

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXVII.—No. 48

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 27, 1907

PRICE TWOPENCE

The ideal does not transform any object into something else, or neutralise its character, but, by removing what is irrelevant and supplying what was defective, makes it more itself than it was before.—HAZLITT.

Mr. Campbell's New Manifesto.—II.

WE left off last week by remarking on the absurdity of Mr. Campbell's suggestion that the apostolic Church of Jesus preached, not a heaven beyond the tomb, but a kind of Socialist millennium on earth. If he alludes to the primitive Christians having all things in common at first, as is recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, we must observe that this was not Socialism, but a voluntary form of Communism. Those who had property sold it and paid over the proceeds to the Apostles, who administered the common fund for the benefit of all the members. Nobody was obliged to sell out; those who did so acted from an enthusiastic impulse; and it was apparently a temporary expedient to provide for a special set of circumstances. It may have been, of course, an attempt at carrying out the teaching of Jesus, that the rich should sell all they had and give to the poor; a teaching, by the way, which Mr. Campbell has just condemned in a City Temple sermon as only calculated to make confusion worse confounded. But whatever was the real reason of that short-lived experiment in Communism, it certainly had no relation whatever to modern Socialism, which is not a theory of organised almsgiving, or of sharing between the rich and the poor, but a theory of the rightful ownership and application of all the material means of production and distribution.

Mr. Campbell's object, we take it, is to nobble the Socialist movement. He has only recently become a New Theologian, and still more recently a Socialist—for it is not long since the Socialists were denouncing him for his sneers at English working-men, and the police were guarding the City Temple against hostile demonstrations. But impetuosity is one of Mr. Campbell's many feminine characteristics. He is out, as the Americans say, for wholesale proselytism. He is a New Theologian and a Socialist; and therefore, every Socialist ought to be a New Theologian, and every New Theologian ought to be a Socialist. He went to the length, indeed, as we pointed out in last week's "Acid Drops," of declaring, in his previous volume, and in the section of the penultimate chapter headed "Christianity and Collectivism," that the New Theology is the theology of the Collectivist movement. In an earlier chapter, he said that "the New Theology is spiritual Socialism"; and again that "the New Theology is but the religious articulation of the social movement." There was something almost sublime in Mr. Campbell's audacity. He had become a Socialist, and that had changed the whole situation. Mr. Robert Blatchford and the *Clarion*, with their Anti-Christianity, might take a back seat; and the Freethinking pioneers of the Socialist movement in England—Hyndman, Queich, Belfort Bax, Bernard Shaw, and the rest of them—might now gracefully retire before they found their occupation gone. It was a case of "The

Campbells are Coming!" The predestined leader of English Socialism had come at last. And those who had borne the heat and burden of the day might think themselves lucky that the new Messiah did not imitate the old one by declaring that all who went before him were thieves and robbers.

Mr. Campbell does not argue. He has no taste, and we may add, no talent, for discussion. He pronounces like an oracle. He has the air of one inspired. Under a modest exterior he hides all the infallibility of a Pope. He knows more about God than anybody else; he understands the mind and character of Jesus better than anybody else; he knows just how the Bible is inspired better than anybody else; and, of course, he understands Socialism better than anybody else. He dogmatizes so good-naturedly, so smilingly. He means well—and it never occurs to him that he can be mistaken.

Such is Mr. Campbell on the personal side. On the politic side, he sees that there is only one political party that could possibly be nobbled. The old parties are wary and sedate; it is always the new party which is ingenuous and enthusiastic; and the new party to-day is the Socialists. Accordingly it is to them that Mr. Campbell exclaims, "Behold I come!" And already crowds of simple workmen flock to hear him, as though the Holy Ghost he received at his ordination covered his platform as well as his pulpit performances. It is quite touching. But there is always the danger that the crowd which shouts "Hosanna!" to-day may shout "Crucify him!" to-morrow. Mr. Campbell's career as a New Theology-Socialist may be brief. We are far from wishing to see him crucified—but we hope the proletariat will see through his little game. Whatever good there is in Socialism (and there is some good in every popular movement, though we are not called upon to consider how much there is in the present instance) will be spoiled and corrupted by being associated with Christianity or any other form of religion. Not without reason did Swinburne, in one of the most pointed and powerful poems of his splendid *Songs Before Sunrise*, thirty-six years ago, call upon the people to avoid that fatal blunder. In the lines "Before a Crucifix" he asked—

"What manhood in that God can be
Who sees their worship and is dumb?
No soul that lived, loved, wrought, and died,
Is this their carrion crucified?"

And in view of all the evil things and evil deeds, black with ruin and red with blood, which had robbed and cursed man under the shadow of the cross, the poet besought the people to give their hypocritical enemies no second chance:—

"Thou, in the day that breaks thy prison,
People, though these men take thy name,
And hail and hymn thee rearisen,
Who made songs erewhile of thy shame,
Give thou not ear; for these are they
Whose good day was thine evil day."

Never should the people set their hands unto the cross:—

"Let not thy tree of freedom be
Regrafted from that rotting tree."

Socialism or no Socialism, let the people beware. Let them remember Clifford's warning. Christianity wrecked one civilisation, and nearly wrecked another; we must take care that it does not wreck the promise of the higher civilisation of the future.

Mr. Campbell caresses the popular ear in the following fashion:—

"Our whole industrial life to-day is based upon a principle which is fundamentally anti-Christian, and the Church of Jesus ought to wage open war upon it until it is gone for ever. Co-operation must replace competition; brotherhood must replace individualism; the weakest (morally and physically) must be the objects of the tenderest care which the community can show; selfishness must be driven out by love. This is the whole Christian program."

Nothing but this represents the mind of Jesus, and nothing but this ought ever to have been preached in his name. So says Mr. Campbell, but he confesses that the fact is very different from his theory; the Church has got so far away from "the whole Christian program" that "the masses of the people have ceased to understand that she ever held it." Well, in that case, the masses of the people are right; for the Church never yet held anything of the kind.

It is easy to say that our whole industrial life of to-day is based upon a fundamentally anti-Christian principle. One part of our industrial life—for Mr. Campbell is not a peasant—is the profession of preaching. Is that fundamentally anti-Christian too? The Quakers say it is, but we judge that Mr. Campbell does not agree with them. Evidently, therefore, his assertion is too sweeping, and he should try to be more precise. Moreover, he should try to explain why the Church of Jesus is only just beginning to find out, through members like himself, that what it has countenanced so long is not the Christian program at all. He might also try to explain why the modern world should trouble itself about the teaching of a personage whose ideas can be so easily and extensively misunderstood.

But let us come a little closer. Mr. Campbell tells us that "co-operation must replace competition." We will not stop to quarrel with his grammar, but we will ask him if the world really picked up that idea from Jesus of Nazareth. It is nearly fifty years since John Ruskin began to teach that Co-operation was the law of life and Competition the law of death. How far he was right or wrong is not the point; the point is that he taught this. But did he teach it as a Jesusite? Nothing of the sort. He taught it as a student of history and political economy. And did he get any particular help from the Churches? Did the Mr. Campbells of the day flock round him when he risked so much for his principles? It is enough to ask these questions. Every well-informed person can supply the answers.

"Brotherhood must replace individualism." Economically this is nonsense. From any other point of view it is sheer confusion. Mr. Campbell is talking clap-trap. Mr. Bernard Shaw once said that he had no brothers, he was his father's only son. It was a witty rebuke to the fluent sentimentalists. Individualism is not necessarily antagonistic to moral brotherhood, and Socialism will not necessarily produce it. There are quarrels, jealousies, and hatreds among Socialists as well as among other people. Those who expect social rearrangements to do the whole business of moral development for us are mistaken. Not that this is any argument against social rearrangements; it is only an argument against expecting too much from them—and especially in wrong directions.

And now let us note the free-and-easy way in which Mr. Campbell lays it down that the physically and morally weakest must be the objects of the community's tenderest care. Put in that extreme way, it is simply a gospel of the survival of the unfit. The survival of the fit is not exactly ideal, but the survival of the unfit is still worse. We see its fruits in our workhouses, lunatic asylums, and huge foolish charities, which potter over the worst effects of social evils and leave their causes operating with steady efficiency. A certain tenderness to the weak, and therefore miserable, is dictated by common humanity; but it will ruin the race to make them the greatest care of the whole community. Mr.

Bernard Shaw was right, though not as novel as he thought, in declaring that progress is mainly an affair of breeding. To breed from the best is not as simple a problem as it looks; but to breed from the worst is easy enough, and we are doing it wholesale. Nothing is more terrible than the recent scientific literature on this subject. Yet in comes our New Theology preacher, spruce and smiling like the gentleman who told Harry Hotspur that parmaceti was the best thing for an inward bruise, and informs us that all this is an integral part of the Christian program. Such is the result of introducing sentimentalism—and Christianity is never anything else—into sociology. The world will have to learn that social progress is a difficult matter; that is easy to move without progressing—as Micawber's horse was all action and no go; that whatever progress is made is only brought about by hard thinking; that appeals to the great heart of the people are all very well in their way, but will effect very little without stimulating appeals to its stupid head; and that Christian sentimentalism only obscures the real issues and intensifies the emotional chaos which is the affliction of every rational reformer.

G. W. FOOTE.

Christian Morality.

WHETHER the statement that conduct is three-fourths of life contains a quantitative or a merely "literary" truth, it is certain that most questions resolve themselves, directly or indirectly, into ethical questions. From one point of view it may be argued that the question of truth is supreme; but the importance of truth lies in our becoming conscious of those facts of existence to which the human organism must adapt itself, so that even here the ethical element is present. It is true that this ethical element is not always obvious, as it is also that some men pursue truth with no other object than its discovery, and that bitter quarrels have been waged over subjects that were of no ethical consequence whatever. But in the long run the question, "Can it affect conduct? And if so, how?" is certain to arise, and the general attitude will be determined by the answer.

It can hardly be said that dissatisfaction with Christianity on purely moral grounds is a new thing, but it is becoming more and more insistent. Among large masses of people the feeling that Christian morality proper is at best poor and insufficient, and at worst mischievous, grows; and from one point of view this feeling is more inimical to Christian supremacy than is the conviction of its falsity. For it happens, however much we may regret the circumstances, that many will much more easily put up with a false thing than they will tolerate a useless or a dangerous one. One need only bear in mind the number of people who, while tacitly surrendering the truth of Christianity, support it because, they say, it is still very useful in the world, to realise the truth of this. And from a more general outlook it is evident that moral dissatisfaction has been the immediate cause of no small proportion of the secessions from Christianity during the past two or three generations. That we no longer hear so much from Christian pulpits of vicarious sacrifice, God's anger, the crime of unbelief, or the pains of hell, is largely due, of course, to sustained criticism and the spread of education. But it is also due in some measure to the fact that large numbers of people have morally outgrown such teachings, and that were they to hear them they would be filled with contemptuous pity or sheer disgust.

In this connection an article in the current *Hibbert Journal* by Professor Seth on "Christian Morality," should prove of interest to both Christians and Freethinkers. Unlike those preachers who evade the intellectual attack on Christianity by vamping about the "moral homage" paid to Christ and Chris-

tian morality, he accepts the position that it is the moral aspect that is to-day made the object of serious attack. And this, not because it is too lofty, but because it is not lofty enough; because it ignores whole tracts of life which ought not to be ignored, and condemns the normal instincts of healthy mankind.

Professor Seth divides the moral charges against Christian teaching into three. First, it is a negative or ascetic ideal, and places the "world" and the "flesh" in constant antagonism. Second, it degrades and enslaves the human spirit, paralysing instead of stimulating its highest powers. Thirdly, there is its anti-social tendencies, and the impossibility of constructing any social order in accordance with its principles. Professor Seth's article is an attempted disproof of these charges, on the lines of partly a plea of mistaken identity and partly one of extenuating circumstances. He also protests against the notion that Christianity was quite a new departure, morally, from the ancient Pagan world. On the contrary, he holds that Christianity is "the fulfilment rather than the negation of Pagan morality"; and that once "develop the implications of Pagan morality, and you have the Christian morality." Whether this view be correct or not we will see later.

In dealing with the first charge, Professor Seth draws a familiar but quite unjustifiable distinction. We must, he says, "distinguish between the asceticism which is an essential element of Christian morality and the asceticism of the mystic or of the monk," as though they were two quite distinct things in their essence. But the asceticism of the monk is one of the most striking features of Christian history for hundreds of years, and during precisely those centuries when Christianity enjoyed the greatest power. And the monk is a phenomenon that needs explanation. That form of asceticism, as Professor Seth admits, was not common in the Pagan world. Pagan thought in its best expression faced life in a healthy naturalistic spirit, ignoring none of its normal aspects, and seeking to blend them into a healthy social whole. Excess, where it existed in the Pagan world, took the reverse of asceticism; and of the two forms of excess it might be fairly maintained that the latter is the most dangerous. But asceticism was not only connected with the earliest forms of Christianity known to history, but it has been persistent right through the Christian period. Such a general phenomenon must be attributed to more than a mere accident.

While it is not true that the asceticism of the work began with Christianity, it is true that it came into the life of the Western world, in a marked form, through Christianity. Its ideal figure was a celibate; its greatest teacher, St. Paul, was also unmarried. He counselled mortification of the flesh, and his teaching was re-echoed by the greatest among the early Christian writers. The denial of normal "worldly" pleasures became one of the stock features of early Christianity; and this teaching persists to-day. Christian communities never have known, and do not now know, how to take life in a frankly healthy spirit—with the result that we are always oscillating between unhealthy outbursts of indulgence in purely sensual pleasures, and equally unhealthy outbursts of prurient puritanism. And it must be borne in mind, too, that Christian ascetics were always under the impression that they were interpreting the true spirit of Christian teaching. This phenomenon, I repeat, needs explanation; and it is certainly not enough to say that the asceticism of Jesus was merely the equivalent of "the unselfish life." Such an explanation is far more likely to be the result of modern thought translating Christianity anew in the light of another conception of life and its duties, than aught else.

The great weakness of Professor Seth's apologetic is that it quite ignores the supernatural element in the teaching of Jesus; and a plea that does this is bound to ring untrue. For the supernatural is the very essence of the situation. Remove that, and there is no necessity for the existence of Jesus.

If we follow the New Testament fairly, it is impossible not to see that the concern of Jesus was primarily with the salvation of men's souls, not with either their minds or their bodies. His agents of help were prayer and fasting; he entered into personal conflict with devils, and witnessed to the efficacy of angelic help; he cured disease by supernatural means and promised rewards and punishments in the world to come. The supernatural is over him and all his works, and it is the height of folly—to use no harsher term—to present him as an amiable moral teacher bent upon making popular a new conception of social service.

Professor Seth argues that "the Christian ideal prescribes no ascetic rule of life; it sees spiritual possibilities in all the natural interests of human life." Yet, in a preceding sentence we are told that the teaching of Jesus "has nothing to do with civilisation, with culture, with work or industry as such." And his excuse for this is "that the teaching of Christ is limited to what he regards as the essential and all-important element in the life of man.....his attention is so pre-occupied with the problem of righteousness.....that he does ignore the other problems of human life, the problems of civilisation, of industrial activity, and of culture." And yet it is this teaching which sees "spiritual possibilities in all the natural interests of life"! Really, in admitting this Professor Seth admits all an opponent could desire. With other implications of such an admission I will deal later. At present I may note that it is precisely the ignoring of civilisation, of culture, of industry, in the supposed interests of righteousness, that create the ascetic and which defeats its own object. For righteousness is not something to be cultivated by itself—in *vacuo*, so to speak. This has been the common mistake of Christian puritanism; it has been the cause of its dismal failure, and Professor Seth bears witness that it has authority in Jesus Christ.

The mistake made by Christian teachers of all ages, from Jesus down to our own day, is precisely that of assuming that morality can exist or can develop independent of appropriate conditions. They fail to realise that the highest flower of human conduct has its roots in the purely material conditions of life, and in the purely animal instincts of the human organism. Divorced from these, human conduct becomes as valueless as a flowering plant from which one has cut the roots. Professor Seth's apology is really equivalent to the statement that Jesus, in his concern for righteousness, completely ignored those conditions upon which it depends for its normal and orderly development. He calls this "the inevitable limitations of the specialist"; and, while I do not admit that it is a correct description of the attitude of Jesus, yet it is enough to dispose of him as a trustworthy moral guide. C. COHEN.

(To be concluded.)

The Capture of Jericho.

THIS alleged incident is dramatically described in the sixth chapter of the Book of Joshua. When we carefully examine it we find that in this description two different and somewhat conflicting stories have been bunglingly interwoven—so bunglingly, indeed, that they can be easily distinguished. The one account tells us that Israel marched round Jericho on seven successive days, the first six in silence, but on the seventh with great shouting, at the word of Joshua, when the walls fell. This account is to be found in verses 3, 7a, 10, 11 (partly), 14, 15a, and it came to pass.....manner, 15b, 20, and the people shouted. According to the second version only a portion of the armed men marched round the town seven times on the same day, taking with them the ark, and on the seventh round the people shouted, at the signal of the trumpets, and the walls fell. This version is contained in verses 4 (partly), 5, 7b, 8, 9, parts of 13 and

15, 16a, 20b. By looking closely at verses 16 and 20 we discover that according to the latter the people shouted both before and after the trumpets, while according to the former they were commanded not to shout till the trumpets gave the signal. It was Wellhausen who first called attention to this distinction.

As soon as the walls fell flat "the people went up into the city, every man straight before him, and they took the city." And this was the sequel:—

"And they utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both man and woman, both young and old, and ox, and sheep, and ass, with the edge of the sword" (Joshua vi. 21).

If such an event ever occurred, and many such have occurred, we are bound to characterise it as a striking example of the exceedingly primitive and savage state of society at the time contemplated. From the purely historical point of view, there is nothing more to be said about it. Unfortunately, however, the occurrence cannot be treated as an ordinary event in history. The taking of Jericho is so indissolubly bound up with religious dogmas as to be rendered entirely unintelligible and exceptionally absurd. Last Sunday, the Sunday-schools of the English-speaking world considered it in its religious aspects, and tried to learn many valuable lessons from it, for the guidance of daily life in the twentieth century.

A start off was made with the declaration that "the whole affair was God's campaign. Every step was taken at his suggestion and direction. Otherwise the enterprise would never have existed." In reality it was God who "utterly destroyed all that was in the city, both man and woman, both young and old." It was he alone who was responsible for the brutal massacre. Left to himself, Joshua would have been incapable of such colossal cruelty. That is what the children were told last Sunday. But why did Jehovah perform or order such a ghastly deed? Here theology steps in with its sophistical explanation. "The real underlying purpose of the capture of Jericho and invasion of the land," the scholars were assured, "can be understood only by recalling God's purpose in the nation itself." Then they were informed that the "plainly expressed purpose of God in this peculiar people was to bring great blessing to all the nations of the earth." And the massacre of all the inhabitants of Jericho was the first instalment of this "great blessing." God's "great blessing" to the Canaanites meant their extermination "with the edge of the sword," or their becoming hewers of wood and drawers of water to their captors. Such was the work of a Deity whom we are expected to look upon as infinite love personified, and such was the way in which he is said to have secured this "great blessing" to all the nations of the earth. "These Hebrews were the chosen agents in a movement of world-wide blessing. Canaan was the spot chosen to be their home." Very glibly the teachers talked in that irrational, wicked manner, and very greatly the young people wondered how such monstrous events could ever have happened. To them, or to most of them, as they listened it was inexplicable that so great blessing could have entered the world by means of so much indiscriminate and horrible slaughter.

In fairness to the teachers, however, it must be added that they did make a more elaborate attempt to justify the Jericho holocaust. One of them may be quoted to the following effect:—

"This great purpose of God is the explanation of the death meted out to the Jericho inhabitants. What in itself might have been heartless cruelty by a victorious people over a fallen foe, was in truth the execution of the death sentence, merited by these people from the Judge of all the earth. It was on the same principle as the putting to death of notorious criminals. That is never done as vengeance upon the criminals, but wholly for the protection of the living. These Canaan nations held their title to this land in trust from the Creator. So all realty titles are held. There is no absolute ownership. They had lost their title by their ignoring

of Him, their defiance of his just laws, and their outrageous impurity, which became a taint upon the earth, and a serious menace to the other nations."

That is an ingenious apology; but it has one fatal defect—it ignores the most important of the facts. It will be remembered that from Shittim, Joshua sent out two spies to view the land and Jericho. When the two men reached Jericho they found their way into the house of a harlot, "and lay there." By-and-bye the king was told of their arrival and their purpose, and sent word to Rahab to deliver them into his hands. But instead of giving them up the woman hid them, and afterwards let them down through the window, thus enabling them to escape in safety. On their return to Shittim, the Israelites broke up their camp and crossed the Jordan. Then occurred the savage attack on Jericho, which was followed by the killing of all living things.

"But Rahab, the harlot, and her father's household, and all that she had, did Joshua save alive; and she dwelt in the midst of Israel unto this day; because she hid the messengers which Joshua sent to spy out Jericho" (vi. 25).

Is it not probable, almost certain, in view of these facts, that vengeance was a strong inciting element in the Jericho horrors? Joshua remembered how the king had purposed to slay the spies, and how the harlot had wrought their deliverance, and remembering these things he slew the king and his subjects, but spared Rahab and all her relations. In the same revengeful spirit Joshua charged his followers with an oath, saying, "Cursed be the man before the Lord, that riseth up and buildeth this city Jericho: with the loss of his first born shall he lay the foundation thereof, and with the loss of his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it" (vi. 26). Was not this vengeance in all its glory? Surely, to spare Rahab, whose profession was under the Mosaic curse, was to keep alive one of the worst characters in the whole city, while many of those who perished at the point of the sword may have been comparatively virtuous people.

On the assumption that the aborigines of Palestine were a menace to the people of God, why were they not all exterminated? Why were so many of them permitted to survive? Why was not God impartial in executing judgment? Why did he show himself such a glaring respecter of persons? Furthermore, there is no historical foundation for the assertion that the Canaanites were so terribly degraded and debased, as it is customary to portray them. The ethical superiority of the Hebrews is not a fact historically established. To say that, because of them, "Canaan was to become, and did become, the sounding-board of God's truth out to the uttermost parts of the earth, and into the innermost needs of the human heart," is to deal a fatal blow to the justice and goodness of the Deity. As a matter of fact, we are much more deeply indebted to the Greeks and the Romans than to the Hebrews. In any case, we have no evidence that the Jews were morally superior to the natives whom they are reported to have treated, for the most part, with such shocking cruelty.

Is it not much more reasonable to regard the conquest of Canaan as an instance of the inborn selfishness of the strong when hungering and thirsting for the land of the weak? Supposing the story of the so-called sojourn in Egypt for so many centuries to be true, the Hebrews, when they entered Palestine, were a semi-civilised race, whose skill in warfare may have been considerably developed, and naturally the less progressive tribes of Canaan could not stand against them. It was a case of the strong crushing the weak; and there was no God of truth and love in the affair at all, nor has there been in such business from that day to this.

The Sunday-school scholars were reminded, towards the close of the lesson, that "the Church is the direct descendant of the Hebrew nation as God's messenger to all peoples." As the Hebrews exterminated the Canaanites, so the Church, in blessing the world, must destroy all forms of heathenism.

As the Canaanites "persisted in possession in defiance of the Lord of the land," as they were a menace to the reign of truth and righteousness in the world, and had to be ruthlessly cut off, so to-day heathenism is a serious menace to the very existence of the Church, and must be done away with at all cost. "There has been, and still is, a great moral battle on between the subtle forces of the non-Christian world and the Church of Christ. Through the centuries the Church has sometimes suffered very seriously in that battle. It must win, or it will be swamped by those terrific, subtle forces." It must win. So it has been claimed from the very beginning; but the victory seems farther off to-day than ever. The truth here again, doubtless, is that heathenism is not nearly so black as it is painted by its enemies, and that the Church has not been the medium of untold benefit to the world.

J. T. LLOYD.

The Sons of God.

"The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair."—Genesis vi. 8.

ACCORDING to the first book of the Bible, the earth fell into a very wicked condition in the days of the patriarchs. God made everything good, but the Devil turned everything bad; and in the end the Lord put the whole concern into liquidation. It was a case of universal bankruptcy. All that was saved out of the catastrophe was a consignment of eight human beings and an unknown number of elephants, crocodiles, horses, pigs, dogs, cats, and fleas.

Among other enormities of the antediluvian world was the fondness shown by the sons of God for the daughters of men. That fondness has continued ever since. The deluge itself could not wash out the amatory feelings with which the pious males regard those fair creatures who were once supposed to be the Devil's chief agents on earth. Even to this day, it is a fact that courtship goes on with remarkable briskness in religious circles. Churches and chapels are places of harmless assignation, and how many matches are made in Sunday-schools, where Alfred and Angelina meet to teach the scripture and flirt. As for the clergy, who are peculiarly the sons of God, they are notorious for their partiality to the sex. They purr about the ladies like black tom-cats. Some of them are adepts in the art of rolling one eye heavenwards and letting the other languish on the fair faces of the daughters of men. It is also noticeable that the Protestant clericals marry early and often, and generally beget a numerous progeny; while the Catholic priest who, being strictly celibate, *never* adds to the population, "mashes" the ladies through the confessional, worming out all their secrets, and making them as pliable as wax in his holy hands. Too often the professional son of God is a chartered libertine, whose amors are carried on under a veil of sanctity. What else, indeed, could be expected when a lot of lusty young fellows, in the prime of life, forswear marriage, take vows of chastity, and undertake to stem the current of their natures by such feeble dams as prayers and hymns?

Who the original "sons of God" were is a moot point. God only knows, and he has not told us. But Jewish and Christian divines have advanced many theories. According to some, the sons of God were the offspring of Seth, who was born in holy succession to righteous Abel, while the daughters of men were the offspring of wicked Cain. Among the oriental Christians it is said that the children of Seth tried to regain Paradise by living in great austerity on Mount Hermon, but they soon tired of their laborious days and cheerless nights, and cast sheep's-eyes on the daughters of Cain, whose beauty was equal to their father's wickedness. Marriages followed, and the Devil triumphed again.

According to the Cabbalists, two angels, Aza and Azael, complained to God at the creation of man. God answered, "You, O angels, if you were in the

lower world, you too would sin." They descended on earth, and directly they saw the ladies they forgot heaven. They married and exchanged the hallelujahs of the celestial chorus for the tender tones of loving women and the sweet prattle of little children. Having sinned, or, to use the vile language of religion, "polluted themselves with women," they became clothed with flesh. On trying to regain Paradise they failed, and were cast back on the mountains, where they continued to beget giants and devils.

"There were giants in the earth in those days," says Scripture. Of course there were. Every barbarous people has similar legends of primitive ages. The translators of our Revised Version are ashamed of these mythical personages as being too suggestive of Jack and the Beanstalk, so they have substituted Anakim for giants. In other words, they have shirked the duty of translators, and left the nonsense veiled under the original word.

The Mohammedans say that not only giants, but also Jins, were born of the sons of God, who married the daughters of men. The Jins soon had the world in their power. They ruled everywhere, and built colossal works, including the pyramids.

Of the giants, the most remarkable was Og. He was taller than the last Yankee story, for at the Deluge he stopped the windows of heaven with his hands, or the water would have risen over his head. The Talmud says that he saved himself by swimming close to the Ark in company with the rhinoceros. The water there happened to be cold, while all the rest was boiling hot; and thus Og was saved while all the other giants perished. According to another story, Og climbed on the roof of the Ark, and when Noah tried to dislodge him, he swore that he would become the patriarch's slave. Noah at once clinched the bargain, and food was passed through a hole for the giant every day.

When we look into them we find the myths of the Bible wonderfully like the myths of other systems. The Giants are similar to the Titans, and the union of divine males with human females is similar to the amors of Jupiter, Apollo, Neptune, and Mars with the women of old. In this matter there is nothing new under the sun. Every fresh myth is only the recasting of an ancient fable, born of ignorance and imagination.

Let it finally be noted that this old Genesiac story of the angelic husbands of earthly women gives us a poor idea of the felicity of heaven. In that unknown region, as Jesus Christ informed his disciples, there is neither marrying nor giving in marriage—that is, no males, no females, no courting, no loving, no children, and no homes. Men cease to be men, and women cease to be women. Everybody is of the neuter gender. Or else all the angels are gentlemen, without a lady amongst them. Perhaps the latter view is preferable, as it harmonises with the Bible, in which the angels are always *he's*. In that case heaven would be, to say the least, rather a dull place. No whispering in the moonlight, no clasped hands under the throbbing stars. Not even a kiss under the misletoe. Oh, what must it be to be there! No wonder the sons of God wandered from their cheerless Paradise, visited this lower world, and saw the daughters of men that they were fair.

G. W. FOOTE.

LEAVE IT TO THE LORD.

A gentleman residing in a small Western town, recently had the misfortune to lose his wife. In deference to the last wishes of the deceased, the remains were cremated. Bridget Flannigan, a former servant in the family, heard of her old master's trouble and called to console him.

"Oh, wirra, wirra!" she cried, rocking herself to and fro. "On' yer poor lady is dead! Sure an' it's miserable we all are, for a more blissed sowl niver lived than Mrs. Barton."

"You are very kind to say so, Bridget."

"An' yo had 'em burn her up?"

"Yes, Bridget; she was cremated."

"Och, the saints presarve us! Why didn't yo let the Lord 'tend to that?"

Acid Drops.

The *Aberdare and Mountain Ash Weekly Post* deserves credit for inserting letters on both the Christian and the "Infidel" side. But why does it give prominence, by leading out the type, to a long letter by a Christian who has not even the courage to give his name? Our contemporary does right in disclaiming responsibility for the opinions expressed by its correspondents, but it is entirely wrong in supposing it has no responsibility for printing their personal libels on other people. This anonymous correspondent, who so modestly calls himself "Nulli Secundus," having been told that the editor of the *Freethinker* was not imprisoned for "indecent" but for "blasphemy," replies that "Foote was imprisoned for the indecent blasphemy of dirty pictures in a dirty paper." Such is this anonymous Christian's real or pretended opinion. Well, it was not the opinion of those who drew up Mr. Foote's indictment, for there was not a word in it from beginning to end about any such thing as "indecent." It simply charged him with "bringing the Holy Scriptures and the Christian Religion into disbelief and contempt"—a thing, by the way, which is done daily by blackguardly libellers on the Christian side.

Fortunately, too, this anonymous person's opinion was not shared by the judge who presided at Mr. Foote's trial in the Court of Queen's Bench—as it was then. That judge was not anonymous—and he was a gentleman. His name was Lord Coleridge, and he sat on the bench as Lord Chief Justice of England. He handsomely assisted Mr. Foote in asking the jury to dismiss from their minds the odious insinuation, made by irresponsible bigots, that the editor of the *Freethinker* was an "indecent" journalist. Lord Coleridge said:—

"Mr. Foote is anxious to have it impressed on your minds that he is not a licentious writer, and that this word does not fairly apply to his publications. You will have the documents before you, and you must judge for yourselves. I should say that he is right. He may be blasphemous, but he certainly is not licentious, in the ordinary sense of the word; and you do not find him pandering to the bad passions of mankind."

We simply answer this "Nulli Secundus" (whoever he is; probably a Christian Evidence scribe in London) with the careful and deliberate judgment of Lord Coleridge. We say "careful and deliberate" most advisedly; for Lord Coleridge thought his judgment in the case so important that he issued it as a shilling pamphlet through a well-known firm of legal publishers, and we believe it is still in print.

We shall send a marked copy of this week's *Freethinker* to our Welsh contemporary, and leave it to do an act of justice or not, as it chooses. It has published a libel on Mr. Foote, for which, of course, it is legally responsible; but things of that sort are sometimes allowed to appear inadvertently in newspapers, especially in the correspondence column. We shall see whether the *Aberdare and Mountain Ash Weekly Post* is really animated by a spirit of justice.

Addressing the Blackpool meeting of the Congregational Union, "with a view to the "Deepening of the Spiritual Life," the Rev. J. H. Jowett was good enough to assert, in the most dogmatic fashion, that Christians are the only people who live. All others are dead. Communion with God and life are synonymous terms. A Christian may be "a nothing and a nobody, a thing that is not, a mere nonentity," but in reality he is the mightiest personage in the world, because he knows and has fellowship with God: "that, and nothing else, is life." All this was very welcome news to an assembly of Christians. It increased their sense of self-importance; it nourished what Mr. Campbell calls their hideous Pharisaism, or their voracious vanity.

Mr. Jowett is not a thinker, but simply a skilful phraseologist. He plays with words beautifully and fascinatingly, but his thoughts are generally shallow and often quite false. Speaking of the "spiritual world," he says: "Into that world we are born by a supernatural birth." The supernatural itself is a creation of the theologian, while the idea of a supernatural birth is infinitely absurd. Mr. Jowett talks glibly about the "spiritual world," and about "a supernatural birth" into it; but what does he know about either? He is simply talking nonsense. It is as clear as noonday that Christians possess absolutely no supernatural qualities or powers. They are just ordinary folks—except in Church, where they get drunk on the strong drink called emotionalism.

That saintly man, the Rev. A. J. Waldron, has just been figuring as a writ-server. It seems to have happened in this way—judging from the *Daily Mail* report. Waldron made the acquaintance of an American lady "apparently in a good position," in August of last year, and she went to stay at his house, perhaps as a "paying guest," perhaps otherwise. While there she met Waldron's brother, who was in the employ of a firm of provision dealers at Bristol. She told him that she was anxious to start a meat-canning factory in England, and offered him a salary of £500 a year, with commission that would pan out at another £500 a year. It was a glorious offer, and there must have been great joy at St. Matthew's vicarage, Brixton. Waldron's brother gave up his job at Bristol, in order to embrace this golden opportunity. But if he was ready the lady wasn't; she never started the meat-canning business, and Waldron's brother was left lamenting. He brought an action against the American lady and his damages have been assessed at £2,000. Whether he will ever get it is quite another matter, for the lady's property (if she has any) seems to be all on the other side of the Atlantic. While that problem is waiting for solution, we may explain where Waldron comes in. There was difficulty in finding the lady when she was wanted, but Waldron eventually found her at the Great Central Hotel and served the writ on her in the grill-room. It must have been a touching sight. The professional soul-saver walking up to the lady with a tract, which turned out to be something very personal; and the lady looking astonished when she found that his solicitude was not about her immortal soul, but about her cash-box. What the other people in the grill-room thought of Waldron's performance may be left to imagination.

According to the *Christian World*, the following resolution was recently passed at Pearl, South Africa, by an obviously religious meeting of wine-growers: "That this meeting, which considers the wine industry a lawful and respectable trade, and wine as a gift of God, and drunk by Christ himself, unites itself with all its power and strength to secure its existence against all the wicked designs made use of by Satan." Christian Evidence lecturers please copy.

The Rev. Frank Ballard asks, "Could the great Father intend that two-thirds of the whole of England and Wales should be owned by 2,000 persons, and two-thirds of all Scotland by 320 persons?" We do not know what the "great Father" intended, and therefore cannot answer the question. But it strikes us as a curious one, all the same. Whether the "great Father" intended the ownership of land to be as it is or not, does not alter the problem in the least. If he did intend it, the necessity is none the less for its alteration. And if he did not, and has not been able to carry out his intention, then it is clearly useless looking to him for help. And is it not supremely ridiculous for a believer in Deity to teach that God wants one thing, but man insists upon another, and so he has to give way? Yet Mr. Ballard, says the *Methodist Times*, displayed in this lecture quite a wealth of "exact knowledge and acute reasoning." The above is a sample!

A religious contemporary is depressed at finding that, "whilst scientists generally are passing out of the pure Materialism of a generation ago, Medical Science appears more than ever inclined to find a physical basis for moral qualities." Now we do not believe that scientists generally are less materialistic than they were. The terminology has necessarily altered somewhat; but the conviction that the universe, including man, is to be explained as the necessary outcome of determinable forces—which is the essence of Materialism—is stronger than ever. Religious people are only too ready to take notice of some scientific men who foist their personal religion on their science, and ignore the large number of scientific workers who do not parade their personal opinions, but get on with their legitimate business.

The fact that medical science is becoming more pronouncedly materialistic is instructive. For medical science is brought into closer relationship with the human or animal organism than any other branch of science. And workers in this department know that not only do they fail to find any evidence in support of the materialistic hypothesis, but also that it is an utterly useless one in practice. Every medical man treats, and is bound to treat, life and mind as functions of a given organism. And Christians would have little faith in a doctor who failed to deal with them on this principle. Christians are fond of telling Freethinkers how sorely they will need religion when they are worn out by disease or borne down by sorrow. The Freethinker might easily and aptly retort that the most ardent believer becomes a convinced materialist when disease takes hold on him. And the maxim, "Three doctors, two Atheists," is a very old one.

Dr. E. Griffin, an American missionary, has just published a book on the Japanese. Although he has worked as a missionary in Japan, he is not hopeful of Christianity triumphing in that country. On the contrary, he warns his co-religionists that those who expect to win the Japanese to traditional Christianity are doomed to disappointment. This is only what many others have said; but the truth needs to be told frequently if it is to have any effect.

The Rev. Wardlaw Thompson, foreign secretary to the London Missionary Society, says there is a great awakening taking place in China. The Chinese are rapidly adopting Western methods and ideas in commerce, education, and science. But he cautions people against taking this as meaning more than it does. He says:—

"It is not the expression of any general impulse on the part of the people, or on the part of their rulers, towards Western Christianity. The move is purely in material things, and the motive is purely self-protection."

We do not doubt it. The engrossing pursuit of "material" things and greater fighting efficiency is about all the Chinese have to learn from Christian nations. Mr. Thompson goes on to point out that the Chinese have intellectual capacity, the capacity for art, many qualities highly developed that are of great value in the life of the world, and a moral teaching superior to anything "outside the Bible." Educated Chinese would doubtless laugh at the last expression, as they would also at the statement that China's need is the Christian religion, which provides "all that which has been a means of grace and protection and purification among the nations of the West." Mr. Thompson, as secretary to a missionary society, could hardly say anything else; but the Chinese, remembering the presence of the Allies in Peking, will smile grimly at the "grace" and "purification" developed by Christian teaching.

London, says Dr. Horton, is a city that worships in a thousand churches, but which "truly reeks with impurity." Well, if true, it is a pretty compliment to pay Christianity. Perhaps this is one of the results of the grace and purification to which Mr. Thompson referred.

Sir Edward Cornwall, L.C.C., is of opinion that the proper development of the vacant site in the Strand is hindered by the existence of the church of St. Mary le Strand. This is not the only Church that stands in the way of development. St. Mary le Strand is only a concrete illustration of a general truth.

The Salvation Army has been at it again with its favorite game of bluff. A City gentleman, Mr. G. Kebbell, received a circular from the Army asking for subscriptions towards a "City Home." On this, Mr. Kebbell asked for a balance-sheet and particulars. In spite of repeated applications, no answer was returned. General Booth was quite willing to receive donations, but, as usual, was chary of answering questions as to how the money was spent. Mr. Kebbell then wrote to the *Times* stating the facts, on which "Colonel" Joliffe wrote asking when the application to the Army was made. On being told, the Colonel professed inability to trace the letters. Several letters passed, but as Mr. Kebbell did not get any replies to the questions asked he wisely sent the whole of the correspondence to the *Times*, thinking it might interest the charitable public. It probably will; but as we have heard from various correspondents of the manner in which this Colonel Joliffe evaded all questions asked by people who had read Mr. Cohen's pamphlet on the Army, we are not surprised at the treatment meted out to Mr. Kebbell.

Dr. J. Hamilton, President of the Methodist Metropolitan District Council, says that 90 per cent. of our criminals had been in Sunday-schools. And yet there are some people who doubt the value of religious education.

The Hon. and Rev. H. H. Courtenay is an exceptionally fortunate man, in that he knows he belongs to the true Church. Dissent is "based on the false supposition that it has a fuller insight into the Bible, and knows better what is the Holy Spirit than the Church to which that Holy Spirit is promised and given." To Dissent clearly the Holy Spirit is neither promised nor given. What a woeful condition to be in! Mr. Courtenay ought to thank his stars that he was born a Churchman, while the poor Dissenter should, like Job, curse the day of his birth. Such puerilities only show what awful shams all churches are.

The *Methodist Times* is wholeheartedly angry with Mr. Campbell because of his recent fierce attack on the Nonconformist Conscience. It calls his account of the general

teaching in regard to sin in Nonconformist Churches "a complete travesty." The *Methodist Times* does well to be angry, because without its doctrine of sin Christianity would have been dead many centuries ago; but it does ill to call Mr. Campbell's account of the doctrine "a complete travesty," because all unprejudiced people know that it is only too true. It was only from the purely ecclesiastical point of view that the highly sensational discourse could be described as "deplorable," and the preacher's case as "distressing." Undoubtedly, Mr. Campbell is effectually undermining Christianity, though he labors under the delusion that he is really establishing it.

It is quite refreshing to find a clergyman who openly confesses that his profession is a species of hypocrisy. Dr. W. J. Dawson, lately a prominent London pastor, but now of America, actually does so in a new volume, entitled *The Empire of Love*. He tells us that, as "the years went on, the sense of unreality in my teaching grew steadily more intense and intolerable." Continuing, he says: "I saw myself continually expending all the forces of my mind on theories which left me and my hearers alike unchanged in the essential characteristics of our lives. I felt myself, like St. Augustine, but a 'seller of rhetoric.' I was inculcating a method of life which I myself did not obey, or obeyed only in those respects that caused me neither sacrifice nor inconvenience." What a salutary confession, and how frank!

But the *Christian World* mildly censures Dr. Dawson for making it in so public a manner. The confession may be sincere enough, but it shows "a distorted and quite unduly depressed estimate" of one's work. Of course, it is a fearfully damaging, as well as humiliating, admission, but is it not undeniable that all ministers, if honest, would be irresistibly driven to make it?

The *Christian World* has discovered what it evidently thinks is a strong argument for Christianity. People say, it remarks, that religion plays the game of the capitalist, "It might be asked in reply what would the capitalist have been like, and what had been his treatment of the poor, if there were no religion, no Christian gospel?" Well, one cannot say things would not have been worse without Christianity, but it is just as likely—more likely, we think—that they would have been better. It is certain that those who have had in view the exploitation of the poor have never found Christianity greatly in the way, and, as a matter of fact, have frequently found it of great assistance to keep people "in order." The *Christian World* is quite able to see how other religions have aided the process of social demoralisation, and doubtless these others see quite as readily the injurious influence of the C. W.'s particular brand. The *Freethinker* is the only one that can agree with both of them in their judgment.

Another writer in the same journal asks whether it is not time that the Churches wakened up and asked themselves what they really were in the world for? Imagine Christianity, after all these centuries, just starting to ask what on earth it exists for! Really, if one could inoculate religious writers with a fitting sense of humor, a good 75 per cent. of them would throw up their occupation.

It is pleasant to notice that some religious writers can face facts—when it suits them. "The tendency of the 'Labor Movement' in this country, as well as on the continent," says the *British Congregationalist*, "is in the direction of a complete antagonism to religion and religious ideas." The B. C. is, of course, sorry for it, but we do not anticipate that its grief will have any very profound influence on the course of events.

The Congregational Union has passed another hypocritical resolution—or series of resolutions—on the Education question. Dr. John Massie, M.P., moved it, and stated that he himself was "a secular-basis man" (see *Daily News* report) but he wasn't going to support what he believed in; for if he did, and if they did, Mr. Balfour would sweep the country with the cry of "Godless schools"—and perhaps the Nonconformists would be worse off than ever. So the Congregationalists of Dr. Massie's principles are to do evil that good may come of it—which one of their own inspired writers, in the Bible, declares to be a damnable policy.

Let us look closely at this hypocritical resolution of the Congregationalists. First, they declare that no public elementary school should receive support from public money unless it is a school provided by the local Education authority. That cuts away all Church and Catholic schools at a

single sweep. Then the resolution proceeds to tackle the problem of the schools that remain—supported by money from the public purse. These schools must not have any dogmatic (that is, Church or Catholic) religious teaching; but they should have *some* religious teaching, and the resolution draws up a nice Nonconformist prescription. Here it is:—

"3. That the local education authority shall be at liberty to arrange that in all schools under their control the proceedings during the school hours of each day shall be opened and closed by the singing of a hymn, the reading without comment of a passage from the Bible, and the repetition of the Lord's prayer. Beyond this they shall only be at liberty to arrange for such use of the Bible as shall enforce and illustrate the lessons on moral and civic duties embodied in the school syllabus."

This is to be the only religious teaching allowed in the State Schools, if the Congregationalists have their way. "That just suits us," they say. And when Churchmen and Catholics say, "But it doesn't suit us, and we have to pay for it as well as you," the Congregationalist tells them to go to the everlasting Dust Destructor where their God burns up his failures.

Of course, the point of the joke is that these Congregationalists, being Nonconformists, profess to believe that the State should have nothing whatever to do with religion. That is the ground of their agitation for the Disestablishment of the Church of England. But when they see a chance of doing a good stroke of business for their own form of faith they throw their principles on the dustbin. For this reason we cordially detest them. They are sneaking thieves—while Anglicans and Catholics are straightforward burglars.

Having passed that hypocritical Clause III., the Congregationalists passed another to match it:—

"That all teachers in a public elementary school shall be appointed by the local education authority, and such appointment shall be made without any reference whatever to the religious faith of the teacher."

Now this is sheer humbug, and the Congregationalist leaders know it as well as we do. If the Bible is kept in the schools as a book of religion, it is perfectly absurd to say that teachers will be appointed "without any reference whatever to their religious faith." There will be no open test, of course, but there is bound to be a tacit one. Every sensible man knows what would be the prospects of a teacher who was not of the religion of the local education authority—especially if he happened to be a Freethinker.

Mr. Compton Rickett, M.P., Chairman of the Congregational Union, informed the Union at Blackpool that there are three Christs—the ethical Christ, the theological Christ, and the Christ of the Christian consciousness. But Mr. Rickett must be aware that his list is woefully incomplete. Why, there are at least twenty different Christs preached in Great Britain just now; and every one of them is a pure invention. Even Mr. Campbell has had three or four within as many years. With some people Christ changes as often as the moon.

Mr. Silvester Horne has composed a new Glory Song, which is now being boomed at Whitefield's Tabernacle. It is supposed to be a great improvement upon the one that was sung to death at the Torrey-Alexander meetings. The old Glory Song is now described as being the glorification of selfishness, while the new may be said to be the glorification of mawkishness. Fancy Jesus having to listen to such rubbishy, sickening stuff as the following:—

"Come let us sing, Praise to our King,
Jesus our King; Jesus our King;
This is our song who to Jesus belong,
Glory to Jesus, to Jesus our King."

Once more religion is being professionally revived in Wales, this time by Gipsy Smith. It is a special mission that is being conducted, and already Carnarvon has been turned upside down. Great crowds have passed through the inquiry room. It is the old, old story. Revivals come and go, but never stay. A clergyman admitted, only a few weeks ago, that in spite of all the exertions of ministers, evangelists, and revivalists, religion is dying in Wales.

Rev. Mark Guy Pearse (the late Hugh Price Hughes's old colleague) discoursed at the New Central Hall, Birmingham, the other night on "A Bit of Bread." A correspondent of ours says that a better title would have been "A Little Bit of String." We suppose the bread the reverend gentleman spoke upon was the "bread of life." He looks well on it.

The Christians have for some time been trying to drive Mr. Pack out of Finsbury Park. Their methods are those of the murderers of Hypatia, only they cannot carry them quite so far in the twentieth century as they did in the fifth. They brought up the Bishop of London one Sunday in the summer, but his lordship, who is reported to be conquering America, could not manage the conquest of Finsbury Park. Mr. Pack had bigger audiences than ever. Since then the Christian cry has been "Howl him down." Pious hooligans have been playing that game to their hearts' delight, and they appear to have a thoroughly congenial leader in a Christian Evidence lecturer named Baker. We are glad to see a letter on this subject by "Fairplay" in a recent number of the *Islington Gazette*. Mr. Pack met with a street accident, we understand, and was knocked about by one of those street-pests called motor-cars. We are told that he very narrowly escaped with his life. When he lectured in Finsbury Park next he had his "head bandaged" and "looked very ill," as "Fairplay" says; and this correspondent adds that "it made a most horrible impression on many to see so little charity from the Christian missionary as to make the poor ill man's effort more difficult by a rowdyism, or I might say a ruffianism, which might have tried the strength of a man in robust health." This is good to read. But it won't have much effect on Baker, who suffers from moral elephantiasis.

Rev. George Lynch Kemp, late rector of Wootton, North Hants, left £18,497. Reckoning coals at (say) ten shillings a ton, at the pit's mouth, this gentleman (if the Gospel be true) piled up 36,994 tons of fuel for his own combustion.

Here is another sad case. The Right Rev. Dr. Thomas James Welland, late Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore, left £13,838. Perhaps he is being burnt with Irish peat.

Justice, the weekly organ of the Social Democratic Federation, in its leading article last week, says much the same thing that we did a week previously. "Socialism in itself," our contemporary says, "is neither Atheist nor Christian. It is fundamentally a theory of the organisation of human society on the basis of the common ownership of the means of production.....It would be as reasonable to talk about Atheist mathematics as to talk about Atheist Socialism."

"A great many people sleep beneath this roof." The guide was taking an American round an old church, and he waved his hand over the inscription-covered floor. "Same way over in our country," said the American tourist; "why don't you get a more interesting preacher?"

Henri Rochefort has left the *Intransigent* and gone over to the Catholic and Nationalist *Patrie*. He denies, however, that he has undergone any change with respect to Catholicism. "I am still," he says, "as anti-clerical as ever; my enemies say that this is my one consistent attitude." His children have done without the blessing of the Church, and his grand-daughter contented herself with a civil marriage.

The Bishop of Manchester is a funny man. Speaking at the annual meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society, he claimed that the Christian Scriptures "simply as a monument of literary labor" would "challenge comparison with any similar effort yet put forth by man." Fancy! God Almighty claiming to be as good an author as William Shakespeare!

The Committee of the Dowsbury Public Free Library denounce Fielding's works as "improper," "disgraceful," and "shocking." One member moved that a copy of *Amelia* should be burnt, and the motion was only lost by one vote. What havoc these gentlemen would make if they were let loose on the Bible!

Pastor Aked is wild at being called "Rockefeller's chaplain." Words fail to express his "contempt for the mean, sneaking, venomous lies of the British press." It stinks worse than Standard Oil.

Manchester's chief constable has prevented the performance of Ibsen's *Ghosts*. The only ghosts they'll stand in Manchester belong to the New Testament—including the great Jerusalem ghost, known as J. C.

William Benjamin Brown, of Kingston, electrocuted himself at the Corporation works. The jury gave a verdict of "Suicide during temporary insanity." "I am going to my Father," he said in a letter found in his pocket. That was enough to satisfy the jury. Christians never hurry "home" unless they go mad.

Mr. Foote's Engagements.

Sunday, October 27, Secular Hall, Humberstone-gate, Leicester : at 6.30, "What is the New Theology?"

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 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.—November 10, Manchester; 17, Stanley Hall; 24, West Ham. December 22, Holloway.
- FRANK SUTTON.—Quite a mistake; it was Lord Neaves, not Lord Neath, who wrote "Let Us All Be Unhappy on Sunday." Thanks, however, for the reference. Pleased you have "keen appreciation" of our "services to the thinking portion of the community."
- F. CARSTEN.—Glad you "look forward" to the *Freethinker* every week. The pamphlet you send us—H. L. Hastings' *Inspiration of the Bible*—was dealt with in our columns twenty odd years ago. The Bagster firm doesn't date it, and people think it is new. It really isn't worth dealing with now. Even the Christian Churches have mostly left such stuff behind them.
- H. STUART.—Found room for the "Voltaire." With respect to the other, it is not quite true (is it?) that the Bible does not contain an ounce of good? It never could have existed so long on such a basis. There are many good things in the Bible, though the book as a whole is immensely overrated.
- W. J. HODGETTS.—See paragraph. Thanks.
- R. J. HENDERSON writes: "The *Freethinker* did not turn up yesterday as usual [why?] and I feel like a fish out of water in consequence. The paper never flags, never becomes dull; it is always up to concert pitch, and, if possible, continues to improve." We must get a powder-puff to hide our blushes.
- J. CHAMBERS.—Thanks for cuttings.
- THE TOUZEAU PARRIS FUND.—J. de B., 2s. 6d.
- G. HULL.—We are obliged.
- ROBERT WOOD.—Thanks for *Eastern Chronicle* report of Mr. Foote's lecture. We wish you every success in your new undertaking and throughout life.
- J. EYNON.—We see by the cutting you send us that Mr. George H. Bibbings, who is going to be "dipped" at the Heolyfelin Welsh Baptist Chapel, Trecynon, represents himself as having heard the voice of Christ "after eighteen years of opposition to Christianity." Is there any truth in this? We don't recollect ever hearing of him as an "infidel." What do the local "saints" say?
- R. SOUTHWARD.—Your letter is really very interesting, but we are afraid of drifting into a discussion of Socialism *per se*, which would be out of place in our columns. Glad you have found the *Freethinker* educative.
- B. FORD.—Thanks for cutting. Rev. Percy Dearmer's on "Sunday Amusement" is, as you say, more sensible than the pious stuff that usually appears in "*Lloyd's Pulpit*."
- J. BROUGH.—Cuttings welcome. Thanks.
- J. F. CARDUS.—Glad you enjoyed our Manchester lectures "immensely," also that you think the *Freethinker* "gets better every week" and is "a great intellectual feast."
- W. P. BALL.—Always glad to receive your well-selected cuttings.
- F. WEBB writes: "Both of the men I got you to send the *Freethinker* for six weeks have become subscribers, and one of them has induced four others to take the paper." This should encourage our friends to persist with the "Underground Movement."
- J. POLLITT.—You must send in your lecture-notice weekly, if you want it inserted. We insert such notices gratuitously, and cannot be expected to take additional trouble.
- C. HIRST.—The book is of no special money value. You might get a couple of shillings.
- E. S. P. HAYNES.—We used the word "editorial" strictly.
- W. LODWICK.—Pleased to hear from you as a new reader. Of course there are good men among the Christians. We are not waging war against Christians, but against Christianity. You do not appear to know that a Freethought organisation already exists—the National Secular Society—of which Mr. Foote is president.
- P. STACKEY.—Thanks.
- F. C. HOLDEN.—We note your suggestion that a Children's Column would be welcome in the *Freethinker*. Glad you are able to advise timid newsgagents that, while a few sanctimonious bigots have withdrawn their custom in consequence of your selling and displaying the *Freethinker*, the patronage of new customers has more than compensated for the loss.
- T. PALMER.—We do not recollect it.
- M. BARNARD.—(1) Yes, extracts from Spinoza as well as exposition. (2) Yes.

W. CAMPBELL.—Glad to hear you are able to obtain this journal from a newsgagent in Toronto every week, and that you find it "a tonic."

F. GREENALL.—Mr. Reid would, of course, have read Mr. Cohen's article. We note you agree with both.

R. CHAPMAN.—We quite understand your belief that Mr. J. M. Robertson is "doing good useful work" and your hope that he will retain his Tyneside seat, but you must bear in mind that we have nothing to do with such things in the *Freethinker*. Our comments related solely to Secular Education, which is one of our specialities.

H. C. BODE.—You will find Scott's *English Life of Jesus* helpful. It can be had at our office price 2s. 6d., post free 2s. 9d. Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, translated by George Eliot, is a more elaborate and costly work.

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.

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, 5s. 3d.; three months, 2s. 8d.

Sugar Plums.

Mr. Foote pays his annual visit to Leicester to-day (Oct. 27). The subject chosen for his evening lecture in the Secular Hall is "What is the New Theology?" Mr. Campbell has been in Leicester recently, and there should be a large audience on this occasion.

Sunday was miserably wet from beginning to end at South Shields, and the weather naturally affected Mr. Foote's audiences, which are drawn from the whole Tyneside district. Of course the afternoon audience was affected the most; the evening audience was a good deal better than might have been expected in the circumstances. Mr. Foote had a slight cold, which made his work all the harder; the lecturing, however, did him good rather than harm, and his cold had almost entirely disappeared by Monday. Mr. Bowie took the chair at the evening meeting; in the afternoon it was occupied by the veteran Elijah Copland. The South Shields Branch is arranging for other courses of lectures during the winter in the fine Royal Assembly Hall.

Mr. Cohen pays his autumn visit to Glasgow to-day (Oct. 27), and lectures afternoon and evening in the Secular Hall, Brunswick-street. District "saints" will note the time and place. We hope to hear of bumper meetings.

Under the auspices of the Secular Society, Ltd., a new course of Sunday evening Freethought lectures is to be delivered at the Stanley Hall, near the "Boston," north London, during November. Mr. Foote opens and closes the series, and the intermediate lectures will be delivered by Mr. Cohen and Mr. Lloyd. North London "saints" are invited to assist in advertising these meetings. Printed announcements for distribution or display can be obtained of Miss E. M. Vance, secretary, 2 Newcastle-street, E.C. Mr. Foote's first lecture, next Sunday (Nov. 3), will be on "The Pope's Challenge to Freethought."

Miss Vance informs us that Stanley Hall is now more accessible than ever, as the new Charing Cross and Hampstead "tube" has a station (Tufnell Park) right opposite. Omnibuses and tramcars pass the door from Oxford-circus, Euston-road, etc.

Mr. Wishart is still "missioning" for the N. S. S. Executive in Yorkshire. Good meetings have been held at Huddersfield, Heckmondwike, Dewsbury, and other places. Leeds, which is the centre of these operations, has been well stirred up, the Branch has been reformed, and an effort is being made to secure a suitable hall for regular indoor meetings during the winter. The local "saints" are anxious to have a visit from Mr. Foote, several contributions being offered towards the expenses of lectures in a theatre or other large building. Mr. Wishart has arranged with Mr. Johnson, newsgagent, Duncan-street, for a weekly supply of the *Freethinker*.

The Kingsland N. S. S. Branch sends us a cheerful report of its past year's work. There has been a most successful summer season of outdoor work at the Ridley-road station, and the finances show an income of £13 9s. 6d., and an

expenditure of £11 14s. 2d., leaving a balance on the right side. Monthly meetings have been held at members' domiciles. At the last of such meetings, held at Mr. and Mrs. Cowell's on Sunday, October 13, a resolution was passed of sympathy with Miss Vance in her illness, and a subscription was voted to the N. S. S. Benevolent Fund. We wish this hard-working Branch all success.

We have received at last a copy of the *Eastern Chronicle* containing a report of Mr. Foote's recent lecture in the Stratford Town Hall. The report mentions the crowded attendance, and says "the feature of the audience was perhaps the presence of the large number of women, who appeared to be in the majority." We don't think they were so many as that, but the number was extremely gratifying.

The *Southend-on-Sea Observer* publishes a long and well-written letter from the pen of Mr. W. Smith, president of the local N. S. S. Branch, in reply to the Rev. D. E. James, a Nonconformist minister who has just settled in the town and appears to think he has come to run it.

We are happy to state that Miss Vance is very much better, and is now back in the N. S. S. office again. She is attending to her duties once more, but she ought to take things easy for a little while.

We like to call attention to the *Humane Review*. This shilling quarterly, published by Ernest Bell, and conducted by a few Humanitarians who prefer to remain unknown, carries on a brave and rational crusade in behalf of the great object which is indicated in its title. The new (October) number opens with a very able and important article on "Imprisonment for Debt" by a writer who signs himself "Appellant." Imprisonment for debt is abolished by law, yet the judges have brought it back under the cover of "contempt of court," and the Home Office, apparently, has now made the treatment of these debtors practically that of criminals. The whole thing has become a monstrous scandal. No less than 11,427 imprisonments of debtors took place in 1905, and the number increased to 12,014 in 1906. The persons imprisoned are mostly poor, and what this means in domestic misery and social wreckage will never be appreciated until a Dickens arises to depict it. Next comes a beautifully-written article on "W. H. Hudson as a Bird-Lover." A painful, but well-written, article on "The Sufferings of Animals in India," by Labhshankar Laxmidas, seems to show that science and religion (strange association!) are responsible for the worst cruelties in our great Asiatic Dependency. One of the Suffragettes, Margaret S. Clayton, gives a lively account of her few days' imprisonment in Holloway. We once called the prison system—from personal experience—an organised imbecility, and it doesn't seem to have changed much since 1883. "Monticola" contributes a noble "Plea for Mountain Sanctuaries." A powerful article follows on "What is Humanitarianism?" This is unsigned, but we could guess the writer. Finally, there is an article on "The Death Penalty," disposing of Dr. Oldfield's fantastic sentimentalities. That pious gentleman talks as though pity for murderers were the one thing to be considered and promoted. His critic regrets that a good case should be spoiled by bad arguments.

One of our readers, an old salt retired from travelling over the rolling waves, knows the East extremely well, and, in sending us some cuttings relating to that part of the world, reminds us that the missionaries, who lie a bit themselves, get an awful lot of lies told to them by the orientals, who are "all born diplomatists, that is picturesque liars." They are always ready to tell the missionary a fairy tale for a dollar. "Mr. Cohen," he adds, "has summed up the whole thing in a masterly way in his pamphlet. I wish more people would read it." So do we. Mr. Cohen's pamphlet on *Foreign Missions* ought to be circulated very widely. Freethinkers should help to circulate it. They ought to be better (home) missionaries than they are.

Freethinkers should be well in evidence at the Secular Education League's first Demonstration in the Memorial Hall, Farringdon-street, on Thursday evening, November 7, at 8. The large hall ought to be packed, and we appeal to the London Secularists to help in securing that desirable result. The chair will be taken by Mr. Halley Stewart, M.P., a leading Nonconformist layman, and the speakers are the Rev. R. J. Campbell, Mr. C. F. G. Masterman, M.P., Mr. Pete Curran, M.P., and the Rev. Stewart D. Headlam. Mr. Campbell has the courage of his principles, and his attitude on the Education question deserves our applause.

Mrs. Eddy.

THE "Reverend" Mary Baker G. Eddy is the author of *Science and Health, with a Key to the Scriptures*, and this book appears to be the nucleus of Christian Science. Why the "divinely-inspired" Scriptures should require a "key" is not explained. Mrs. Eddy announces herself as President of the Massachusetts Metaphysical College, Boston.

In appearance the book is like a Bible, for it is printed on Oxford India Bible paper, and has a limp morocco cover with round corners and gilt edges. Though this is a colorable imitation, the contents are no truer; in fact, to us it savors of charlatanism, as though to say—"I am first cousin to the Holy Book itself." Perhaps it is just as true and just as reliable; but that is not saying much.

It is a fact that Christian Science is making some headway, much as Theosophy did a score of years ago. As in Theosophy, there is a substratum of truth or fact running through Christian Science, though this has been common with nearly all religions, and is especially noticeable in the more modern and cleverly-conceived dogmas. There is no justification, however, for raising a gigantic fabric of often impossible and nearly always improbable assertions. Yet this is done by Mrs. Eddy, and the whole dubbed "Christian Science."

This new-fangled faith is puzzling. It is full of pseudo-scientific phraseology, and contains the veriest jargon of metaphysics. She works the power of the mind for all it is worth, and is probably herself capable of producing in many a state closely allied to hypnosis. Those of us who have in any fashion studied psychology know the occasional power of mind over matter, to use stereotyped words. *How* the mind affects matter we do not know. Certainly we are conversant with the common effects of sudden fright, grief, or anger; and we largely know their result on the body. Fear, for instance, may arrest digestion, although of course faith never fills the stomach. Not that Mrs. Eddy says this; but she says much more.

The book is an artful hashing-up of religious, medical, and metaphysical matters; the conglomeration being exceedingly plausible—irresistible, in fact, to the ignorant reader. In the effort to probe the logic of thought or being, as the basis of that which is merely phenomenal and cognisable by the senses, this "reverend" lady may largely succeed with the shallow thinker, and often gain a rapid and complete victory with the ordinarily ignorant Christian who knows nothing of the foundations of his creed. With the medical mind she has more difficulty; first, because such mind is more or less scientific; and, secondly, because her doctrine threatens to knock all medical fees on the head. You can no more expect the ordinary practitioner to seek to embrace Christian Science than you can expect him to sing the praises of anti-vaccination, and the majority of doctors probably do not particularly desire to hear about any subject that may imperil the butter on their bread. However, as the book has nearly seven hundred pages, we must confine criticism to the first chapter only, entitled "Science, Theology, Medicine." And this is quite enough for the present; for, unless honest strictures are satisfactorily met, there is no justification for further possible waste of time.

(Mrs. Eddy's statement in the preface that Christian Science is the "adaptation of Truth to the treatment of Disease and Sin" puts the position somewhat in a nutshell, and prepares the reader for the doctrines announced.)

Under *Science* she says that "To develop the full glory of this Science [i.e., Christian Science] the discords of corporeal sense must yield to the harmony of spiritual sense"; and this seems another way of suggesting you must be half-dead before you can understand; or, on the contrary, it may be quite meaningless. She makes the definite assertion that "God called her to proclaim His gospel." (Christian Scientists assert there is no personal God, only

"Infinite Mind"; in which case Infinite Mind, being everything, the "calling" seems an impossibility.) Of course, if there is a God, and he *did* do this, it is final. There is no escape. But she gives no proof of either, and we beg leave to doubt. She fails to give any actual definition of "God"; nor does she explain how she was "called"; so we are forced into scepticism. She affirms as follows, and probably considers this incoherent effusion definite and convincing:—

1. God is All in all.
2. Good is good. Good is Mind.
3. God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter.
4. Life, God, omnipotent Good, deny death, evil, sin, disease.—Disease, sin, evil, death, deny Good, omnipotent God, Life."

No. 3 is crazy, half-bred hylo-idealism. The rest is as useful as the cabalistic Abracadabra. It is like it, too, for she explains that her formula can be read with equal effect either forward or backward; but this is a very doubtful advantage. Personally, we don't care whether it is read upside down or inside out; whether cooked to a turn or a cinder.

She says "the Principle of all harmonious Mind action is God"; in which case we seem perilously close to postulating another God operating thieves and murderers. If "Mind governs the body not partially but wholly," and as most of us don't want to die, a sufficiency of Christian Science would seem to imply nothing short of perpetual existence, thus knocking the older-fashioned "immortality" into the proverbial cocked hat.

"There is no pain in Truth, and no truth in pain; no nerve in Mind, and no mind in nerve; no matter in Mind, and no mind in matter; no matter in Life, and no life in matter; no matter in Good, and no good in matter." (These capitals are as she uses them, and don't matter an ounce to us, though her credulous readers are doubtless deceived by such subterfuge.) When this is not nonsense, it is both true and false; and then it is a contradiction. It depends upon how you take it. There is certainly no pain in truth, *per se*, though we all know that pain may be a resultant of truth. It is metaphysical balderdash à la Eddy, the claptrap and jingle-jangle of words.

Then we have the heading "Scientific Definition of Immortal Mind":—

- "God: Principle, Life, Truth, Love, Soul, Spirit, Mind."
 "Man: God's universal idea, individual, perfect, eternal."
 "Idea: 'An image in the Mind; the immediate object of understanding.'—Webster."

This last is "Webster"; so far so good. The others are "Eddy"; not one incomprehensible, but two incomprehensibles! God save us!

She asserts that adhesion, cohesion, and attraction are properties of Mind. A real difficulty obtains when we try to think property of mind in the adhesion, let us say, of a rubber patch on a pneumatic tyre, or the mutual attraction of two chips of wood on the surface of still water. If it is all the result of divine Mind, surely everything else is also; only, an earthquake then becomes suggestive of the naughty boy knocking down the house he has built with his own bricks. Then, again, if "All Science is Divine, and human thought never projected the least portion of true Science," why does God cause some of his "perfect ideas" to think they are scientists? Mrs. Eddy finishes, under the heading *Science*: "You cannot add to the contents of a vessel already full." She no more defines "full" than she defines "Truth." It depends upon what she means by "full." Certainly water can be added to a pail "full" of sand.

Under *Theology*, Mrs. Eddy asks: "Must Christian Science come through the Christian Churches?" Well, it appears to have come through Mrs. Eddy up to the present, and the Christian Churches largely and viciously repudiate it. She after declares: "It has come already, and through the one whom God called." Although she has told us she was called, she here evidently means Jesus, for she quotes him as having said: "I thank Thee, oh Father, Lord of

heaven and earth, because thou has hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seems good in Thy sight." But surely the wise and prudent would be the very people to whom it should be revealed, for they would understand it; while to reveal it to "babes," who know nothing of science, seems sheer inanity. Such a revelation would be the work of an Infinite Fool. The Freethinker can shake hands with Mrs. Eddy when she says that "The Jewish tribal Jehovah was a man-projected God, liable to wrath, repentance, and human changeableness"; though we knew this in the swaddling-clothes epoch of Freethought. She declares that "the Christian Science God is universal; [necessarily if infinite] eternal, divine Love; which changeth not"; and this is difficult to understand if there is no matter in which "Love"—which surely is thought—can function. Moreover, if "God, Spirit, being all, nothing is matter," "changeth not," he originally loved himself, and does so still.

Then, under *Medicine*, she maintains that "Health is not a condition of matter." If it is not, is disease? If not, why does disease kill? Ill-health must be definitely a condition of matter in tuberculosis, cancer, and elephantiasis; though it may not so definitely be a condition of matter in varied neurotic states where the physical body is apparently sound and the mind affected. Dr. J. F. Woods has lately published in the *British Medical Journal* some remarkable figures with reference to his alleged cures by suggestion without hypnosis, and the majority are under the heading "Neurasthenia." The method adopted by Dr. Woods is similar to that practised by Christian Scientists, but he neither claims to cure all ills nor does he make a religion out of what is probably the beginning of a science. Mrs. Eddy asks: "Which was first, Mind or medicine? If Mind was first and self-existent, then Mind, not matter, must have been the first medicine. Mind being All, it made medicine; but that medicine was Mind." Well, if this is so, they were co-existent. The proposition or question is preposterous. If "Mind was first," to use loose words, what did it "create" matter for? Or if "Mind" did not create matter, why did it, or does it, deceive us into the general belief that there is matter? The self-existent "Mind" might surely have been satisfied with itself, for it was medicine at the same time. But it appears to have introduced something out of nothing from nowhere—or made us think so—and caused the Devil's own bother in the shape of boils and blisters, and so long as there was "no nerve in mind" these things would not have bothered us. She goes on: "It is plain that God [*i.e.*, the All in all] does not employ drugs.....else Jesus would have recommended and employed them in his healing.....The human mind uses one error as a medicine for another. It seeks to quiet pain with morphine." "God does not employ drugs"! But if "All in all," they are "him." This is getting close to Pantheism. As for Jesus, it is fortunate he did not dabble in poisons, for we cannot quite imagine him much of a chemist or physician. He was probably absolutely ignorant of the most rudimentary science. As to "seeking" to quiet pain with morphine, the term is erroneous, for this drug, probably not directly remedial, is, as an anodyne, invaluable.

"Medicine is not a science, but a bundle of speculative human theories. The prescription which succeeds in one instance, fails in another, owing to the different mental states of the patient." Granting that up-to-date medical practitioners now look largely to fresh air and suitable diet as preventives to disease, yet it is impossible to deny the effect of certain drugs when disease is manifest. The small number of drugs having definite action must have that action, faith or no faith. It is easier to understand the failure of a prescription on other grounds—for instance, erroneous diagnosis. Drugs may and do fail, but not always. "You say a boil is painful; but that is impossible, for matter without mind is not painful." Yes, but there is mind when there is

a boil. This is old nonsense. We all agree that pain is cognised by the brain, and no one suggests that a boil remaining on the dead body would continue to be painful. She goes on: "The boil simply manifests your belief in pain, through inflammation and swelling, and you call this belief a boil. Now administer mentally to your patient a high attenuation of truth on this subject, and it will soon cure the boil." Heigh presto, and the trick is done! Poor Job! There were no Christian Scientists in his time. We wonder whether the highest possible attenuation of truth would have any effect on calculous concretions, or osseous growths, or whether it would even condescend to banish the more humble corn. "We have smallpox because others have it, but mortal mind, not matter, contains and carries the infection." Then smallpox is not zymotic, and contagion ought never to happen where there is ignorance of proximity to the disease. And if "mortal mind" carries the infection, does it do so by the creation first of hundreds of thousands of staphylococci? Then we are told, "Curious bones have been restored to healthy conditions." This is very ambiguous. What are the healthy conditions after caries? Does fresh bone form? In the Royal College of Surgeons specimens of the formation of new bone on portions of old bone, and changes in the dead bone, are shown; and this is a natural fact without Christian Science. If healthy conditions can be promoted, caries of the teeth, which is so common, could be dealt with, and fillings and extractions become things of the past. Or does Mrs. Eddy mean arrested? In either case, how does she know? Has she revealed caries by incision, closed the part, and healed by Christian Science? No surgeon, having made the incision, would stop half way. If necrosis is not physical, nothing is. Is not a foreign body in the vermiform appendix of the caecum the physical cause of inflammation? And will any amount of Christian Science stop the inflammation while such foreign body remains? Is not the operation of appendisectum definite and conclusive, and would Christian Science adequately supplant such operation?

Does the proposition, "Mind is medicine," apply also to the lower animals, or do they die of disease because they can't think they haven't got it?

We may paraphrase Mrs. Eddy's words on Medicine, and use them against her own clever invention: "Christian Science is not a science, but a bundle of speculative theories." Mrs. Eddy succeeds with some people and fails with others, owing to the differing mental states of the recipients. She refers to the words of Jesus: "These sayings shall follow them that believe.....if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them." It has not come to pass yet, notwithstanding the extraordinary results achieved under hypnotism. Perhaps, if the world lasts another thousand millions of years, the perfected Christian Scientist will eat and drink quite differently. As for "any deadly thing," well, perhaps at dinner he would take with his fish, instead of hock or niersteiner, acidulous spirits of salt; with his meat a brimming flagon of hemlock brew, or the more potent kakodylic cyanide, and finish up, unharmed, with the beans of St. Ignatius and a magnum of aqua regia. Doubtless a "high attenuation of truth," imbibed immediately prior to the soup—a kind of indispensable bitters, as it were—would not be forgotten.

A. FAGG.

CHRISTIANITY.

We must not embellish or deck out Christianity: it has waged a deadly war against the higher type of man..... Christianity has taken the part of all the weak, the low, the ill-constituted, it has made an ideal out of the antagonism to the preservative instincts of strong life; it has ruined the reason even of the intellectually strongest natures, in that it taught men to regard the highest values of intellectuality as sinful, as misleading, as temptations. The most lamentable example: the ruin of Pascal, who believed in the ruin of his intellect by original sin, while it had only been ruined by his Christianity.—*Nietzsche*.

The "Religion of Humanity" Martyr.

THE whole history of human thought contains no more pathetic picture of strenuous and unflagging labor at a great aim without a ray of popular encouragement or help. I suppose there is no example of a thinker of such eminence who, during his own lifetime, was so utterly abandoned and unknown. His wife, his early adherents, his literary acquaintance left him one by one. All his projects were rejected, and his writings ignored. One by one his pupils disappeared, and his official duties were taken from him. In extreme poverty, scarcely providing the bare necessities of physical life, oppressed by a concerted silence which effectually shut out his very name from his contemporaries, with not a single acquaintance who was not as poor, as powerless, and as unknown as himself, supported only by a small band of friends, whom he saw but once a week, with his wife and his principal colleagues at the beginning now become his bitter enemies, with the sole tender feeling still active in him, his memory for the dead woman whom he had loved with devotion and without sin, Auguste Comte toiled on during the whole period of his second career as a reformer of religion, without one hour of flinching, of relaxation, or of subordinate work. Living for ten years the life of the sternest hermit, denying himself alcohol, coffee, tobacco, everything but the barest modicum of food and clothing able to maintain life, too often, it must be feared, falling below that minimum, in silence, penury, solitude, and neglect, Auguste Comte worked out his gigantic scheme of philosophy and religion, never turning aside from his task for one instant, or wasting an hour in profitless controversy.

It was then that I saw him; nor can I easily forget the severe simplicity of his material existence, the intense conviction which gave him fire within, his personal courteousness and dignity, and the pure and noble spirit which he threw into all that he touched. And, not for an instant, in this long time of labor and neglect, did he ever show an hour of weakness. Never did he utter one word which was to call out public attention or conciliate the literary opposition, or seek to break the conspiracy of silence. With his eloquence, his courage, passion, and vast attainments it would have been easy to him to have forced himself on the world, to have won some immediate distinction, to have formed a party, or founded a school. With none of these would he deign to parley for an instant. Year after year his intense philosophic activity struggled on without the loss of an hour. The silent, stately, patient man kept silence even from good words, laboring with intense energy at his task, leaving it to those who might be able and willing to work out for themselves the meaning of his abstract ideas and difficult argument, but as indifferent to immediate popularity and the approval of his age as is the oak sapling, silently stretching out its roots into the soil and its branches into the air of heaven.

For thirty-five years he continued (without one hour's interval or deviation) his intense labor of philosophic absorption, unlighted by one ray of popular fame; living day by day the same silent, methodical, laborious, self-denying life. And can men ask if it were a life of high morality, of self-devotion, of purity? Can one impute to such a man egoism, self-indulgence, vanity, or vice? Assuredly a life of such terrible martyrdom in the cause of truth, of such utter and unnatural absorption in the future, such hermit-like exclusion of all that gives ease and sweetness to man's existence, had its dangers and its evils. It is manifest to all men that the price even the greatest and the purest pay of such solitary devotion to truth is harshness, excess of passion, self-reliance pushed to the limit of arrogance. Be it so, the ideal Christ, the Saints of the Catholic Church, the Protestant heroes, the Puritans, the Quietists, the Quakers, the Covenanters, Wesley himself—all had not a little of these things. Be it so, and there stands out far above these, perhaps inevitable, shortcomings of the martyr and prophet, a clear image of dauntless courage and self-devotion to the cause of human progress.

—*Frederic Harrison, the "Positivist Review."*

Correspondence.

THAT WHISKY HYMN.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—We are all indebted to you for nailing down one more lying slander, the "whisky" story. I had heard it from different Christian Evidence speakers, and wondered what portion of the book contained the "praise of whisky"; for, although I have not one in my possession now, I remember well its issue, and I sold the first copies at the

Hall of Science. It might interest readers of the *Freethinker* to know how the verses came to be included in the book.

About a year before the publication of the "Secularists' Manual of Songs and Ceremonies," the Rev. Bee Wright, a clergyman of the Church of England, started a crusade against Sabbath-breakers by summoning small shopkeepers and fruit-stall-keepers for selling their wares on Sunday. At that time any private person could institute proceedings under the Act of Charles II., and magistrates were bound to grant summonses; so every Monday morning the Rev. Bee Wright made his appearance at one or more of London's police-courts, applying for these legal documents.

Most frequently the application was made to the Lord Mayor at the Mansion House, and almost every week saw a poor applewoman or someone in an equally humble sphere of life fined the customary five shillings and costs.

These proceedings naturally excited a considerable amount of public interest. The pious press, of course, sided with the parson, whilst the more rational journals heaped scorn, satire, and contumely upon him, and one of the London dailies printed the verses, "Let Us All Be Unhappy on Sunday," copied, of course, from *Blackwood*.

The preparation of the "Manual" was then in progress, and I well remember the two editors, Messrs. Watts and Holyoake, discussing the inclusion of the verses one Sunday in the committee-room at the Hall of Science, when the former gentleman was to deliver a lecture, and it was largely due to the notoriety which the Rev. Bee Wright's proceedings had attained that they decided to include Lord Neaves' satire.

The end of the reverend gentleman's campaign was real comic. A few members of the National Sunday League (Freethinkers all, by the way) took observations, and noted that the Lord Mayor was driven every Sunday from the Mansion House to St. Paul's Cathedral. They ascertained the name of the coachman (never mind how), and you never saw such an astonished civic functionary as his lordship looked when the impious Sunday Leaguers applied to him on a Monday morning to grant a summons against his own coachman for contravening the Act of Charles II. by driving himself to St. Paul's! He stared, he hesitated, he twisted, and at last said he would adjourn the application till Friday.

When Friday came, he refused the summons on the ground that driving a coach was not a business within the meaning of the Act. A shuffle, of course; but it had the intended effect. All London was laughing at the ridiculous position. Then information reached the "Leaguers" that a certain fishmonger was supplying a member of the Royal Family with fish on a Sunday—namely, the Duke of Teck (he was Duke at that time); so, after getting evidence, they applied to Sir James Ingham, at Hammersmith, for a summons against the fishmonger. This was refused, Sir James bluntly declaring that the needs of the Royal Family was above the law.

But the end had come. This was such a glaring instance of "One law for the rich and another for the poor" that the Government brought in a short Bill, taking it out of the power of private persons to institute proceedings under the Act, and confining it to the police. This was hurried through in a few days, and thenceforward the police alone had power to prosecute; and there it now stands.

So the Rev. Bee Wright made his exit and was seen no more, and never missed.

In conclusion, during the whole time the book was in print, not one of our Christian opponents had any fault to find with it (indeed, Mr. Gladstone quoted from it with approval at a large public meeting, which added greatly to its sale); but then the Christian opponents of Freethought in those days, although by no means too scrupulous, were far and away superior to the ignorant, scurrilous, scoundrelly blackguards who are now employed by the Christian Evidence Society. One of the old school of opponents told me plainly a few months ago that he is seldom engaged now because he insists on lecturing on Christian Evidences and refuses to vilify Freethinkers.

W. J. RAMSEY.

We uncommiserate pass into the night
From the loud banquet, and departing leave
A tremor in men's memories, faint and sweet
And frail as music. Features of our face,
The tones of the voice, the touch of the loved hand,
Perish and vanish, one by one, from earth:
Meanwhile, in the hall of song, the multitude
Applauds the new performer. One, perchance,
Our ultimate survivor, lingers on,
And smiles, and to his ancient heart recalls
The long forgotten. Ere the morrow die,
He too, returning, through the curtain comes,
And the new age forgets us and goes on.

—R. L. Stevenson.

Voltaire.

THERE is magic in thy name,
Voltaire!
Universal is thy fame,
Voltaire.
Tho' the Church may curse your grave,
Tho' the priests may angry rave,
Yet our hearts will ever have,
We swear,
Affection for your spirit brave,
Voltaire.
Enemies you did not fear,
Voltaire.
Nowadays are neither here
Nor there!
Bigots still may shriek and howl,
Evil hearts 'neath monkish cowl,
Still they be but as the owl—
Unfair
Dwellers in their darkness foul,
Voltaire.
Though the radiance of your smile,
Voltaire,
Bring on you anathema vile,
Voltaire;
Protestant ingrates that they be
May spit on thy memory,
Through thy jests we only see,
So rare,
Nought but the great kind heart of thee,
Voltaire!
Tremble all the priestly herds,
Voltaire,
At the lightning of thy words,
Voltaire.
When dark Christianity
Shall no more remembered be
Nations then shall honor thee,
Voltaire!
Worshiped by humanity—
Voltaire!
Theirs is but ignoble shame
Who dare
To befoul your sacred name,
Voltaire.
In the path you bravely trod
Humbly I will try to plod,
For to me you are a God,
Voltaire!
Aye, and greater than a God,
Voltaire!
Voltaire!
HENRY STUART.

RIGHTS AND DUTIES.

The theory of *rights* enables us to rise and overthrow obstacles, but not to found a strong and lasting accord between all the elements which compose the nation. With the theory of happiness, of *well-being*, as the primary aim of existence we shall only form egoistic men, worshipers of the material, who will carry the old passions into the new order of things and corrupt it in a few months. We have, therefore, to find a principle of education superior to any such theory, which shall guide men to better things, teach them constancy in self-sacrifice and link them with their fellow men without making them dependent on the ideas of a single man or the strength of all. And this principle is *Duty*.—*Massini*.

Man, consequently, as a living being, is responsible to no one. His own God and the model of all past and present deities, his worship is due only to that which is greatest in himself. Heaven is his own illusion, and hell his own damnation. The shuttlecock of natural laws and environments, he is primarily chance made, though secondarily self-makeable. Non-existing before birth, he retains no individuality after death. The soul which he inherits from the elements, whatever it may be, he also returns to them: his personal immortality consisting solely in great thoughts, words, and deeds, and the depth of their impression on the shifting sands of men's memories.—*A. Redcote Devar*, "From Matter to Man."

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, J. H. Kennet, "The Riddle of the Universe." Selections by the Band before Lecture.

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S.: Victoria Park (near the Fountain), 3.30, G. Aldred, "The Church's One Foundation."

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S.: Station-road, 11.30, W. J. Ramsey, a Lecture. Brockwell Park, 3.15, W. J. Ramsey, a Lecture.

WEST LONDON BRANCH N. S. S.: Hyde Park (near Marble Arch), 11.30, H. B. Samuel, "My Neighbor and God."

COUNTRY.

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Prince of Wales Assembly Rooms, Broad-street): H. Percy Ward, 3, "Why Should an Atheist Fear to Die?" 7, "Did Jesus Ever Live?"

FAIRSWORTH (Secular Sunday School, Pole-lane): 6.30, E. Booth's Concert Party and Mrs. B. Hodgson Bayfield, "Morality Without Religion."

GLASGOW: Secular Hall, Brunswick-street—C. Cohen, 12 (noon), Sex and Religion"; 6.30, "The Search for God."

LEICESTER (Secular Hall, Humberstone-gate): G. W. Foote, 6.30, "What is the New Theology?"

MANCHESTER BRANCH N. S. S. (Secular Hall, Rusholme-road): 6.30, W. A. Rogerson, "Kirkdale Election."

SOUTH SHIELDS (Navigation Schools, Market-place): 7.30, Important Business Meeting.

OUTDOOR.

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N. S. S.: The Bull Ring, 11.15, H. Percy Ward, "Was Jesus a Socialist?"

EDINBURGH BRANCH N. S. S.: The Meadows, 3, a Debate between J. Ralph S. Ommundsen and N. Levey, "Has Man a Soul?" The Mound, 7, a Lecture.

MR. WISHART'S MISSION.

LEEDS BRANCH N. S. S.: Friday, Oct. 25, Clarion Club, 125 Albion-street, at 8, "Atheism and Personality: a Reply to Rev. Spencer Elliot."

HUDDERSFIELD: Saturday, Oct. 26, Market Cross, at 7.30. Weather permitting.

HECKMONDWYKE: Sunday, Oct. 27, Fountain, Market Cross, at 3, "Jesus Christ, a Blind Guide." Weather permitting.

DEWSBURY: Sunday, Oct. 27, Market Cross, at 6.30, "The New Theology, a Red Herring." Weather permitting.

LEEDS: Sunday, Oct. 27, Woodhouse Moor, at 3, G. Weir, "Heavenly Poultry." Weather permitting.

TRUE MORALITY:

Or, The Theory and Practice of Neo-Malthusianism,

AS, I BELIEVE,

THE BEST BOOK

ON THIS SUBJECT.

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

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

A POPULAR EDITION IN PAPER COVERS.

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

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

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

Orders should be sent to the author.

J. R. HOLMES, EAST HANNEY, WANTAGE.

"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.

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 BOOK OF GOD
IN THE LIGHT OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM.**

By **G. W. FOOTE.**

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

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

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

Take a Road of Your Own

Or, Individuality and Mental Freedom

By **COLONEL R. G. INGERSOLL**

PRICE ONE PENNY

IS THE BIBLE INSPIRED?

This Useful Pamphlet by

Mr. G. W. FOOTE.

Will be forwarded, post free, for

THREE HALFPENCE.

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

FLOWERS OF FREETHOUGHT

By **G. W. FOOTE.**

First Series, cloth 2s. 6d.

Second Series, cloth 2s. 6d.

Contains scores of entertaining and informing Essays and Articles on a great variety of Freethought topics.

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.

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, FARRINGTON STREET, LONDON, E.C.

THE BIBLE HANDBOOK

FOR

FREETHINKERS AND INQUIRING CHRISTIANS

EDITED BY

G. W. FOOTE AND W. P. BALL

A New Edition, Revised, and Handsomely Printed

CONTENTS:

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

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

The above four useful parts, convenient for the pocket, may be had separately, FOURPENCE EACH, or the whole, bound in one volume, 1s. 6d.; Best Edition, bound in cloth, 2s. 6d. (Postage 3d.)

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

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 ½d.
- WHAT IS RELIGION? Colonel Ingersoll's Last Lecture. 2d., post ½d.
- WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED? 2d., post ½d.
- WHY AM I AN AGNOSTIC? 2d., post ½d.

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