints" will rally in strong force and give him the welcome he deserves.

Mr. Cohen's visit to Aberdare to-day (Oct. 13) is eagerly looked forward to by the local "saints," and they expect first-rate meetings. Mr. Cohen had a capital audience at the Workman's Hall, Strafford, on Sunday evening, his lecture being the first of the West Ham Branch's new winter course.

We are glad to be able to report an improvement in Miss Vanco's condition. She has gone away to the seaside to recuperate, and must not return to office work until she is herself again. She has the best wishes of a host of friends.

The Leicester Secular Society's "Chrysanthemum Bazaar" is to be opened at 3.30 p.m. on Saturday, October 12, by Sir Edward Wood (the mayor). We hope it will be a completely successful function, and that a goodly sum will be raised for the Society's work.

Mr. Foote has consented to open the season at South Shields with a lecturing visit on Sunday, October 20, in the Royal Assembly Hall. With the view of meeting the public demand for more light upon the question of the House of Lords and the Bishops, the local committee have specially invited him to lecture upon "The Bishops, the Lords, and the People"; and remembering the vast importance of the Education question, the afternoon has been set apart for "Church, Chapel, and Child, and the Necessity of Secular Education."

A Southend-on-Sea Branch of the N. S. S. has been formed, with Mr. W. Smith as president and Mr. J. K. Sykes as treasurer. A committee meeting will be held this evening (Oct. 13) at 8 o'clock at Mr. Sykes's news-shop, Prittlewell.

We said in our article last week that we believed the verses "Let Us All Be Unhappy on Sunday" were written by Brough. Mr. George Wallace writes us that the verses were really written by Lord Neaves, an old contributor to *Blackwood's Magazine*, and published by Blackwood & Sons in 1879 in a volume called *Songs and Verses, Social and Scientific*, by An Old Contributor to Maga. Mr. Wallace offers to lend us the book, and we have accepted his kind offer. What have the C.E.S. blackguards to say now? What has the C.E.S. secretary to say? What has the Rev. A. J. Waldron to say? What fools they must look!

Sir Edward Grey's fine tribute to Mr. Thomas Burt ended with the statement that "there was no one for whom, as a public man or a friend, he had greater regard, esteem, and affection." This is a high tribute from such a quarter, for Sir Edward Grey, while he may be right or wrong in this or that point of policy, is recognised by all parties as an embodiment of the best traditions of English public life; indeed, it is the recognition of his strength of character,

more than anything else, which gives him his commanding influence in the House of Commons. We may take it, then, that Mr. Burt's friends should be proud of his winning a secure place in such a man's "esteem and affection." How many years have rolled by since Thomas Burt gave Charles Bradlaugh shelter in his home one night against the north-country bigots! But he is the same Thomas Burt still—the friend of liberty, the friend of reason, the friend of man.

Under the heading of "The Descent of Man," and the sub-heading of "Are We Reverting to the Monkey Type?" the Manchester *Daily Dispatch* lately (Sept. 30) published an interview with Haeckel from its "own correspondent." The great biologist—for no one denies him that title—spoke of the ascent of man through countless ages, and then said, "Let us now take heed lest we fall." Being asked to explain, he said that man would not necessarily go on from perfection to perfection, but might easily drop into the descending scale. This would not happen if the work of progress could go on "unhindered by the Powers of Darkness." By this expression he meant the theologians. Having made that clear, he proceeded:—

"Do you know that no agency has ever existed which has done more to hinder the true progress of the race, and its ascent to heights of knowledge and true experience, than the Church? I make no distinction between Rome and Berlin, between Calvin and Luther and Loyola. They are all alike in their intense hatred of all science which would upset their 'Revelations' of the divine will, and turn men away from their allegiance to priests and their belief in a future state and the immortality of the soul."

The interviewer ventured to think that some theologians were seriously seeking the truth. Haeckel shook his head:—

"Science and revelation are opposed from beginning to end. Revealed religion, as it is called, has never done mankind any good. I even dispute its claim to have set up a noble ideal. Just look at the most religious nations! Look at your England, at Germany, at Holy Russia! Consider what these countries are spending on armaments, and spending, mind you, with the blessing of the Church. That is only one example. No, no, progress on a grand and unprecedented scale will only be possible when men have given up their belief in those old Jewish and Babylonian doctrines with which they are now so handicapped. They will lose nothing by doing so. They will gain much in freedom, and when free from this blight they will be able to form the noblest of ideals."

The interviewer asked what this ideal was. Haeckel replied:—

"The pursuit of knowledge. For knowledge does not mean power alone, but happiness. And we Monists have our religion also. We also dream of a church in the future, which will take the place of the present insane mixture of superstitions. The good of all will be the aim of each."

Haeckel spoke very solemnly. Then he rose and took his visitor into the museum.

When the moment of parting came, Haeckel shook his visitor by the hand at the door and said "laughingly":—

"This is no dismal philosophy. We Monists are the happiest of men, the most pronounced optimists. We are victorious all along the line, and we are looking forward with a bright hope to the fast-approaching day when superstition will hide for ever its hoary, ignoble head, and men will strive alone after peace and knowledge and universal brotherhood."

It is a sign of the times that such an interview should be made a special feature of the day's issue of a widely circulated newspaper. And in England too!

Bishop Wilkinson (Bishop of Central and Northern Europe—a tremendous diocese!) told the Church Congress some unpalatable truths about France. Our readers will be glad to see the following extract from his speech: "The religious life of France is a very sad story indeed, and reads us a more terrible lesson than that of any other country in Europe. We have there the spectacle of a nation openly, ostentatiously, and of set purpose ignoring God. The French Government of to-day neither by act or deed makes mention of God, of Providence, or a Divine law; it enforces a strictly secular education in all primary schools, and removes all religious symbols from all public buildings. The very fact of attending the services of the Church, or giving religious education, sets a mark upon public servants, and creates a bar to their advancement. It is the formal, determined purpose of the French Government to organise a State without any reference to God. The religious orders have been expelled, confessional schools have been abolished, and neither army nor navy chaplains exist. There is a great 'Labor party,' strongly organised in guilds that number a million members, and they are fierce anti-Christian. While these changes have been going on every four years there has been a General Election, and the people have invariably ratified what the Legislature has enacted."

## Science and Religion Once More.—II.

(Concluded from p. 635.)

DR. COLVIN is very severe on those who "assert that we cannot see God and therefore have no right to believe that a God exists, for it is gross superstition and mental slavery to believe in anything you cannot see and feel and hear." But who are the people who make such an assertion? Dr. Colvin is merely demolishing a contention of his own devising. No scientist or Atheist contends that nothing must be accepted unless it can be seen, felt, or heard. The position of science is something very different. What is maintained is that nothing should be postulated as true unless evidence that will stand examination can be brought forward in its favor. Science is willing to stand or fall by that principle. Is religion willing to do the same? Do we not know that the glory and boast of faith is to believe in despite of evidence? Who was it said "I believe the impossible"? Of course, people may believe what they like. It is when they begin to justify their beliefs to others that the trouble begins. Dr. Colvin's elaborate contention that science accepts many things on faith is entirely beside the mark, and is, moreover, misleading. Science accepts nothing on faith, using the word "faith" in the sense understood by the Christian. All the conclusions and theories of science—even the most daring or startling—are based on facts. This is where science differs from religion, whose theories are based on initial assumptions that themselves require verification. Dr. Colvin asks can we see the law of gravitation, or feel it, or hear it? Yet, he adds, every scientist believes in its existence. This sort of thing savors of childishness, and one can hardly conceive of its being received without a smile by any audience possessing even a smattering of scientific knowledge. It recalls the ancient Theistic objection to the Atheist who believed in the existence of Australia without having been there.

Were one disposed to be jocular on this subject, it might be suggested that if Dr. Colvin does what Satan wanted Christ to do, throw himself from a pinnacle of the nearest temple, he will experience the law of gravitation in operation. But seriously speaking, the law of gravitation is accepted by science because its truth is capable of demonstration, and because it is in harmony with the other facts of nature as we know them, and explains some of them. No scientific theory is accepted on faith, in the sense that a Roman Catholic dogma is accepted on faith; and it is entirely misleading to refer to the faith that a scientist has in the discoveries of science as though it were akin to the faith of a religionist. Every follower of science is prepared to submit every article of his scientific creed to the scrutiny of the human reason. Is the Catholic Church ready to submit her doctrines to the verdict of the same tribunal? Of course not. It should seem then that the "faith" of a scientist is something very different from the "faith" of a Christian.

Moreover, there is one important circumstance connected with the teachings of science that Roman Catholic critics overlook when they are dealing with the particular point just referred to. The doctrines of science and the pronouncements of individual scientists can always be taken for what they are worth. There is no penalty attached to non-acceptance. You are at liberty to maintain that the moon is made of green cheese if you choose. Science will not damn you for all eternity because you do not adopt what it considers the true view of the matter. So if there be any measure of truth in the charge of dogmatism that is made against science, the dogmatism of science is at least preferable to Christian dogmatism. Science does not consign to perdition all who decline to accept its findings. All that science asks is that any new theory propounded shall be in harmony with established facts. Let the theory be proved or disproved, it makes no appreciable impression on the position of science. Science has

never made the mistake of professing to be infallible, and is therefore always open to receive any new truth.

Dr. Colvin is in error in supposing that the Atheist asks to "see" God. What the Atheist requires is a demonstration of the existence of God, such as satisfies us regarding the law of gravitation or the existence of ether, which, Dr. Colvin remarks, cannot be seen but are yet believed in. It is unnecessary to dispute the statement that "every scientist must accept on faith the greater part of his knowledge, which he is unable to test for himself, for he is only a specialist in his own particular line of study." The important matter is this: that the conclusions taken for granted by the present-day scientist are such as are agreed with by the whole scientific world, and have been tested and verified by *someone*. The doctrines of Roman Catholicism are accepted by millions on the authority of individuals who have no more assured knowledge of the truth and objective reality of the said doctrines than the ignorant multitudes who believe; and in addition they are not unanimously accepted by the religious world. The accepted truths of science have been tested by somebody, and are always susceptible of verification; the accepted truths of Catholicism have been tested by no one, and in their very nature are incapable of being verified. Huxley is cited as admitting that the scientist makes an act of faith at the very beginning of his work, for he must place implicit belief in the power of his own fallible senses. The reference is not given, and one cannot be certain that the exact meaning of Huxley has been conveyed; but in this connection Dr. Colvin surely ignores two vital considerations. First, the scientist, though doubtless compelled to work with what brains he has, makes no affectation of infallibility. Second, no one is called upon to believe that the scientist is infallible. And, as a matter of fact, no scientist places implicit trust in his own "fallible senses." His investigations and deductions are given freely to the entire scientific world, which may pick holes in them or overturn them at pleasure.

To Dr. Colvin's mind the non-finality of the pronouncements of science constitutes a grave drawback. To those whose concern first and last is truth, the non-dogmatic character of science establishes its superiority to Catholicism, which has erected an arbitrary standard of truth and morality to which it would have all bow down. Science is receptive of every new theory and idea, and is willing to discard whatever becomes discredited in the light of fuller knowledge. Dr. Colvin thinks this disqualifies science for being a reliable guide to humanity. To those who realise that there can be no finality to knowledge, and that, so far as humanity is concerned, truth and morality can never assume an absolute aspect, but must ever remain relative, the flexibility and adaptability of science furnish its strongest recommendations.

It should be noted here that Dr. Colvin falls into the common blunder of fancying that the Atheist asserts there is no God. Time and again has this misapprehension been corrected; but it seems a delusion ineradicable from the mind of the Theistic apologist. Will Christians never understand that scientists and representative Atheists leave dogmatism regarding the existence of God severely to the believers therein? Science of the Atheistic type does not say there is no God, but it calmly proceeds to construct a working hypothesis of the universe, supremely indifferent alike to the existence or the non-existence of Deity. It has been aptly said that no scientific experimenter takes God into the laboratory. Nor does any scientific examiner of the problem of the universe regard God as a factor in his calculations. The true scientist does not deny the possibility of a God; he simply ignores the latter as (like the Gilbertian flowers that bloom in the spring) having nothing to do with the case under his examination.

During the last few years far too much has been made of Haeckel by the disputants on both sides of

the religion *versus* science dispute. After all, while recognising the valuable contribution of the Jena *savant* to scientific data, thought, and speculation, the case for Atheism was skilfully argued and firmly based long before Haeckel was heard of, and is not affected one whit by any doubt that may be cast upon the accuracy of his theories and inferences. Of this a man like Dr. Colvin should be perfectly well aware. Yet he wrestles with Haeckel as though the overthrow of that doughty protagonist of Monism could appreciably affect the Atheistic position. The real strength of the case against the Christian Deity rests on grounds of reason. The case for God rests on grounds of faith, and it were well if defenders of Theism refrained from the foolish and futile task of calling science as a witness in his favor. Individual scientists may believe in a more or less nebulous Deity, but science knows nothing of God.

Dr. Colvin assumes that the theory of spontaneous generation has been "exploded." But that is not so. Who exploded it? It has been frequently pointed out that, although spontaneous generation has not been shown to occur in modern times, it still remains a plausible hypothetical explanation of the transition from inorganic to organic life. Any student of science should be aware of the stupendous difficulties standing in the way of an exact reproduction of the conditions under which spontaneous generation must have occurred in the remote past, if it ever occurred at all. Failure to reproduce such conditions does not necessarily mean the explosion of the spontaneous generation theory. The phrase "spontaneous generation" may indeed be objected to, but there is no warrant for supposing that life was specially created. It is impossible for any educated man today to reject evolution; and evolution, being granted, what authority is there for excluding anything—even the so-called vital force itself—from the evolutionary process? Everything points to the continuity of nature, and the study of evolution leads us irresistibly to the assumption that (to quote Newman Smyth) the organic substance at some time has been raised and quickened from the deadness of the inorganic world.

At the same time, science is not irrevocably wedded to spontaneous generation, or to any other theory of the origin of life. Science, however, imbued with a sense of the unity of nature, perceives no warrant (*pace* Lord Kelvin, of whom more presently) for postulating the interposition of a special creative act to account for the existence of life. Life appeared in the evolutionary process just as the diamond has appeared, just as gold has appeared. What need for a special creative act in the one case any more than in the others? And who shall trace for us the exact dividing line between the inorganic and the organic? Who can place his finger at any particular point and declare, "Here is a decisive break in the orderly line of evolution, and here the direct intervention of God is called for"? Dr. Colvin alludes, in passing, to the impossibility of animal life arising from vegetable life, and to the enormous gap between animal and intellectual life; but, as he pleads lack of time to discuss these matters, one is left in ignorance of his reasons for speaking of "impossibility" and "enormous gap." Enormous gaps have been heard of before. We used to hear of the "gaps" in the evolution of species, but science has so industriously and patiently filled up the interstices of the evolutionary scheme that those who are well read in the subject now say little about gaps in that connection. In this they give evidence of having learned discretion. Fancy the position of the religionist who feels his belief in God revived and strengthened by the absence of a minor link in the chain of physiological evolution! But the Theist has found a last refuge in the "enormous gap between animal and intellectual life." What is that gap? Dr. Colvin does not say. Let me ask what has been asked before. Is there any intellectual gap so great between the highest animal and the lowest man as there is between the latter and the highest man?

It is true that science has not explained the origin of matter. Science is in no way called upon to do so. It has been very pertinently asked how the supporters of the creation theory know there ever was a beginning at all? The taunt that science does not account for the beginning of things may be quite serenely retorted on the expounders of the Christian cosmogony. Religion does not account for the beginning of things either, except by referring us to God, which is no explanation whatever. It should seem that a profession of *knowledge* where no knowledge exists is scarcely entitled to our reverential regard. One would suppose that frank confession of ignorance would be more admirable. But the Christian does not think so. To science, a beginning is absolutely inconceivable. Religion has no more knowledge regarding a beginning of things than science has, but it feebly attempts to render the inconceivable conceivable by mumbling the word "God." God, now as ever, is an expression of man's ignorance.

It might have been thought that after the emphatic repudiation by leading scientists of Lord Kelvin's unfortunate remark relating to the necessity for a creative power, anyone in touch with scientific thought would have realised the utter futility of again bringing it forward as evidence in support of a creator. The declaration made by Lord Kelvin in the spring of 1903 that science is compelled to accept a creative power, was so conclusively dealt with at the time that only a brief reference to it is necessary here. Lord Kelvin is a physicist, and—like other physicists—sees no need to postulate deity in connection with the branch of science in which he is an expert. But he sees the need for a creative power in the domain of biology, where he is not an authority. Biologists (*e.g.*, Ray Lankester and Thiselton-Dyer) find it unnecessary to fall back upon God, and justly resented Lord Kelvin's assumption of authority to speak in the name of science in general and of their branches of study in particular. Unless Lord Kelvin (or any other scientist) can show where scientific investigation affords evidence of a God, his belief in God is merely a personal matter, and is of no value whatever to anyone else of thinking capacity. The same remark applies to the list of distinguished men, mentioned by Dr. Colvin, who believed in some sort of a God. To those, of course, who are content to believe so long as someone more intelligent than themselves can see his way to believe, the testimony of a Kelvin or a Newman will always carry weight. But religious belief at second hand is a poor sort of thing at best.

GEO. SCOTT.

#### SAME OVER THERE.

For a sample of misconducted business we recommend the post office of this country. Recently we have been sending circulars of books we want to sell to our friends. Included in the envelope are two blotters to assist our correspondents in writing letters containing orders. The clerk, being dubious about the weight, thought to make sure by submitting a sample to the post office. The weight was all right, but the post office clerk sprung a new rule on him. Blotters, printed or unprinted, are merchandise, and subject to merchandise rates. One ounce for a cent. Printed matter two ounces for a cent. Either would go for a cent, separated. The foolishness of such a rule is that, separated, the post office would have to do just twice the work for the same pay. The constant aim of the officials seems to be to restrict the use of the post office by the people by complicated rules unauthorised by law, and invented by a tin god in the department at Washington. Our Socialist friends sometimes use the post office as an illustration of how fine the government does things. Those who have much dealing with it know that it is the best possible illustration of business incompetency in the world. If the Standard Oil Company had been managed as idiotically, it would have been bankrupt years ago.—*Truthseeker* (New York).

What have we done for Adam? What has Adam done for us? Everything. He gave us life, he gave us death; he gave us heaven, he gave us hell.—*Mark Twain*.

#### Advice Gratis.

WHETHER we give aught else or no,  
Advice quite freely we bestow,  
Advice too superficial far,  
Ignoring what men really are,  
Or obvious as A B C,  
And pitch'd in one unvarying key,  
To varying humanity.

We bid the loafless try plum-cake,  
The half-starved sempstress eat good steak.  
The drowning man cramped in each limb,  
We strongly recommend to swim.  
The starving poor we cry should save,  
As beardless youths we know must shave.  
Few of us are there but have chidden  
The nervous trembler worse; and bidden  
Dullards be bright and fools be wise;  
So simple seems it in our eyes  
The blind should see, the dumb should talk,  
The moral cripple rise and walk.

As launching arrows at the sun  
May make men stare at what is done,  
But food for human needs bring none,  
So overwrought advice falls short,  
And proves mere mockery and sport.  
So teach we scorn for lofty aims,  
For noble work, and moral claims,  
By urging men to vain endeavor,  
Ridiculously crying ever,  
Be this; be that; be great; be clever;  
Be wise in thought and word and deed;  
Always be good; always succeed:  
Be faultless, and at once acquire  
All virtues that all men admire,  
Conflicting virtues though they be,  
Impossible, as wise men see.  
For good advice, like simple faith,  
Sees mountains moved at a mere breath.  
In life's long race, the last and worst  
Are told to all be best and first.  
The moral Ethiop, black as ink,  
Not yet, alas, a missing link,  
Is urged by kind belief to grow  
Into an angel white as snow;  
And many a solemn prosy dunce  
Bids human leopards change at once  
The beautiful or damning spots  
That destiny, as gifts or blots,  
To coat or character allots.

Most readily this good advice  
Is given to us, Fate's living dico,  
By those who, falling luckily,  
Have wealth but small capacity.  
Sagely they tell us to acquire  
The paltry virtues they admire:  
Like them be faultless; then shall we,  
Doubt not, like them successful be.

Seldom indeed we find advice  
That precious boon beyond all price,  
The guidance of the helpful sage,  
Whose one dry word transcends a page.  
More oft 'tis insult in disguise,  
Or folly from the falsely wise,—  
A means of sowing words in vain  
Or pompous mode of giving pain,  
Or cheaply showing all the earth  
Their wisdom and superior worth.

Would you believe now, reader mine,  
This cynic talk in measured line  
Is written but to break the ice  
That I in turn may give advice?  
Yes, after showing you what fools  
Men are who give advice by rules  
I now propose to give you mine;  
Compressed indeed to half a line,  
And more, I plead, though piping cheap,  
Result of cogitation deep,  
Advice that I believe will keep,  
And serve at times, in sportive reason,  
Much ponderous advice to season,  
Quizzing long-eared well-meant effusions  
Full of the usual child's illusions,  
Leading to one-logg'd conclusions.

This then I say to all  
Who on me for advice may call:  
"Choose well your parents." Yes, good friend,  
The ancestry whence you descend

Needs soundest choice ; because your birth  
Decides all else for you on earth ;  
Your frame inherited ; your mind  
Transmitted clear or dull or blind ;  
Your gifts acquired by gifts innate ;  
Your lot in life, your aims, your fate ;  
Your passions held like dogs in leashes ;  
Your rank, your race, your very species ;  
Your will, without whose active aid  
No kind of progress can be made.  
Our varied powers of love and hate  
Capacities or small or great,  
From parents must originate,  
Nor can elsewhere. Then here, indeed,  
The wisest choice of all we need ;  
Here, where Fate bemocks our thought  
And laughs our foolish dreams to naught—  
Yet not to naught if we but turn  
Our thoughts to Hope's fair face and learn  
To think in time of the young race  
That shall in future take our place.  
Here may we choose somewhat, *for others*,  
And be good fathers, and good mothers,  
Our children's angels ; such as they  
Would choose if wisdom held the sway :  
But if our parentage they'd shun,  
Then better far we should have none.

And now, since on this gadding earth  
Of brave advice there is no dearth,  
Value it all at its true worth.  
Just make of each thing, blest or curst,  
The best you can and not the worst.  
And if you give advice, why then,  
So far as you can influence men,  
Make them both feel and understand ;  
Give motive, not a hard command.  
Show what there is of reason'd hope  
Where heart and brain and will find scope.

Don't give advice that's too high-flown,  
Or useless platitudes outgrown.  
Show the best course the case admits ;  
Give where you can, help that befits.  
Thus do good humbly, day by day ;  
But for your children, first I say,  
Choose well their parents, both of them,  
And first yourself a special gem.

—Progress.

W. P. BALL.

## Correspondence.

### "RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION."

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

Sir,—Referring to your recent criticism of my book, I would direct your attention to the preface to the first edition as indicating the difficult conditions under which I was placed as to verifying references, etc. The work may have serious limitations, but I would remind you that the *Freethinker* gave me two most eulogistic notices when it originally appeared.

I should be glad if you would not misrepresent my attitude to militant Freethought. I attended the Freethinkers' Congress at Rome as a British delegate in 1904 ; and I have, at some pecuniary loss, allowed my book to be published at sixpence. There is no idea more distasteful to me than the suggestion that Freethought should be confined to the rich and suppressed among the poor. I recognise the great services of the pioneers, and I am fully mindful of the necessity of still maintaining a vigorous policy.

E. S. P. HAYNES.

[We insert Mr. Haynes's letter, having no wish to do him an injustice. We do not recollect the eulogistic notices of his book in our columns ; they were certainly not editorial.—EDITOR.]

The September number of the *Positivist Review* opens with Mr. Frederic Harrison's eloquent article on "The Jubilee of Auguste Comte." On one point he speaks with the requisite firmness :—

"We in no way pretend that the life of Auguste Comte is a perfect type, or that his character and qualifications are a model of goodness for our imitation and adoration. No one can now with good faith impute to us anything of the kind.

It would be wholly alien to the spirit of Positivism, a contradiction of what Comte himself taught, a retrograde imitation of the extravagant mysticism of supernatural systems of religion. We have repudiated the term "Comtists" from the first. Comte in no sort of way is to us what Christ is to Christians, or even Mahomet to Mahometans, or Buddha to Buddhists. We neither ascribe to him any ideal perfection, or any preternatural sanctity, or any exceptional inspiration. All such ideas are abhorrent to us and to all that we have learned from him. We recognise no kind of duty to accept him as a model for imitation, nor to take his words on any subject as conclusive and sufficient. Let us leave to theological schools all attempts to deify a teacher, even to idealise his memory, or in anyway whatever to remove him from the strict sphere of the collective progress of man in intellect and character."

Mr. Harrison explains, with regard to Comte's sociology, he himself is "not prepared to adopt more than the ground plan and fundamental doctrines." He winds up something on the lines of our own tribute to Comte recently. Positivists by profession are few, but Positivism itself is widespread :—

"Positivism, in so far as it means the conscious surrender of all supernatural hopes and the frank acceptance of truth, demonstration, science, and good sense as the ultimate guides of life, Positivism, in this sense, is the sure and growing belief of all that is strongest and best in the people of our age."

We agree with Mr. Harrison, but in this general sense, Positivism is very much the same thing as Secularism.

Mr. S. H. Swinny, the editor of the *Positivist Review*, contributes an article on "Tolstoy and Shakespeare." It is able and interesting, but it treats Tolstoy rather too seriously, at least, in our opinion. Mr. Swinny's first quotation from Tolstoy puts the great Russian writer out of court as a critic of the greater English writer.

## Converting Huxley.

THE profound and accurate *Daily Mail* (Oct. 1) had a pious leading article in which it argued that Science and Religion were now getting on nicely together. There had been a great change, it said, since the days of Huxley. Finally, it ventured to say that Huxley himself had virtually abandoned his extreme views "before his death"—as if he could have done so *after*! Huxley could not reply to the *Daily Mail*. We wish he could. His answer would have been good reading. But his son, Mr. Leonard Huxley, took the organ of imperial piety down in the following letter :—

### "HUXLEY'S ATTITUDE TO RELIGION."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'DAILY MAIL.'

Sir,—In your leading article of October 1, I notice with amazement that, speaking of the problems of science and religion, you say : 'Huxley himself before his death virtually abandoned the extreme views which he had taken up in sincere good faith, and owned that his conception of a world without God was an illogical one.'

Really, you take my breath away. I am aware of no such statement of his—not even 'virtually' made : 'virtually'—admirable word for such unverified assertions—a word of which Professor Huxley himself said, "'Virtually' is apt to cover more intellectual sins than 'charity' does moral defects.'

As a matter of fact, my father remained consistently in the attitude which he defined as agnosticism. While no man ever felt more deeply the might and majesty of the ultimate forces that dominate the universe, he would neither affirm nor deny transcendental whereof convincing evidence was not forthcoming, and from early days onwards he rejected, as incapable of proof, both extremes, the ultimate assumptions of philosophic materialism and of philosophic spiritualism alike.

When the *Daily Mail* solemnly enunciates a misconception of this kind barely a dozen years after a man's death, and while his writings are open for all the world to read, one ceases to be astonished at the mushroom growth of legend elsewhere.

LEONARD HUXLEY.

The Athenæum, Pall Mall, S.W."

The *Daily Mail* ought to print its article and that letter together as a leaflet. It would be very effective.

## 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, W. J. Ramsey, "Salvation by Faith." Selections by the Band before Lecture.

### OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S.: Victoria Park (near the Fountain), 3.15, Mr. Allinson, a Lecture.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S.: Station-road, 11.30, Guy A. Aldred, a Lecture. Brockwell Park, 3.15, F. R. Theakstone, "The Cradle of Christianity."

### COUNTRY.

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Prince of Wales Assembly Rooms, Broad-street): 7, H. Lennard, "The Dusk of the Gods."

BRISTOL BRANCH N. S. S. (I. L. P. Hall, 21 King-square-avenue): 3, Business Meeting, to discuss projected visit of Mr. G. W. Foote.

GLASGOW: Secular Hall, Brunswick-street—John Lloyd, 12 (noon), "Theology Nonplussed"; 6.30, "Religion and the Joy of Life."

HUDDERSFIELD BRANCH N. S. S. (Room No. 9, Friendly and Trades Club): Tuesday, Oct. 15, at 8, Meeting.

MANCHESTER BRANCH N. S. S. (Secular Hall, Rusholme-road): G. W. Foote, 3, "The Growth of God"; 6.30, "The Pope's Challenge to Freethought." Tea at 5.

SOUTH SHIELDS (Captain Duncan's Navigation School, Market-place): 7.30, Final Arrangements for Lectures; important meeting.

WIGAN BRANCH N. S. S. (Drill Hall, Wigan): Friday, Oct. 11, Joseph McCabe, "Our Earliest Human Ancestors."

### OUTDOOR.

BRISTOL BRANCH N. S. S.: Horsefair, 7.30, B. G. Brown, "Christianity, Atheism, and Socialism: The Lesson of Kirkdale."

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

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

Orders should be sent to the author,

J. R. HOLMES, EAST HANNEY, WANTAGE.

## Thwaites' Liver Pills.

The Best Family Medicine in the World.

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

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

1s. 1½d. and 2s. 9d. per Box.

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

G. THWAITES, Herbalist,

2, Church Row, Stockton-on-Tees, and  
24, Linthorpe Road, Middlesbrough.

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

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 it participate in the control of its business and the trusteeship of its resources. It is expressly provided in the Articles of Association that no member, as such, shall derive any sort of profit from the Society, either by way of dividend, bonus, or interest, or in any way whatever.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**THE 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 Gospel 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 Huxley, 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 1d.

## 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 1½d.
- 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.