

# THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXVIII.—No. 21

SUNDAY, MAY 24, 1908

PRICE TWOPENCE

*The Holy Church has a stomach healthy :  
Hath eaten many a land as forfeit,  
And never yet complained of surfeit :  
The Church alone, beyond all question,  
Has for ill-gotten goods the right digestion.*

—GOETHE.

## The Fate of the Red Bush Pig.

At the first glance I fell in love with the Mandingo woman. The features, though negro, were regular; the lips of African amplitude, yet feminine; the eyes mild and sociable; the skin a mellow brown; the bust shapely, the left breast—the only one exposed,—full without obtrusiveness; the hands long and slender. A gold necklace of simple pattern encircled her neck, and drooped another loop over her breast. Silver bangles sparkled on her left wrist. A black hat of the smoking-cap type bore a neat scarlet design. From the right shoulder to the left hip was hung a robe of lovely purple, and surely no Tyrian dye-works ever gave a Phœnician lady or a Roman emperor a more dignified and splendid cloak. The skirt was sable, striped from waist to foot with broad embroidered bands of white.

The Mandingo man also caught my admiring eye. Brown shining skin and strong countenance were not unhandsome, though the nose had the fatal flatness of the Dark Continent. The cap was plain and dark. A toga-like robe hung from neck to knees, an under vest of white edging it above and at the wrists, the sleeves flowing wide and loose. The feet were bare.

I met these charming dusky brethren in the pages of Sir Harry Johnston's two volumes on Liberia, his copious photo pictures being reinforced by fine colored sketches, done by his own hand.\*

Liberia is a West African coast-land, some 48,000 square miles in area, the Atlantic surf beating on its shore of 350 miles; and since 1847 its negroes and mulattos of American origin, its "civilised" natives of local birth, added to a more primitive multitude of some two million blacks, have constituted a free republic. The emblem of the republic is a ship lying off a coast, where a palm rises loftily; and the motto below reads: "The love of liberty brought us here." Till recently (perhaps now) an old lady, the octoroon wife of the first President (Roberts; he died in 1856), lived in retirement near Battersea Park, her memory going back to the immigration from America and a residence of seventy years in West Africa.

Forests are extensive in Liberia. On the edges of the muddy lagoons the tangled roots of the man groves make a gloomy retreat for the crocodile, and in the branches perch white and black fishing-vultures and green-hued monkeys. The streams, rippling over boulders here, expanding into silver sheets there, and crossed by wicker-bridges in the narrower channels, roll between banks richly decked with palms, spice-trees, cotton-trees, water-trees (yielding cupfuls when slashed), spiky dragon-trees, and luxurious spreads of bracken-ferns. The chim-

panzee haunts the groves. The potto, a kind of lemur, yells at midnight, and earns the name of "Softly" by its subtle mode of progress. Flying "squirrels" skim through the air. Bristled rats and spotted golden-cats are small companions to the elephant. A pigmy hippopotamus plunges in the river, and is far out-shone in beauty of color by the red river-hog or red bush-pig. This latter creature, which supplies the text of my present meditation, flares in the Liberian wilds in a skin of bright orange, with black and white patches on the face, white hair at the tips of the ears, and a white crest or mane along the back. It is easily tamed, and a German naturalist tells of a sort of Damon and Pythias friendship between one of these orange-hued splendors and a chimpanzee. The pig genially trotted about a garden with the chimpanzee on its back. Afterwards, on a grand tour, the river-hog visited Europe, and finally died—no doubt to the regret of the chimpanzee nation,—in the Zoological Gardens of Amsterdam.

At this point I suspend my researches into the "live critters" of Liberia, though much might be told of the antelopes, the leaf-walking bird, the rose-colored flamingoes, the egrets, who die a martyr's death at the demand of European women, the great-beaked kingfisher, and the rest. But my thoughts take a new turn as I contemplate the fate of the red bush-pig. Though Europe seems to admire this pretty hog in a wild-beast show, the singular thing is that European influence has not favored him in his native country. Sir Harry Johnston astounds me when he says that the Liberians have taken the trouble to import into Africa the Berkshire swine, and have taken no pains at all to domesticate their orange-colored river-hog! The ugly alien is preferred to the handsome native, in spite of the fact that the African animal is sweeter, cleaner, more genteel and (one says it with mingled feelings) superior eating to his English cousin.

On examining Liberian life on its human side, we see that the fate of the red bush-pig is overtaking a good many other native institutions. Opening the book again, I come disagreeably upon a photograph of a group of Liberian students at a college. All these negro striplings wear mortar-boards! Africa apes Oxford, or, for that matter, the fifth-rate boarding-schools of our unæsthetic kingdom. Opposite this dreadful picture, Sir Harry breaks out into lamentations and prayers, thus:—

"If the author of this book were a Liberian, he would strive (within reason) to do everything as differently as possible from what is done in Europe, Asia, or America. He would try to be original. For instance, if he were the principal of the Liberia College he would resolutely exclude 'mortar-boards' from the heads of his students, not only because they are an unsuitable form of headgear, but because they happen to be the mode adopted in England and America. He would try to develop a special African architecture, an African school of painting. He would certainly study and develop the inherent musical talent evinced by many of the Liberian natives. He would attempt to domesticate the red bush-pig, and not introduce Berkshire swine; the red buffalo, and not the English shorthorn; the Agelastes guinea-fowl, and not the Cochín-China. Along this route there is life, hope, and a future before the Liberians."

These reflections are perfectly sane. They harmonise with our best conceptions of art in relation to the social and natural environment. All artificial beauty should fit the scene which yields it material and a home. African poetry should be sung to an African lyre, and the Mandingo form be draped in those vestures that the negro taste has gradually selected as most congruous with the complexion and habits of the Liberian tribes.

When we search more deeply into the life and soul of Liberia, we discover one powerful agent in the degradation of the native æsthetic. The republic is honeycombed with swarms of Protestant sects. Liberia hums with the prayers and psalmodes of Methodist Episcopalians, Protestant Episcopalians, African Episcopalians (these are the correct technical terms), Free Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, and Zionists! There is a Divinity School at Epiphany College which possesses, in the person of a Mr. T. M. Gardner, a "Professor of Bible History, Secular History, and Spelling!"—these three subjects being the most remarkable example I have yet seen of what modern educationists call Co-ordination! Among the culture-agencies I note a Literary Union at Monrovia, the capital, under the presidency of Dr. Blyden. I recall with pleasure having met Dr. Blyden at a social gathering at the South Place Ethical Society, and I suspect this liberal-minded colored gentleman has risen to a much higher level than the episcopalian theology of Epiphany College.

The purple cloak of the Mandingo is disappearing. Liberian negresses dress in European gowns. They do their best to appear feminine in spite of the inappropriate clothing. But the men are a far more dismal failure. Sir Harry Johnston displays depressing portraits of them. One picture represents them as seated in a long row like a band of British deacons, all wearing frock coats and tall silk hats. Another shows them in a Masonic procession, rendered more passable by the white aprons, but still hideous in frock coats and chimney-pot hats and stiff, respectable boots. African palms lift their glorious leaves mockingly behind this march of the Philistines. Sir Harry has an affection for Gospel ethics (probably on a Unitarian basis) but the rest of the Protestant system he abhors. Here is his description of the confusion in the spirit of Liberia. Missionaries, behold your work!—

"The Christianity of Liberia is an exact mimicry of the narrow, warped Christianity of England from Puritan times to the dawn of better things in the middle of the nineteenth century. The teaching of Christ, which might be accepted by the whole world without demur, is over-loaded with a worship of the letter of the Old Testament which is inconceivably wearisome, time-wasting, and futile."

We will join in Sir Harry's hope that the era of emancipation draws nigh, when the Liberian newspapers "will cease to devote a large portion of their space to profitless examination-papers on the Old Testament."

These West African republicans can build towns, work telephones, play municipal brass bands, cultivate rubber, and elect a House of Representatives, etc.—all of which achievements are more or less marks of civilisation. But along with this impetus towards a sort of culture, unhappy Liberia has suffered some manifest wrongs at the hands of the Zionists and Episcopalians. I will not dwell further on the fate of the red bush-pig. But why should West Africa lose its aboriginal charms and innocent characteristics? Some of the old manners did no harm. The costume I have described was entirely appropriate and pleasing. The disappearance of these old styles not only ministers to the silly conceit of the Zionists and their orthodox allies, but actually robs the Liberians of native pride and "pith o' sense." Why should not Europe show its respect for African sentiments and atmosphere? The White People would lose nothing by manly recognition of what is valuable in the negro world; and the negro would all the more

gratefully and intelligently absorb the wisdom of the West.

If I could act as spiritual ambassador from the Caucasian race to the long-suffering genius of Africa, I should make it my first business to assure the lady of the silver bangles, with a most courteous bow, that we should deem it a privilege to help in preserving that which was beautiful in the soul of Liberia.

F. J. GOULD.

### Science and the Church Congress.—I.

THE Pan-Anglican Congress of this year has commenced its work by issuing, in a lengthy series of papers, the addresses which will be presented when it formally commences its sittings. The various pamphlets cover a wide range of subjects, and are written by a number of well-known gentlemen, lay and cleric. On a preliminary glance the papers strike one as being rather above the average, although it would be unsafe to be too certain of this without a more detailed examination than I have yet been able to give to them. Anyway, the titles indicate most of the main points at issue in the religious and anti-religious controversy, and the value of the contributions will be seen by the criticism of such as it may be thought profitable to notice in these columns.

The first pamphlet that calls for notice consists of three papers, by the Rev. F. R. Tennant, who writes on "Faith and Science"; Sir Dyce Duckworth, who writes on "Science and Christian Faith"; and Mr. F. C. S. Schiller, whose contribution is entitled "Science and Religion." All three of these writers protest, as a matter of course, that religion—properly understood—and science—properly understood, also—are in cordial agreement, although it is admitted by the Rev. F. R. Tennant that science has made it harder for us to look upon the world as the work of God. Of the three papers, that of Sir Dyce Duckworth's, although from a professional man of science, is the least scientific both in its reasoning and its outlook. His point of view is, indeed, that of dwelling upon the ignorance of science in certain directions in order to gain favor for religious statements based upon an equally comprehensive want of knowledge. It is as true as ever, he says, that—

"The last revelations of science tell us nothing as to the intimate nature of life, or the origin of it; nothing as to the nature of the soul of men, and all nature is silent as to the future."

And then? Well, as science—which is coextensive with human knowledge—cannot discover that man has a soul, nor can discover any trace of a future life, we ought, in Sir Dyce Duckworth's opinion, to accept as true what religious people tell us, although they know no more about these things than we do. One can only hope that this gentleman's treatment of his patients proceeds on sounder lines than his reasoning on the relations of science and religion.

Sir Dyce Duckworth also remarks that the method necessary to acquire religious faith is "apart from all those rigidly followed by the scientist"—a sentiment with which one cordially agrees. But when we are told that the hospital is a good teacher of religion, because "suffering is one of the best schools for implanting the teaching and value of faith," one can only wonder at the type of mind that has its faith in the goodness of God developed by witnessing the suffering of men, women, and children in a hospital ward. Fortunately, Sir Dyce Duckworth and his fellow-medicos are better than the Deity they profess to worship, or they would do as he does—stand on one side and wait for others to make good the bungling or lack of care.

The only other remark of Sir Dyce Duckworth's that calls for notice is the following:—

"The Agnostic physician brings little brightness and assurance to the bedside of the sick, and even he must testify to his experience of the calmest and most happy death-beds as being those in which the patient was sustained by the Faith which has no meaning and no comfort for him."

Here is both untruth and confusion of thought combined. In the first place, anyone's experience ought to convince them that whether a doctor—or anyone else, for that matter—brings comfort into a sick room is less a matter of the message he delivers than it is of personality or temperament. There are some people who could almost issue a sentence of death so as to make the condemned cheerful, and there are others who always manage to shroud the most cheerful message with the lugubriousness of a funeral. Next, the "assurance" to which Sir Dyce Duckworth refers as being brought by the religious doctor does *not* cheer the patient in the slightest. People who send for a doctor are by no means cheered by his assurance that there is a life beyond the grave, and that they are about to make its acquaintance. A doctor who habitually cheered up his patients in this manner would soon find himself without any patients to comfort. Sick people do not, as a rule, want to hear about the next world, and never do they welcome the assurance that they are about to set out on the voyage thither. It is true that social pressure prevents many doctors giving patients their opinions on religion—nor is there any reason why they should—but common sense would tolerate to a hardly greater extent a doctor who dosed his patients with religion. Its depressing effects would be appreciated by even religious people themselves.

Experience, too, is dead against the thesis that religious people die easier or more comfortable deaths than non-religious persons; or, to put the matter more accurately, that non-religious people exhibit a more accurate, that non-religious people exhibit a distress at the approach of death that is not felt by believers. As a matter of fact and of common experience, in all but a case here and there, the dying are so worn out by suffering, wasted by disease, or enfeebled by age, that death is no more than a sinking to rest against which it exhibits little tendency, as it possesses little strength, to struggle. This, I repeat, is a truth borne out by the experience of all; and it is a little depressing to find this common pulpit feeling about death-beds repeated by an eminent medical practitioner. It almost looks as though, having made the more reputable members of the clergy ashamed of repeating this falsehood, we must set to work to prevent its circulation amongst laymen. One may commend to Sir Dyce Duckworth the opinion of a brother medico, and one of a far more scientific turn of mind, Dr. William Osler, who, having kept careful records of some hundreds of death-beds, concluded that the popular belief concerning the desire of the dying for religious ministrations was quite erroneous.

The Rev. F. R. Tennant's paper on "The Faith and Science," falls under a different category to that of the one just dealt with, but it is open to attack to an even greater degree. Specially is this the case in his account of the historical relations between Christianity and science. He admits that the Christian Church did look with disfavor upon scientific pursuits, but points out that at the time when Christianity was established the scientific activity of Greece had come to an end, and "it was scarcely likely that theology would stimulate research by means of experiment and observation when science itself showed practically no such inclination." We are also asked to remember that on some scientific matters on which the Christian writers expressed an opinion, such as the flatness of the earth's surface and the Antipodes, "the time for proving the earth's sphericity and the existence of human beings on its opposite surface had not as yet arrived. These were the purely speculative matters for which no evidence was forthcoming."

That there had come a pause in Greek scientific activity is true enough, even though the cessation was not so complete as Mr. Tennant assumes. Inquiry was still proceeding, and the Alexandrian schools still existed. Nor is it true that there was no evidence in proof of the scientific conclusions at which Greek thinkers had arrived. There were proofs, even though the theories lacked the complete

demonstration given since by modern science to substantially the same teachings. Nor is it true that the Christian writers dismissed these theories because they were not proven. They were set aside, avowedly, because they were in conflict with Christian teaching. Mr. Tennant admits that Christians showed hostility to "ascertained physical facts" in the sphere of medical science, and the same is true of science in all its branches. Mr. Tennant is simply throwing dust in the eyes of his readers by pretending otherwise.

The real points that arise are (1) What encouragement did Christianity offer to intellectual development? and (2) What was the amount of knowledge then existing upon which Christian teachers, had they desired, might have built? That Christianity did nothing to encourage, and everything to discourage sound learning is admitted, as it is also that "during the age of the Fathers was forged the chain with which the Church was destined to fetter science in a subsequent period." But the statement that Christianity took no interest in science can lead to no real appreciation of its blighting influence on the civilised world. For Christianity did not rise to power as did Mohammedanism among barbaric tribes. It had at its service a vast literature, civilised polity, and a science that had taken the first sure steps in the investigation of nature. In the sixth century B.C., Pythagoras taught a heliocentric theory of astronomy and explained the rotation of the earth on its axis. In the third century, Bion had explained the shape of the earth, Eratosthenes had propounded rules for its measurement, Aristarchus had calculated the size of the sun as 300 times that of the earth, Archimedes had propounded a theory of gravitation that only just fell short of the Newtonian law. A century later, we find Hipparchus calculating the size of the sun by a method that was actually used by Copernicus many centuries afterwards. Democritus propounded an atomic theory that remained substantially unaltered until our own day. Many of the actual calculations were, of course, inexact, but they were on the right lines. At all events, they knew enough to teach that the earth is a sphere hanging suspended in space, that it rotates on its axis, and so caused day and night. They understood something of its size, and discussed the possibility of other races of men at the Antipodes. They had calculated the size of the moon, and knew something of its relation to the tides. They also knew something of the vast size of the sun, the character of the stars, had catalogued them, and had actually made planispheres and written on the precession of the equinoxes. The true nature of disease had been stated, and the conception of universal natural law reached. In the writings of Cicero and others, many of these things—with others—are referred to as more or less established, while the single work of Lucretius points to a large accumulation of scientific knowledge, and a vast amount of scientific speculation. The ground had been prepared; what use did Christianity make of the situation?

(To be continued.)

C. COHEN.

### Some Awkward Facts and Their Implication.

IN order to thoroughly understand any great, practical question, it is essential that we should keep our eyes open to all the signs of the times in relation thereto. The Christian Church has been in active existence for a period of nearly two thousand years. It was founded in the full expectation that almost immediately the whole world, or at least all the elect therein, would be gathered into its fold. According to Matthew and Mark, the risen Lord commanded the original apostles to "go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." But even to this day that commission has not been carried into

effect. This is fact number one; and no one dreams of denying it. Another fact, equally incontestable, is that, at present, the Church is decidedly on the downgrade. As frankly admitted by a well-known British apologist, the Christian Churches are "far from including, or even reaching, the whole modern population of these realms, and their growth, however real, shows no sign whatever of keeping pace with that of the people in general." This is fact number two, and statistics amply attest its accuracy.

The chief obstacle to the Church's triumph in all ages has been unbelief. Even during the so-called Ages of Faith, when the Church seemingly swept all before it, silent scepticism was rife everywhere. Unbelief was only cowed at the point of the sword. Read the history of Charlemagne's wars, especially against the Saxons, and you will know what value to attach to the reported wholesale conversions to Christianity. Thousands upon thousands entered the Church simply because they preferred it to the grave. They accepted Christian baptism rather than violent death. As soon as the sword ceased to be the supreme missionary of the Cross, the Church began to lose ground, its converts becoming fewer and farther between continually. When Christians boastfully declare that Christianity won the Roman Empire, they conveniently omit to mention the means and the cost of the conquest. They take good care not to refer to the fact that Paganism was suppressed by force of arms, not by supernatural intervention. Indeed, one of their strongest arguments against Mohammedanism is that its phenomenal expansion has been due to its unsparing use of the sword, as if no such charge could be brought, with equal and sometimes greater truth, against their own religion. In point of fact, Christianity marched to its alleged throne through one long-continued deluge of blood. In the eighth century the Servians were conquered by Byzantium, and became nominal Christians. When they regained their independence in the ninth they formally renounced Christianity; and they re-adopted it only after re-conquest. The truth is, speaking generally, that in proportion as people have been emancipated from the tyranny of an ecclesiastically-manipulated State, their allegiance to Christianity has weakened, which clearly shows that, even at best, their faith was more nominal than real, more the creation of fear than of love.

Now, inasmuch as Christian apologists ignore the true explanation of the rise and triumph of the Church, we are not at all surprised to find that they likewise ignore the real significance of its decline and threatened fall. That it is declining they have not the temerity to deny; and, if it is declining, its fall must be imminent. For this uncontroverted decay of its power and influence they assign various reasons. One is "the development of natural science." Another is that "Biblical scholarship has developed into what is known as the Higher Criticism." A third reason is thus presented:—

"In addition to the above, and, indeed, principally through their means, a smouldering fire of bitter antagonism to everything Christian has been maintained under the auspices of the National Secular Society. It has only a small following, and, with the exception of Leicester, has scarcely any respectable buildings for its purpose."

The National Secular Society, though a very small and poor affair, is yet one of the causes of the downfall of the Church. Another cause is the publication of cheap reprints of great anti-Christian works by accredited scientists and well-known scholars. The last causes named are thus summarised:—

"Other influences which indirectly but undoubtedly tell against Christian beliefs and sanctions are to be found in the unparalleled multiplication of literature of all kinds, ignoring religion altogether, along with the increasing pressure of life upon all who are not numbered amongst the rich, and a corresponding reaction in favor of exciting and sensational engrossments which leave neither time nor disposition for anything deeper or higher."

Now, why should the facts just enumerated operate as causes of the demolition and disappearance of Christian beliefs and practices? Why should they have any power against such an institution as the Church? If the Church is what it represents itself to be, how can natural science, the Higher Criticism, the National Secular Society, anti-theological books, and non-religious fiction—how can all these combined do it the slightest injury? Jesus is reported to have said: "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Paul's conception of the Church is most exalted. He speaks of the strength of God's might, "which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and he put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the Church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all" (Eph. i. 19-23). The Holy Ghost dwells in the Church to lead it into all truth. Protestants laugh to scorn the dogma of the infallibility of the Pope; but do they not know that in so laughing at it they are really laughing at Jesus and Paul? If the New Testament is true, the Church itself is infallible; and it follows, as a matter of course, that the Pope, its chief spokesman, must be also. The one claim which the Church has always made, and still makes, for itself, is, that it is the depository of a supernaturally revealed Gospel; that whenever two or three of its members meet in the right spirit, their deliberations and judgments possess the sanction and authority of him who sits upon the throne of the Universe; that its voice is the voice of the ever-living Lord, its bindings and loosings his bindings and loosings; that it has never been left to its own devices, or strength, or wisdom, even in the darkest times. Such a claim is virtually a claim to infallibility, to omnipotence, and to absolute authority in all religious matters. Now, if this claim is valid, the Church represents and is the kingdom of God on earth; and surely the kingdom of God cannot be overthrown.

Here, then, are two sets of facts, and the acceptance of the one set necessitates the rejection of the other. On the one side, we have the Church and its claims, and on the other the Church and its history, and our contention is that the Church's history completely belies its claims. If the Church is fallible; if it has ever taught, or now teaches, false doctrines; if it can be convicted of any errors in either judgment or action, then its claim to be under the guidance of an infallible Lord falls to the ground, and its Divine Head turns out to be nothing but an impotent figure-head. The Rev. John Bevan says that "where Christ is there is the Church," and we hold that, if Christ spoke the truth, where the Church is there is Christ, and that if he is not there he is nowhere. But Mr. Bevan contradicts himself when he observes that "the Church is being weighed in the balance," and that "as organised Christianity it is surely losing ground"; and he actually commits suicide, as a Christian minister, when he ventures on the remark that "the Great Founder of Christianity had apparently no intention of establishing a Church or a religious system over against Judaism." What, then, did Jesus mean by "My Church," against which the gates of Hades could not prevail? Mr. Bevan knows perfectly well that the Church is a colossal failure, and knowing this he wishes to give the term some mystic meaning, in order, as he hopes, to save Christ and Christianity. But that miserable subterfuge will not save anything; it will not even succeed in bamboozling the public for any length of time. There is no Christ apart from Christianity, and no Christianity apart from the Church. Consequently, the failure of the Church implies the failure of Christianity, and the failure of Christianity robs Christ of his actuality.

In other words, to admit that natural science, the Higher Criticism, anti-Christian literature, Secular

Societies, national and social changes, are alienating the people from the Church and sowing the seeds of Agnosticism in their mind, is tantamount to confessing that the New Testament conception of the Church, and the Church's interpretation of Christianity, are alike fundamentally false. Neither is the Church protected and led by an infallible and omnipotent Head, nor is Christianity a Divinely-revealed religion, with all the resources of an unseen spiritual world behind it. The constant dropping of doctrines once held as essential and vital, the repeated confession of helplessness in the face of rapidly-advancing knowledge, the never-ceasing appeal from the discouraging and depressing present to an imaginary future aglow with sweetest promises, all this proves conclusively that the Church is a purely human institution trading on the exploded traditions of the past. The much-belauded power of the Holy Ghost, whose special function it is to render the atonement of Christ universally effective, is seen, on careful analysis, to be neither more nor less than the organised power of social machinery working for the accomplishment of a fervently-desired end. The only feasible explanation of the fact that science and criticism are dislodging the Christian faith from men's minds, is to be found in the inference that Christianity is not of God, and that belief in it as such is artificially engendered and artificially maintained. The Christian religion, like all other religions, is exclusively of man's own manufacture, at a time when he had practically no knowledge either of the laws of nature, or of those of his own life.

On this ground we conclude that acquiescence in the main results of scientific research and Biblical criticism, on the part of theologians, bears as an inescapable implication—*Atheism*. No belief whatever in a personal God of infinite justice and love is either logically or morally possible, once the facts about the Church and its history are allowed calmly to submit their witness. They are exceedingly awkward facts; and it is very difficult to believe in the entire honesty and disinterestedness of those who admit their truth, and yet profess to be sincere adherents and proclaimers of a supernatural religion. It is all very well to assert that God's redeeming love has its efficiency seriously crippled by the imperfect instruments through which it works; but why does God choose defective instruments, or why does he, being a person, work through instruments at all? If "Spirit with Spirit can meet" in direct personal communication, why is there a single human being to whom God is utterly silent and unknown? And as we listen for reply, all we can hear is the clear, unmistakable echo—*why?*

J. T. LLOYD.

### The "Devil Chasers."

A MESSAGE from Nazareth, Pennsylvania, gives shocking details of an inquest which has resulted in the arrest of the leader of a local sect known as the "Devil Chasers," a foreigner named Robert Bachmann, on a charge of sacrificing a six-year-old girl named May Smith. The parents of the girl, who are members of the sect, are also in custody.

The girl was unruly, and her parents took her to a meeting of Bachmann's followers, where it was declared that she was possessed by an evil spirit, which should be beaten out of her. She was thereupon subjected to such castigation that she died.

At the inquest last night, the coroner severely questioned the man Bachmann, and he admitted that he directed the punishment, which he seriously believed would drive the evil spirit out of the girl. The father similarly tried to justify the sacrifice, but the mother declared she did her utmost to prevent her daughter being killed, but she was pushed aside and told it was better to sacrifice the child than to leave her in possession of the spirit.

The Coroner ordered the arrest of all three witnesses, and the police were hard put to it to prevent them being lynched by the angry crowd on the way to the gaol. The indignation in the locality is very strong, and the authorities are being urged to stamp out the sect, which has been found to have many members among the more illiterate and foreign ironworkers.—*Liverpool Evening Express*.

### An Anti-Infidel Champion.

W. R. BRADLAUGH's dear old friend and colleague, Walton Powell, is in trouble again. The first time we ever saw the fellow we perceived him to be a born criminal. We recognised the type at once. It was at a meeting of ours in Bristol, where he did his utmost to create disorder. Soon after that we heard of his joining the Anti-Infidel forces, and going up and down the country "refuting infidelity." He was a loud-mouthed, vulgar, reckless speaker, and his chief stock in trade consisted of the most abominable slanders on leading Secularists. But this did not stand in the way of his success with the friends of what is facetiously called Christian Evidences. He was entertained by Christians of standing, crowds of Christians went to his meetings and applauded his filthy references to Secular leaders, and money was poured into his pocket by malicious partisans of the "Gospel of Love." At length he made an unspeakably vile statement about the conduct of Secularists at the Hall of Science. His precise words are unprintable; the substance of them was that a class was held at the Hall for teaching boys unnatural vices. It is difficult to understand how such a monstrous statement could go down with any audience outside a lunatic asylum. But it did. It was even published in W. R. Bradlaugh's monthly sewer. He was "pals" with Powell then, and he declared that they would prove the statement up to the hilt. But there was an ignominious climb-down when Mr. R. O. Smith, the proprietor of the Hall of Science, brought an action for libel against the printer and publisher of the Christian rag; the proprietor and editor being no more worth powder and shot than Powell himself. The defence was that the Hall of Science was not the place meant; it was somewhere else. This ridiculous plea enabled the jury to cut down the damages, but they were obliged to give a verdict for the plaintiff.

Some time after that, the Anti-Infidel cronies quarrelled. We think it was about the cash. Powell, however, could get on very well without the other fellow. He had the throat of brass, the tongue of lies, and the cheek of a born impostor. But he was bowled over at last. Criminality will out. The delectable scoundrel was sentenced to fifteen months' hard labor at Bristol on November 26, 1897, for debauching young girls. On his release he was arrested for bigamy, and got another twelve months for that. After his next release he led a life of fraud. His last avatar was as Professor Sylvester, the great American doctor, who cured diseases almost miraculously. Finally, he did some business as a station-thief; and on May 14, at the Clerkenwell Sessions, he was sentenced to fifteen months' imprisonment for stealing a Gladstone bag at Victoria Station. He answered then to the name of Bertram Mortimer.

It appears that we were quite right in concluding that Powell was a born criminal. According to the police evidence at his latest trial, he was a Captain in the Salvation Army at Bath for some years up to 1881, when he was allowed to resign for misconduct. Then he went to sea. In 1882 he was twice fined for assault; in 1883 he was sentenced to seven days, and in 1885 to one month; and in 1892 he was fined £5 for drunkenness and assault. The fellow has been a blackguard all along—and never more so than when he played the "Anti-Infidel" game for all it was worth.

Decent people will think that Powell's career is over. Well, you never can tell. There is an old proverb, the greater the sinner the better the saint. Revivalists never find so much acceptance as when they boast of having been such a "bad lot" before Christ saved them. Walton Powell may take up the Anti-Infidel business again some day—and his old friend, W. R. B., may be still living, and moved by the Lord to welcome the prodigal back to their old profession.

### Acid Drops.

Mr. Foote's lectures at Aberdare moved "A Minister" to write to the *Weekly Post* on "the moral condition" of the locality. By *morals* this anonymous gentleman evidently means *belief*. He deplored the terrible fact that a part of the beautiful Aberdare valley was "a hot-bed of Atheism." The fact that scores of people had no belief in God, in what used to be such a religious place, made him "shudder." He called upon the Churches to be up and doing; let them "dispel the thick cloud of disbelief." Yes, but how? Well, all this anonymous defender of the faith had to propose was the *boycott*. It appears that the Trecynon Nonconformist

League, a little while ago, succeeded in "inducing the local Press not to report atheistic meetings." That was good in its way, but it was not enough. The Bill-posting Company should be called upon to refuse to display the Atheists' "putrid posters." Fancy the "heinous question" on the walls: "Did Jesus Christ Ever Live?" It was "monstrous." Down with "infidel" placards! Let Christian placards have a monopoly of the hoardings in Aberdare! Such is a "A Minister's" recipe for the cure of Atheism; and the impudent bigotry of it is only too worthy of his creed. Yet there is one aspect of his insolent letter which, as the cocoa advertisements say, is "grateful and comforting." This man of God is, in the first place, ashamed to publish his name; in the next place, he has no other reply to Atheism than persecution—which shows that he believes it cannot be defeated with intellectual and moral weapons.

Albert Matthias Stones, Protestant missionary and anti-infidel, of Liverpool, having been ordered on March 26 to pay five shillings a week for sixteen years towards the maintenance of the female child of Ellen Foster, wife of John Foster, appealed against the order before the Sheriff's Court, and lost the day. The Deputy Recorder confirmed the magistrate's decision, and ordered Stones to pay the costs of the appeal. The evidence in the case was particularly nauseous.

Rev. Edwin Champion Wade Hannan having long been intemperate and cruel to his wife, the Divorce Court has granted her a decree of judicial separation. There is no particular moral. There would be if the peccant husband were a Secularist. The moral then would be a yard long.

Those Atheists will go on committing suicide. It is the natural outcome of their principles. There is the case, for instance, of the Rev. Frederic Wilson Sparkes, who lost his wife twelve months ago, and was engaged to be married again—to a schoolmistress; but instead of keeping the engagement he went into the bathroom and cut his throat. So much for Atheism!

Four "colored preachers"—one male and three females—applied to the Fulham Board of Guardians for parochial relief, and have been ordered to be expelled under the Aliens Act. They came over from America to do some revival business here, but found it slower than they expected. We suppose they had been misled by the glowing falsehoods of Torrey and other evangelists, and looked upon this country as the soul-savers' Eldorado.

We read that Mormonism has ten thousand members in England. Elder Petersen, who seems to be at the head of affairs in London, being interviewed by the *Daily Chronicle*, did not shirk the question of polygamy—which, of course, is a Bible institution. He said that the happiest home he ever saw was one in which the husband had five wives and thirty-seven children. But what was Elder Petersen's condition just then? Was he in prohibition State?

Another poverty-stricken disciple of the poor Carpenter of Nazareth! Rev. George Moulton Messiter-Terry, of the Vicarage, Peyhombury, Ottery St. Mary, Devon, left £42,656. We all know where he is now—if the New Testament is true.

Rev. W. W. Howard, of Willington, held debates a great many years ago with Joseph Symes and other Freethought advocates, and used to represent himself as a wonderful infidel-slayer. Listening to him, you would imagine that he had settled the hash of "infidelity" for ever and ever, and a day beyond that. We see, however, that the reverend gentleman has recently been bemoaning the growth of that same "infidelity." Membership and finances of his denomination are both suffering, and the "increased wealth and the love of pleasure amongst the masses of the people" had something to do with it, but "a more important cause was the spirit of infidelity that had been gathering force for the last fifty years." It appears, then, that Mr. Howard's great achievements were all in vain. "Infidelity" is livelier than ever. We tender him our deep sympathy.

That great *Daily Mail* pietist, Mr. Harold Begbie, has been writing on the Education question, on which he is such a high authority. He says it is not the priest who should be kept out of the school. "It is the Atheist," he says, "who must be kept out." This is true enough, from Mr. Harold Begbie's point of view. But when he says "it is the easiest thing in the world" to keep the Atheist out, we venture to think he is mistaken. With the growth of Atheism—and it is growing—Atheist teachers will get more

and more into the schools; and if they are compelled to give religious instruction (or lose their situations) they will take care that it is of the *right color*.

Mr. W. T. Stead, writing an "In Memoriam" article in the *Review of Reviews* on the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, says that "He went down into the valley of the shadow with unfaltering steps, for to him there was no darkness, but beyond the river of death a great light shone." In that case, what room was there for "faltering" and what courage was implied by its absence? We hope Mr. Stead does not imagine that persons who do not share his belief in the "hereafter" die *falteringly*. If he does, any doctor will tell him that he is mistaken. We should also like to ask Mr. Stead why he emphasises Sir Henry's perfect resignation to the will of God? If such a being exists, everybody has got to be reconciled with his will. When a man has to die, is it really a merit on his part to say "All right, God, I'll go"?

"It is over a century since Paine died." This statement appears in the *Review of Reviews*. We thought Mr. Stead was better posted up in relation to Thomas Paine by this time.

Pastor Archibald Brown, like his great predecessor, Charles Haddon Spurgeon, is theologically infallible, and has no toleration for those who differ from him. Like Jeremiah of old, Mr. Brown suffers from a brother-minister who is his greatest obstacle in doing God's work. Jeremiah's opponent was Pashhur, the governor of the temple, while the thorn in Mr. Brown's side is the pastor of the City Temple, whom he politely calls "a professed Christian teacher." Then he refers to two sermons preached on Good Friday and Easter Sunday, in the first of which Mr. Campbell is said to have stated that the death of Jesus has no more to do with the forgiveness of sins than the death of Thomas Cranmer; and in the second, that it does not matter whether Christ rose from the tomb or not. Well, here are two men of God, ordained to the ministry of the Gospel by the Holy Ghost, preaching two diametrically opposite doctrines, and each confidently calling his own the only "real gospel." How lovely the simplicity that is in Christ Jesus!

"We are in the pulpit," says the Rev. J. D. Jones, of Bournemouth, "not to balance probabilities, but to declare what we know." Good; but what do they *know*? If preachers confined themselves to saying what they really know their sermons would be of microscopical proportions. Most of them appear to be engaged at the task of finding out how much their congregations know and adopting their discourses accordingly. At the best of times preachers never did more than tell their congregations what they believed, and the number that are honest enough to do this seems to be rapidly decreasing.

Christians call Jesus Christ King of Kings and Lord of Lords; and the prophecy in the book of Revelation is that "he shall reign for ever and ever," conquering all the kingdoms of the world and making them his own. The Rev. Mr. Jowett assures us that "he shall not be a mock sovereign, to whom we offer ceremony, but deny the sceptre; a sovereign by courtesy, but not by sway; a sovereign who receives recognition on our coins, but not in our hearts; who is followed by our nods and bows and smiles, but not honored by the homage of our arms. No," continues the reverend gentleman, "he shall not be a counterfeit king, a toy king, swathed in impotent purple; he shall be a real king, and he shall reign." Blessed above all words is the verb "shall"; it is the Christian minister's only city of refuge. It is in this "shall" that the Christian religion lives and moves and has its being. The dominant note of this year's May Meetings has been, "We are in a bad way just now, our membership is dwindling, our zeal is cooling; but don't let us lose heart, the future shall be ours." That has been the language of the Church from the beginning; and it is her only safe language. She will employ it until she dies, and with her very last breath she will cry, "He shall reign for ever and ever." It is really most amusing and—most significant.

Really, the Revs. Jacob Primmer and G. Thompson Diver, of Glasgow, are clerics of whom all Scotland may feel justly proud, and from whom Freethought lecturers should learn a precious lesson in common courtesy. Recently, there was conducted in Edinburgh a General Mission to Roman Catholics, in which several priests, with such letters as O.S.B., C.S.S.R., and C.M. after their names, took part. These reverend gentlemen, and they were *gentlemen*, at any rate, stated distinctly that they did not wish to enter into

any kind of controversy, or to attack any views different from their own. Their one object was to expound their Church's doctrines to people who somewhat misunderstood them. They seem to have carried out their purpose very successfully; and Edinburgh, apparently, showed them hospitality, one of their biggest meetings having been held in the Synod Hall.

Then the two Glasgow men of God, full of holy zeal, and bursting with righteous indignation, courageously came out "to the help of the Lord against the mighty." It was an edifying spectacle! "If Papists are Christians," exclaimed man of God number one, "where on God's earth will you find Christians?" There is the true religious ring about that. "If Papists were our Christians, then two-thirds of our Christians were criminals." What perfect taste! Mr. Primmer improved as he went on. "If you want to know what purgatory is," he added, "just put your hand in a priest's pocket, and you will find it there." Their system, he said, was a swindle to get hold of money. Then he called the mission "a fraud-Jesuitry and trickery to deceive the people."

Mr. Diver, Glasgow man of God number two, went one better still, "Papacy, he believed, was the crowning work of the Devil from top to bottom." He did not hesitate to assert that the doctrines of the Church of Rome had damned man and woman for eternity. He closed his onslaught by declaring that the confession, as practised by the Romish Church, had resulted in more immorality, sin, and devilishness than any other institution the world had ever seen. And all these beautiful sentiments were loudly applauded by the people. Comment would be superfluous.

Mr. Mark Judge's excellent letter asking that the art section of the Franco-British Exhibition should be open on Sundays, met, as was to be expected, with a refusal from the Committee. The moral character of the British public is, apparently, so weak, that a walk round an art gallery on Sunday might be expected to have very terrible consequences. M. Yves Guyot endorsed Mr. Judge's letter by writing to the *Times*, pointing out that the closing of the exhibition on Sundays would make it impossible for thousands of French people to visit it through the medium of a week-end trip. He also points out, on behalf of both English and French workmen, that the inspection of scientific or artistic treasures is no longer regarded as an aristocratic privilege, while to make them lose the amount of a day's earnings to visit such an exhibition is to make the visiting of such places a privilege of the well-to-do. He also puts the pertinent query, in reference to the museums already open on Sunday, "Has the opening of the national museums and art galleries exercised a bad moral influence?" M. Guyot's letter is excellent, but it overlooks an important factor—the power of British religious ignorance and bigotry. And so the exhibition will remain closed. French visitors must interest themselves in watching informal exhibitions of British drunkenness, horseplay, and bad manners on the "Sabbath"—of which institution these are partly a product.

Other gentlemen have also written to the papers on the same subject. The fussy secretary of that fussy Society—the Lord's Day Observance Society—writes that the opening of the exhibition would be contrary to the "Divine law"—and, of course, the wishes of the L. D. O. S. Another gentleman, writing from Cardiff, who has "just returned from France," thinks that if Mr. Judge realised the "miserable Sunday" French people have, his letter would never have been written. Well, it all depends upon what is meant by "miserable." Our own experience—and it is the experience of all impartial observers—is that Sunday in France shows less drunkenness, less hooliganism, and offers greater opportunities for healthful recreation and education than is the case in England. Art galleries and museums are well filled with citizens, whose behavior is conspicuously better than that of our own people on a Bank Holiday. And the day of rest of employees is safeguarded by all these institutions being closed on Mondays. Leigh Hunt tells us in his *Autobiography* that after a four years' residence abroad he was "grieved at the succession of sulky faces which I met in the streets of London." What else could be expected when, in his day, the channels of enjoyment and rational development were carefully closed by religious bigotry? Things are a little better to-day, but there is still much to be done. Meanwhile, it would be interesting and educative if those French visitors who can wield a pen were to give the public their impressions of the moralising value of the British Sunday as compared with their own.

The Medical Officer of Health for Swansea has issued a circular letter to the churches and chapels within his district, calling attention to the danger of using a common communion cup. It is, he says, "a fruitful cause of conveying the germs of disease" from one person to another. Diseases of the mouth, throat, and nose are freely communicated in this manner. One more benefit that religion has conferred upon the community.

It is of the utmost importance, says the *Methodist Times*, that India and China should be brought to realise that "British civilisation rests upon a Christian foundation." The only ones that such a result is important to are the missionaries, for they are the only parties immediately interested in the acceptance of such a thumping falsehood. British civilisation no more rests upon Christianity than it does upon the story of the man in the moon. All the most important elements in our legal, political, and social life are based upon principles that have no connection whatever with Christianity. Any history of jurisprudence, or any good history of England, will prove this. But Christian teachers go on, generation after generation, repeating the same falsehoods, until they assume a semi-sacred character, and are uttered and accepted without reflection. For persistent lying—conscious and unconscious—Christian advocacy occupies a first place in the world's history.

After all the glowing reports telling of how native races in India, China, and elsewhere were longing for the gospel, their wholesale conversions, and the rapid change the new beliefs brought—some issued by Mr. Wardlaw Thompson himself—that gentleman's recent declaration is interesting. The truth, he says, is that "men are not hungering for the bread of life, their conceptions of the character of God and the nature of sin cannot be changed in a day; the rebellious heart does not want to leave its evil, and has no desire to be cleansed. Thus it comes to pass that, with all our organisations, with all our means, progress seems imperceptible, and the heart grows sick." This is, we daresay, near the truth, and means, in plain English, that natives are not converted, and that missionary yarns are mostly lies. But what of the many millions that have been extracted from a credulous British public by stories and reports exactly the reverse of what the Secretary of the London Missionary Society now says is the truth?

To distinguish the Colonial Missionary Society from the London Missionary Society, the secretary of the former makes the following naïve observation: "The Missionary Movement of the last century was to Christianise the heathen; the Colonial Movement of to-day is largely an attempt to prevent the heathenising of Christians." Clearly this innocent official did not perceive the true inwardness of his statement, or he would have put it very differently. The inevitable inference that must be drawn from it is, that Christianity is just a coat of paint which soon wears off unless periodically renewed by experienced workmen. This is very lucky for the workmen, the spiritual painters, but most injurious to the objects painted, because paint is good only for *dead matter*, not for living beings.

We have more than once said that ladies, in pursuit of the suffrage, who appeal to violence, are giving away their own game—besides injuring the dearest interest of the community; for free and orderly discussion is far more important than the vote itself. We have pointed out that violence is a policy in which women are bound to be beaten. They may appear to gain for a little while, but that is only as long as men are withheld from retaliating out of deference to their sex. When that deference breaks down woman necessarily suffers, and is soon tossed along like a cork on a roaring flood. The lady who rang a bell to prevent Mr. Churchill from being heard at Dundee overlooked a very important fact; namely, that she had not patented the idea, which anybody else was perfectly free to adopt. And it has been adopted with a vengeance. Several women's meetings have been broken up since, notably one at Pontypridd, where Mrs. Fawcett and Mrs. Despard could not get a hearing, and the meeting had to be abandoned. Mrs. Despard seems to have approved the bell-ringing policy at Dundee. By this time she must understand how dangerous a policy it was for those who started it. When men mean business they will always beat women at ringing bells, blowing whistles, and creating uproar. To put it in another way, the male will always beat the female at hooliganism.

The London Missionary Society has accumulated deficiencies amounting to £37,715. During last year expenditure exceeded income by nearly £8,000. This is another sign that the days of Foreign Missions are numbered.

The British and Foreign Bible Society boasts that it has translated and published the Bible, in whole or in part, in 412 different languages. Well, that doesn't make it any truer—does it?

Great is the responsibility of Mr. R. J. Campbell. In a populous district in South Wales his New Theology has taken deep root. One of his converts was a Wesleyan minister, who became a Socialist, and took to preaching only a human Christ. When a missionary went to conduct a revival in that minister's church, he found the heavens as brass. For a week he "preached Christ and Christ and Christ," but there were absolutely no conversions. But one night the minister arose and said, "There will be no conversions in this church until the minister has been converted." Then he fell at the Communion rail, in the presence of all the people, and gave himself anew to Jesus. The following Sunday night there were forty seekers, five-and-thirty of them being men." Later the minister invited the missionary into his garden to see a fire. He had set light to all the anti-Christian and Unitarian books which had helped to lead him astray. Then the two men stood side by side and sang the Doxology. Such is the stuff that goes down and elicits loud and prolonged applause at the May meetings. Is it any wonder that the churches are being forsaken by thoughtful people?

The Rev. Principal Fairbairn, of Mansfield College, Oxford, has just contributed to the *Manchester Guardian* what may be termed, on the whole, an eminently sane deliverance on the vexed subject of education in Government schools. The Principal is, of course, a Nonconformist of the Congregational persuasion, and, as such, he cannot afford to allow to pass unimproved a single opportunity to gird at the Established Church, with its "unqualified, uneducated curate"; but we are glad to find that he also taunts his Nonconformist brethren with their reasonable attitude to the traditions of their Puritan fathers. He maintains, further, that if the State is to establish and endow any religion in its schools, it should be identical with the religion it has already established and endowed in its pulpits, which is an entirely reasonable contention. As between the Churches merely, the present heated controversy should, therefore, be settled in favor of the State Church.

But the Principal looks at the question from a much broader and juster point of view, which has been the *Freethinker's* point of view all along, and comes to the following conclusions:—

1. We cannot allow the legitimacy of any demand for instruction in religion. This is a broad principle, here broadly stated, but we are quite clear that if the State is allowed to select the religion to be taught in its schools, there is no standing ground in reason to prevent it authorising the religion which is to be preached in the Church.
2. The supremacy of the State, as a State, must be maintained, but in its own sphere. That sphere is neither spiritual nor religious, but secular; and the schools it creates and maintains must be created and maintained in harmony with its genuine character.
3. The State, as a State, cannot act against the conscience of the people. This is not a counsel of perfection, but a maxim of practical politics, incorporated in the very idea of the modern State. It means that the State, as such, leaves the question of distinction and discussion in religion to the Church, and can touch only what has a civil character.
4. The teacher must be, like every other political and Government official, free from theological tests; and he can be this only provided he is free from the obligation to teach religion, or belong to a special Church."

We heartily commend the above to the notice and earnest study of Dr. Clifford, in particular, and to that of the other Free Church leaders in general. Dr. Clifford is everlastingly talking sheer nonsense about the sanctity of freedom, the glory of unsectarianism, and the inalienable rights of citizenship, while, at the same time, advocating the impossible system of Simple Bible Teaching. How a sane man can simultaneously support two diametrically opposite and mutually destructive policies, passes our humble comprehension. May the Oxford Principal's timely warning receive its due attention in the proper quarters.

It is curious, writes Dr. Warschauer, how many theological difficulties are due to a mental fog! We advise Dr. Warschauer not to be too venturesome. It may well be that if he succeeds in dissipating the fog he will find that the theology has disappeared with it. To think in a fog and act in a fuss is the natural condition of a Christian—particularly those with a leaning to politics.

If God is dependent upon his servants for information about the condition of the world, how hopelessly bewildered he must be. One of them said to him the other day, "O Lord, the world is getting worse and worse continually! Gracious Father, come quickly, and save it." Another, almost simultaneously, informed him thus: "Surely the world is better now than it was long ago." Every minute he is receiving thousands of contradictory reports concerning this, that, and the other. No wonder he hesitates to act. The Rev. Dr. Warschauer is positive that he is conscious of all that is going on. Then, poor God, how awfully bored he must feel!

The Bishop of Rochester is a *rara avis*—which meaneth a rare bird, something out of the way and uncommon. His lordship says that the thirty-seven dioceses in England must be increased, and rapidly. But how is the money to be got? "There is a very simple way," his lordship says, "of doing this. Take thirty-seven bishops and halve their salaries, and you double the number of bishoprics." Good! And yet our heart is full of misgivings. This must portend something. A bishop proposing a decrease of 50 per cent. in his own salary! We wonder if the end of the world is approaching. When the lord Hamlet is told that the world is turning honest, he replies, "Then is doomsday near."

"Inquirer," in the *Ayr Advertiser*, asked if it was true, as alleged, that "Police Court crime was much reduced since the Salvation Army revival began." The editor applied to Captain Lowdon, chief constable, for information. That gentleman gave the figures of persons (adults) apprehended or cited during seventeen weeks from January 1 in 1907 and 1908. The figures for corresponding weeks in the two years varied very considerably, but the totals worked out at 378 in 1907 and 374 in 1908. This disposes of the Salvation Army boast.

The "Army" also boasted of having made 1,691 converts up to date. Adjutant Boyce, of this wonderful "Army," was civilly asked whether these figures were really accurate. Had they been checked? were the names and addresses kept? had any lapsed? Adjutant Boyce gave the usual answer of the Salvation Army to critics and inquirers. "I fail to see," he wrote to the editor, "that any good purpose will come out of the controversy through your paper respecting the revival." At a meeting subsequently Adjutant Boyce suggested that such questions were "a very great reflection, not only on the work of the Salvation Army, but on God himself." Which is the very attitude and language of charlatany.

All religions die of being found out. So do all religious bodies. And the turn of the Salvation Army is at hand.

The *Ayrshire Post*, which helped Adjutant Boyce in working off his imaginary statistics upon the local public, has a writer of paragraphs under the heading of "Oculus." Someone has been sending him the *Freethinker*, and he begs it may not be sent him again as it is full of "rank bias-phemy." He says that he means to go on trusting in the "old, old story, which is authenticated as each spring comes round, and the 'dead' seeds and roots rise again and live." What a botanist! And what a reasoner! It is precisely because the seeds and roots were not "dead" that they "rise again."

In the same number of the *Ayrshire Post*, we see the report of a local embezzlement case, in which a highly-respectable and most "religious" draper, named Robert M'Vicar, was charged with having appropriated to his own use various sums amounting to £9,000 belonging to the Ayr and Newton Consumers Gas Company, of which he was chairman, secretary, and treasurer. Prisoner was found guilty and sentenced to seven years' penal servitude. We understand that Robert M'Vicar was for half his lifetime a pillar of the Wee Free Kirk; that the frauds are said to amount actually to £20,000, but he was only put on trial for the £9,000; and that he has left destitute nearly every relative from whom he could borrow. Of course, this "light of the church" didn't read the *Freethinker* either.

The tower of St. Botolph's Church, Boston, was struck by lightning recently and seriously damaged. Half a ton of masonry went crashing through the lead roof of the belfry. "He doeth all things well."

Mr. George Harwood, M.P., says that "five-sixths of the Bible is historical fact." Really! If Mr. Harwood's statements in Parliament are as trustworthy as his calculations concerning the Bible, the House of Commons is possessed of a rare gem—of a kind.



## Mr. Foote's Engagements.

June 7, N. S. S. Conference, Manchester.

## To Correspondents.

C. COHEN'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—May 24, a. and e., Victoria Park; 31, a. and e., Parliament Hill.—Address: 241 High-road, Leyton.

THE PRESIDENT'S HONORARIUM FUND: Previously acknowledged.—Donations, £165: Annual Subscriptions, £182 1s. Received since.—Dr. Henry Smith, 10s. 6d.; C. S. Knight, 8s.

T. DEARDEN.—Pleased to hear that Mr. Wishart had a good and successful meeting at Wigan.

A. GORDON.—Only one volume of Wheeler's *Footsteps of the Past* was published.

H. P. (Cardiff).—Sound sense, but no more. Poetry does not consist in writing lines that rhyme. There can be poetry in prose. Neither can a "first attempt" be of any importance to anybody but the attempter. Would you not smile at a man who offered you his "first attempt" in the form of (say) a pair of boots? We say frankly to all our readers: Never write verses unless you must. Things are always better said in plain prose, except to born poets. And the born poet is not frequent.

R. J. HENDERSON.—Glad you were "much pleased" with our Paine article.

SOUTH DEVON.—Biblical English was not the language of "the early Tudor period"—or any other period. We defy anybody to produce evidence of your assertion, which we have seen before. The *Book of Homilies* is good Tudor English—and religious English; but it isn't a bit like Bible English. Wickliffe himself, who began English translation, long before, did not write Bible English himself. We have his writings to prove it. We went into the matter in our *Book of God*, and you will find more on the subject in Dr. Marsh's *Lectures on the English Language*.

W. P. BALL.—Thanks again for cuttings.

J. G. DOBSON.—Glad to have your good opinion of Mr. Wishart's lecture at Bury. The N. S. S. will do all that is possible in that direction.

JAMES TULLIN, 89 St. Leonard-street, Sunderland, will be glad to hear from local Freethinkers who would like to see Secular propaganda revived in the town.

E. PHILLIPS.—See paragraph. Thanks.

H. BLACK.—The N. S. S. Conference is a purely business gathering and, consequently, only open to members of the N. S. S. Non-members will, of course, be welcome at the evening public meeting.

ENQUIRER.—(1) The man Stones, who is in trouble at Liverpool, probably merits your description. We have always heard of him as a peculiarly vulgar dealer in personalities, both against Catholics and Atheists—the two logical extremes. (2) It is indeed high time that thoughtful Socialists made a strong stand against the smothering of their movement in Christian slush.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Sugar Plums.

This number of the *Freethinker* will be in the hands of a good many of our London readers in time for them to see this reminder of the social gathering at Anderton's Hotel, Fleet-street, on Thursday evening (May 21). This is the first of a series of such gatherings. They will probably be held monthly in future, their object being to bring London Secularists more into personal touch with each other, and to promote acquaintance and friendship amongst them. To

this end there will be plenty of opportunity for introductions and conversation; a little music, etc., being included by way of variety. The expenses are borne by the N. S. S. Executive, and consequently there will be no charge whatever for admission. Members of the N. S. S. may introduce a friend. Non-members wishing to attend must obtain a ticket of admission from the Secretary. We hope to hear of a first-rate attendance on the opening night. Mr. Foote will "preside," and Messrs. Cohen, Lloyd, Davies, Roger, and other members of the Executive will be present.

Provincial members of the N. S. S. who happen to be visiting London will, of course, be quite free to attend these social gatherings, and will be very heartily welcomed.

We publish this week the full Agenda of the National Secular Society's Annual Conference, which is to be held at Manchester on Whit-Sunday. Several important and interesting matters are down for discussion. We may add that the President will have a pleasant announcement to make as an informal addendum to the Annual Report. There should be a good muster of Branch delegates and individual members from all parts of Great Britain. Scotland and Wales ought to be fairly represented this time. Manchester is easily accessible for both of them.

Delegates or individual members who are going to the Conference, and who require accommodation at hotels or otherwise, should lose no time in communicating with the Branch Secretary, Mrs. E. M. Pegg, 15 Mytton-street, Hulme, Manchester.

The tickets for the luncheon at the Merchant's Hotel, Oldham-street, Piccadilly, between the morning and afternoon sittings of the Conference, are 2s. each; and, as the number of seats at the tables is limited, early application should be made, by those who would not like to be disappointed, to the General Secretary, Miss E. M. Vance, 2 Newcastle-street, London, E.C.

The Manchester Branch is arranging an outing for the Monday for the benefit of delegates and visitors. There is to be a Circular Drive to Knutsford, in Cheshire, and back, through as fine a country as any in England. Tickets for the drive are 2s. 6d. each. Hot lunch at Knutsford another 2s. In this case, too, the number is limited, and early application should be made to Mrs. Pegg. We understand that fine weather has been duly ordered.

Mr. Cohen lectures in Victoria Park this afternoon and evening (May 24). East London "saints" should bring their more orthodox friends along.

Liverpool "saints" are requested to note that both Mr. Wishart's open-air meetings to-day (May 24) will take place at Shiel Park Gates.

The *Aberdare Leader* reports Mr. Foote's recent lectures as fairly as could be expected. "Fairplay"—these Christian critics are all anonymous!—advises the Secularists to be more serious (he means more *solemn*) in their lectures. He says that in Mr. Foote "the Secularist platform has deprived the Stage of a fine wit." We understand the Christian objection to *wit*. It is the most fatal of weapons against superstition.

We congratulate the Leeds N. S. S. Branch on its raising once more the question of its right to make collections and sell literature, as other bodies do, at meetings in the Parks and Recreation Grounds. Three years ago the Parks Committee refused to allow the Branch to exercise the same right as other citizens, and refusal is also the fate of the present application. The action of the Parks' Committee was challenged at a Council meeting by Mr. Badley. Mr. Firth replied that the Committee was unanimous on account of the Society's "filthy literature"—which we defy this gentleman, or any of his colleagues, to specify. Mr. Willey, a police-court lawyer, also talked about the Society's "indecent literature"—and we extend the same defiance to him. Alderman Hepton said it was "disgusting"—which epithet is applicable to his manners. The whole discussion illustrated the old truth that bigots are often blackguards.

We are informed that at a service in the Jerusalem Baptist Church, Pentrebach, S. Wales, last Sunday morning, the pastor said that "It gave him great pleasure to be able to say that during the last seven or eight years of his ministry in that locality he had had the privilege and pleasure of baptising no less than fifty-three persons; but it pained him to have to admit that none of them were in the church to-day."

The poor man of God has our sympathy. At the same time, we rejoice at the cause of his mourning.

The late Gerald Massey, who devoted his life and his small means to the writing and publication of his great Freethought works showing the Egyptian origin of most of Christianity, was receiving a Civil List pension which expired with him. He has left a widow between 70 and 80 years of age, and four daughters, two of whom are virtually invalids. A fund is being raised for their benefit, and we sincerely hope it will be adequate. A nucleus was formed by the kind donation of £200 by the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman from the Royal Bounty Fund. We should like to forward the Treasurer (James Robertson, Esq., 5 Granby-terrace, Hillhead, Glasgow) a collective subscription from our readers, to mark their admiration of Gerald Massey's whole-hearted devotion to the great cause of Truth and Reason. We put ourselves down for a guinea, and hope we shall receive donations to go with it when we remit to the Treasurer. We shall acknowledge such donations in these columns—as usual.

Mr. Hector Macpherson, who knew Spencer personally, wrote the review of the *Life and Letters* in the *Daily Chronicle*. The following passage is worth reproducing:—

"A word or two may be said of Spencer's attitude to religion. One of the remarkable features of his mental development was that he did not pass through what is known as a religious crisis. When he was a young man the air was thick with religious controversies. Considering Spencer's upbringing, one would expect him to have gone through the soul-torturing experiences so common among young men of the period. We find in him none of the spiritual wrestlings which Carlyle depicts in *Sartor Resartus*, none of the conflict of opinions and clash of ideals which we find in George Eliot, not even the sense of spiritual dissatisfaction which haunted Mill as revealed in his *Autobiography*. Impressed with his detachment from the religious life of the time, I once asked Spencer if he had ever had mental wrestlings with Christianity. He replied that he never had. Christianity, as presented to the modern mind, never appealed to him at all. His mind lay outside of it from the first."

"Christianity never appealed to him at all." We thank Mr. Macpherson for placing this utterance of Spencer's on record.

## The Sayings of Jesus.—VIII.

(Continued from p. 310.)

WE are told in the Gospels that from the period called "the beginning" Jesus had dwelt with "the Father" in heaven, and that "when the fulness of time came, God sent forth his son" to redeem all mankind. Jesus himself is represented as saying:—

"I came forth, and am come from God; for neither have I come of myself, but he sent me.....Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was born, I am [*i.e.*, was in existence].....And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John viii. 42, 58; xvii. 5).

If this statement and others to the same effect be true, as all good Christians believe, Jesus had a perfect knowledge of heaven and its inhabitants, of the Creator whom he calls "the Father," and of everything said and done there. Assuming the Gospel statements to be true, we should expect to find full and detailed information upon these and a host of other matters. Having come from the heavenly country beyond the skies, Jesus would surely have acquainted his disciples, if not the general public, with all that awaited them there, including the social relations, conditions, and occupations of the blessed in that place. We have now to see what information on these or any other points the Christian Savior has actually given.

1. Christ's description of God. Since Jesus is said to have been in personal contact with "the Father" from time immemorial, it is somewhat disappointing to find that all he says of the nature or appearance of this celestial Being is the following:—

"God is a spirit" (John iv. 24).

What are we to understand by this statement? Presumably that "God" is not a solid body, but something impalpable, intangible, and invisible. Jesus does not offer any further explanation; he seems to have thought that the words "God is a spirit"—or "God is wind"—were full and sufficient. But what

idea does the word "spirit" or "wind" give us of God? It tells us nothing. Clearly, then, Jesus (or the Gospel writer) knew nothing about God. Such a description is certainly not what we should expect from one who had dwelt for ages, and held communion, with this "God" in heaven. It is merely that of a man who had noticed that in the Book of Enoch the deity was called "the Lord of Spirits," and who inferred from that title that that mythical Being must be of the nature of *spirit*. The Book of Enoch was regarded by the early Christians as an inspired writing, and is referred to by the writer of the Epistle of Jude (14-15), who quotes a passage from it, and who actually believed it to have been written by the mythical Enoch mentioned in Gen. i. 21-24, and to have been preserved from destruction in the ark by the equally mythical Noah—an example of Christian credulity that probably beats all records.

2. Christ's statement respecting marriage in heaven. In two of the Gospels it is related that "certain of the Pharisees" endeavored to puzzle Jesus by asking (in a hypothetical case of a woman who had had seven husbands): "In the resurrection therefore whose wife of them shall she be? for the seven had her to wife." The answer put in the mouth of Jesus is as follows:—

"The sons of this world marry and are given in marriage; but they that are accounted worthy to attain to that world, and the resurrection of the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: for neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels, and are the sons of God, being sons of the resurrection" (Luke xx. 35-36).

Now, it is obvious that no knowledge of the relations of sex that obtained in heaven is evinced in this reply. Jesus says nothing that throws any light upon the subject. Will the two sexes meet and hold intercourse with each other there? or will sex cease to exist? In the heaven described in the *Essene Book of Revelation* there are no women: the ransomed of the Jewish nation are given as 144,000 *men* "which were not defiled with women" (xiv. 4). Will friends be able to recognise each other there? Will they appear in their natural bodies, or be spirits without bodies? Will clothes be worn in heaven? Will food be necessary? In short, what real information does Jesus give of the life awaiting believers in heaven? He gives none whatever, and the reason is plain: the Gospel writer had no knowledge of celestial matters. The reply which he has put in the mouth of Jesus contained all the information he was able to collect from the Jewish "holy books"—in this case the Book of Enoch. In that ancient Apocalypse the "Lord of Spirits" says to the fallen angels:—

"You.....have polluted yourselves with women..... and have done as flesh and blood do. These, however, die and perish; therefore have I given to them wives.....But you from the beginning were made spiritual, possessing a life which is eternal, and not subject to death for ever. Therefore I made not wives for you, because being spiritual, your dwelling is in heaven" (Enoch xv. 3-7).

The same imaginative Jewish writer says of the "Lord of Spirits":—

"He shall select the righteous and holy.....and all shall become angels in heaven"—"None shall perish in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, neither shall they be capable of perishing" (Enoch l. 24; lx. 7).

Here we see that men who "die and perish" are allowed wives; but that angels who are immortal have none: also, that the righteous "shall become angels" in heaven—and consequently will not be allowed wives—"neither shall they be capable of perishing," or in the words ascribed to Jesus "neither can they die any more." The last sentence gives the clue to the source.

3. The Mansions in the skies. In one of the Gospels, Jesus is represented as saying to his disciples:—

"In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so, I would have told you; for I go to prepare a place for you.....I come again, and will receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also" (John xiv. 2-3).

No one can say that this statement displays any knowledge of heaven. Jesus simply says that in that celestial kingdom there are many "abiding places"—nothing more. But what is the meaning of the ridiculous expression "If it were not so, I would have told you"? Does it mean that the disciples ought to have known that the social and domestic arrangements in heaven are precisely the same as those existing on earth? If not, what does it mean? What information respecting heaven do we derive from this Gospel statement? Absolutely none. What are these "mansions" like? The word in the Greek only means "abodes" or "abiding-places," and therefore tells us nothing. Are they wide halls capable of seating large numbers of saints? or are they small rooms like those in a block of model dwellings? Are they occupied by both sexes indiscriminately? or are sets of buildings set apart for each sex? What are the arrangements for sleeping? Is sleep necessary in heaven? How do the believers employ their time? Do they pass the whole of it in twanging harps and singing praises of the Father? Are there fields, trees, mountains, and lakes in heaven? What, in short, is this heavenly kingdom like? Nobody knows. If Jesus really came from that abode of bliss, how is it that he has given us no information upon any of these points? The answer is simple: the Gospel writers knew nothing save what they had read in the "holy books," which in this case was limited to the following bald statements:—

Enoch xxxix. 4. "There I saw another vision: I saw the habitations and couches of the saints. There my eyes beheld their habitations with the angels, and their couches with the holy ones."

Enoch xlv. 3. "In that day shall the Elect One sit upon a throne of glory, and shall choose their conditions and countless habitations for those who have fled for protection to my holy and glorious name."

2 Esd. ii. 11. "Their glory also will I take unto me, and give these the eternal tabernacles which I had prepared for them."

As we have seen, Jesus is made to say "I go to prepare a place for them." The third Gospel writer had heard of the "eternal tabernacles," for he makes Jesus say in a parable:—

"— that when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles" (Luke xvi. 9).

Thus, the amount of knowledge displayed by Jesus concerning things heavenly accords exactly with that contained in the pre-existing sacred writings to which the Gospel writer had access. Enoch had used the somewhat indefinite term "habitations"; Jesus could therefore say nothing more definite than "abodes" or "abiding-places."

4. The disciples to sit upon thrones. In the First Gospel, Jesus is represented as saying to his disciples:—

"Ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (Matt. xix. 28).

This promise included Judas Iscariot who, later on, is described as a traitor. It also implies that there were twelve tribes amongst the Jews in the time of Christ, when, according to the Old Testament accounts, there were only three—Judah, Benjamin, and Levi.

In this case, as in the last, the Gospel writer drew his inspiration from the Book of Enoch, in which (cv. 26) the "Lord of Spirits" is represented as saying:—

"I will bring them into the splendid light of those who love my holy name; and I will place each of them on a throne of glory."

On another occasion, known only to the compiler Luke, Jesus is represented as saying to seventy imaginary disciples:—

"But rejoice that your names are written in heaven" (Luke x. 20).

In this case, also, no actual knowledge of heaven

was required. The following passages were written before the compilation of any of the Gospels:—

Psalm lxxix. 28. "Let them be blotted out of the Book of Life, and not written with the righteous."

Dan. xii. 1. "Every one that shall be found written in the book."

Rev. xxi. 27. "but only they which are written in the Lamb's Book of Life."

Rev. xxi. 14. "And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and on them twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb."

No other recorded utterance of Jesus shows the smallest knowledge of things heavenly. Though that much-lauded individual declared he had come straight from heaven, he has given us no information upon anything connected with that realm of the blessed. How are we to account for such silence? What should we think of a man who professed to have travelled through the whole of the interior of Africa, yet could not tell us a single fact regarding the country or its inhabitants, except that the latter had "dwelling places"? We should not be far wrong in thinking that the man had never been in the districts mentioned at all. Further, would it cause us to alter our opinion if the so-said traveller, when pressed, repeated two or three alleged geographical facts—known, later on, to be erroneous—which we found recorded in an ancient text-book, long out of date? I rather think not; yet this is the case of the Jesus of the Gospels.

But even the words ascribed to Jesus with which this paper opens—that he had lived from the beginning with "the Father" in heaven—were suggested by a passage in the same veracious "Book of Enoch the prophet." This passage reads:—

Enoch lxi. 10. "— for from the beginning the Son of man existed in secret, whom the Most High preserved in the presence of his power, and revealed to the elect."

The early Christians believed Jesus to be the "Son of man" named in the books of Daniel and Enoch; hence everything stated respecting that mythical personage in those two works of fiction was boldly and confidently asserted of their almost equally mythical Lord and Savior.

ABRACADABRA.

(To be continued.)

## Shelley Letters.—IV.

THE most interesting and valuable part of this correspondence, we should say, is that which relates to, and throws light upon, what may be called "the case of Harriet." It contains Shelley's own account of his marriage with Harriet Westbrook, and a few letters of hers to Miss Hitchener—which we propose to deal with first.

Harriet's first letter to Miss Hitchener is dated from Keswick on January 26, 1812. Its general tone and sentiments are probably a reflection of her husband's greater mind; but, even allowing for that, it creates a very favorable impression of her on the reader's mind. One passage is infinitely pathetic; not in itself, but in view of the tragedy in which she was caught and whirled to her doom. She was going over to Ireland with Shelley, and as she had never been on the sea before she wondered what effect it would have upon her—"though now," she says, "I can bear the journey better than if I were you know what; which I do not expect will be the case for some time—years perhaps." This language is not derived from her husband—it is the child-wife's own; and there is a certain sweet artless innocence about it that brings the moisture to one's eyes. She was to have children; she was to be hurried from them in a pitiful death; and they were to grow up beyond their father's care, and to die long after her and him, in old age, without the least knowledge of his greatness.

Mr. Dobell has the following reference to this

letter of Harriet's, which was finished by Shelley himself:—

"Nor is it possible to read Harriet's portion of this letter without a sense of pity and compassion for her as well as for the other actors in this unique drama. It is hardly possible to reflect on the whole pitiful story without feeling that that stern and immutable fate which was the chief agent in the Greek tragic drama was here also hurrying its victims forward to their inescapable doom."

This is a point that we shall return to presently.

In a later letter written from Dublin, Harriet tells "My dear Portia" (Shelley's nickname for the "sister of my soul") that things are very bad there, and one perceives that she wanted to see her husband safe out of the situation. She pities the poor working people, who often want bread, and even the beggars, though it is no use relieving them. "Poor creatures," she says so naively, "they live more on whiskey than anything, for meat is so dear they cannot afford to purchase any."

But the most important letter of Harriet's is the third, written from Dublin on March 14, 1812, in which she chats with engaging confidence about herself to Miss Hitchener. She says that in her very young days she admired the red-coats, and thought them the best as well as the most fascinating men in the world—though she used to declare that she would never marry one. "This," she adds, in her ingenuous way, "was not so much on account of their vices as from the idea of their being killed." She thought, if she married anyone, it should be a clergyman; but this strange idea, as she calls it, was the result of her being brought up in the Christian religion. And then she proceeds:—

"You may conceive with what horror I first heard that Percy was an atheist; at least, so it was given out at Clapham. At first I did not comprehend the meaning of the word: therefore, when it was explained, I was truly petrified. I wondered how he could live a moment, professing such principles, and solemnly declared that he should never change mine. I little thought of the rectitude of these principles; and, when I wrote to him, I used to try to shake them,—making sure he was in the wrong, and that myself was right. Yet I would listen to none of his arguments, so afraid I was that he should shake my belief. At the same time I believed in eternal punishment, and was dreadfully afraid of his supreme Majesty the Devil: I thought I should see him if I listened to his arguments. I often dreamed of him, and felt such terror when I heard his name mentioned! This was the effect of a bad education, and living with Methodists. Now, however, this is entirely done away with, and my soul is no longer shackled with such idle fears."

All this is extremely interesting. And what a delicious touch is that about the bad education and the living with Methodists! There are other charming touches in the same letter. They help to persuade us that Harriet really deserved the compliments that Hogg paid her, and that the portrait he painted of her is fairly true to the original.

Why did Shelley marry her? The answer to this question must, of course, very largely govern our view of the subsequent separation, and its tragic consequences. It is so easy to apportion praise and blame; it is so difficult to form a disinterested judgment on the whole of the facts.

Mr. Dobell takes the following view of Shelley's first marriage:—

"It is plain enough that it was no over-mastering passion on Shelley's part which caused it; but rather pity for the lady's real or imaginary distresses which led him, in the spirit of a knight-errant, to rescue her from her persecutors. But Shelley was very young, and Harriet was younger; and as the French say, What would you? At nineteen and sixteen we seldom consider what the future consequences of our actions are likely to be. Had it been an ordinary boy and girl marriage, it might have turned out happily enough; but Shelley was a genius, and his wife—was not."

This seems to us perfectly true in the main, though we shall have something to say in criticism of the last sentence.

Fortunately we have in one of these letters a first-hand statement of the circumstances which led up

to that ill-fated marriage. Shelley writes thus to Miss Hitchener:—

"Some time ago when my sister was at Mrs. Fenning's school, she contracted an intimacy with Harriet. At that period I attentively watched over my sister, designing, if possible, to add her to the list of the good, the disinterested, the free. I desired therefore to investigate Harriet's character: for which purpose I called on her, requested to correspond with her, designing that her advancement should keep pace with, and possibly accelerate, that of my sister. Her ready and frank acceptance of my proposal pleased me; and though with ideas the remotest to those which had led to this conclusion of our intimacy, [I] continued to correspond with her for some time. The frequency of her letters became greater during my stay in Wales. I answered them: they became interesting. They contained complaints of the irrational conduct of her relations, and the misery of living where she could love no one. Suicide was her favorite theme, her total uselessness was urged in its defence. This I admitted, supposing she could prove her inutility, [and that she] was powerless. Her letters became more and more [gloomy.] At length one assumed a tone of such despair as induced me to quit Wales precipitately. I arrived in London. I was shocked at observing the alteration in her looks. Little did I divine its cause: she had become violently attached to me, and feared that I should not return her attachment. Prejudice made the confession painful. It was impossible to avoid being much affected. I promised to unite my fate with hers. I stayed in London several days, during which she recovered her spirits. I had promised at her bidding to come again to London. They endeavored to compel her to return to a school where malice and pride embittered every hour: she wrote to me. I came to London. I proposed marriage, for the reasons which I have given you, and she complied."

Now this is an unimpeachable piece of evidence. It was not written after a quarrel had broken out, but while husband and wife were living together quite happily. Shelley concludes the foregoing statement respecting his marriage by calling Harriet "noble" and "lovely." He was very much attached to her just then, and therefore not likely to represent his pre-nuptial affection as less ardent than it was. We may take it, then, that Shelley married Harriet, as Mr. Dobell says, not from any over-mastering passion, but in a spirit of knight-errantry. And the sequel must be held to show that a man's virtues, as well as his vices, may be his own undoing. For the plain truth is that nature makes no distinction between mistakes and crimes, but punishes both with absolute impartiality. It makes no difference, if you stand near the edge of a cliff, whether you jump off or fall off; in either case, your neck is broken at the bottom.

Shelley married Harriet, not only against his interests, but against his principles; that is to say, against the principles he held at that time. What a lad of nineteen thinks about abstract ideas may be of some importance; what he thinks about practical life must be relatively unimportant. Shelley's early Atheism, therefore, might be worthy of our attention, even if we declined to trouble ourselves about his early hostility to the institution of marriage. The fact remains, however, that he was opposed to that institution. Even after his own marriage he writes to Miss Hitchener:—

"Miss Weeke's marriage induces you to think marriage an evil. I think it an evil—an evil of immense and extensive magnitude: but I think a previous reformation in myself—and that a general and a great one—is requisite before it may be remedied."

Shelley is actually at pains to explain to Miss Hitchener why he went through the marriage ceremony; and it must be remembered, in reference to his opening words, that there was no *civil* marriage in England then, the matrimonial knot having to be tied by a clergyman:—

"You will enquire how I, an Atheist, chose to subject myself to the ceremony of marriage,—how my conscience could consent to it. This is all I am now anxious of elucidating. Why I united myself thus to a female, as it is not in itself immoral, can make no part in diminution of my rectitude: *this*, if misconceived, may.

I am indifferent to reputation: all are not. Reputation, and its consequent advantages, are rights to which every individual may lay claim, unless he has justly forfeited them by an immoral action. Political rights also, which justly appertain equally to each, ought only to be forfeited by immorality. Yet both of these must be dispensed with, if two people live together without having undergone the ceremony of marriage. How unjust this is! Certainly it is not inconsistent with morality to evade these evils. How useless to attempt, by singular examples, to renovate the face of society, until reasoning has made so comprehensive a change as to emancipate the experimentalists from the resulting evils, and the prejudice with which his opinion (which ought to have weight, for the sake of virtue) would be heard by the immense majority!—These are my reasons."

Everything connected with Shelley's first marriage is creditable to his heart—and equally discreditable to his head. He was so young, so inexperienced, so innocent; and he blundered out of pure chivalry into a romance that was so likely to prove tragical. Harriet was still younger, and her inexperience and innocence were a match for his. They were neither *full grown*—in any sense of the words. Their unfitness for each other was not then apparent; when it became obvious, as each developed, a calamity of some sort was inevitable. Not that we quite agree with Dobell with regard to Shelley's being a genius, and Harriet's not being one, as the simple and satisfactory explanation of their eventual disagreement and separation. We very much doubt whether Mary had any more genius than Harriet. Nor do we conceive it to be necessary that a man of genius should marry a woman of genius. Husband and wife do not live together with their geniuses; they live together with their characters. The most subtle and powerful bonds of life depend on personality. And it is perfectly clear that Harriet, in developing her own nature, with her sister's unfortunate help, clashed more and more with the developing nature of Shelley. There is no necessity or justification for blaming either of them. We loathe a good deal of what we have read in censure of Harriet, as we depise much that we have read in dispraise of Shelley. Fate caught them in a trap; and one was slain, and the other injured for life. And instead of coldly sitting in judgment upon them, we should think of them with awful pity as victims of the "Blind Necessity" of things—sufferers under the "weary weight" of "this unintelligible world."

We intended to let this article be the last, but we find we must add one on Shelley's opinions.

G. W. FOOTE.

## National Secular Society.

### ANNUAL CONFERENCE.

SECULAR HALL, RUSHOLME ROAD, ALL SAINTS,  
Manchester.

WHIT-SUNDAY, JUNE 7, 1908.

### Agenda.

1. Minutes of last Conference.
2. Executive's Annual Report. By PRESIDENT.
3. Reception of Report.
4. Financial Report.
5. Election of President.  
Motion by North London, Kingsland, West Ham, and Birmingham Branches:—  
"That Mr. G. W. Foote be re-elected President."
6. Election of Vice-Presidents.  
(a) The following are nominated by the Executive for re-election: J. Barry, J. G. Bartram, R. Chapman, Victor Charbonnel, C. Coheu, W. W. Collins, H. Cowell, W. Davey, F. A. Davies, J. G. Dobson, R. G. Fathers, Mrs. Fathers, Léon Furnémont, T. Gorniot, John Grange, S. L. Hurd, R. Johnson, W. Leat, J. T. Lloyd, James McGlashen, G. B. H. McGluskey, J. Neate, R. T. Nichols, J. Partridge, S. M. Peacock, C. Pegg, Mrs. M. E. Pegg

W. T. Pitt, C. G. Quinton, J. H. Ridgway, Thomas Robertson, Victor Roger, G. Roleffs, S. Samuels, F. Schaller, W. G. Schweizer, G. Scott, H. Silverstein, W. H. Spivey, Charles Steptoe, W. B. Thompson, T. J. Thurlow, John H. Turnbull, Miss E. M. Vance, Frederick Wood, W. H. Wood, G. White.

(b) Motion by Executive:—

"That Mr. W. H. Baker and Mr. J. Marshall be elected as Vice-Presidents."

7. Election of Auditors.
8. Sub-Committee's further Report *re* a Badge for the Society.
9. Motion by Birmingham Branch:—  
"That the National Secular Society be formed into a Limited Liability Company, on the same lines as the Secular Society, Ltd.; and that the Executive be instructed to take immediate steps to bring this about."
10. Motion by North London Branch:—  
"That the Executive request the London County Council to order a more stringent enforcement of its rule that no literature be sold or in any other way distributed except by individuals or societies at their own permitted meetings."
11. Motion by West Ham Branch:—  
"That the desirability of establishing Sunday Schools in connection with N. S. S. Branches be seriously considered during the coming year."
12. Motion by Liverpool Branch:—  
"That this Conference is of opinion that the N. S. S. should associate itself with the newly formed International League for the Rational Education of Children."
13. Motion by Kingsland Branch:—  
"That the services of an Organising Lecturer, as approved at the last Conference, should be continued for another year."
14. Motion by Executive:—  
"That this Conference expresses astonishment at the fact that the Liberal Government, with its overwhelming majority in the House of Commons, has brought in no less than three Education Bills in two years, having dropped two of them, and apparently being by way of dropping the other—which is a scandal to statesmanship; that this Conference desires to record its opinion that these three Bills were all devised by Nonconformists in the interest of Nonconformity, and thus deserved to fail; and that this Conference warns the friends of Secular Education throughout the country against the danger of the proposed Round Table Conference, by which the supporters of religious education at State cost, with State authority, in State schools, hope to arrive at some compromise that may secure the great Christian Churches special privileges to the disadvantage of all the rest of the Community."
15. Motion by Executive:—  
"That this Conference regrets that a Liberal Government in 1908, like the Liberal Government in 1883, has sanctioned a prosecution for "blasphemy"—and hopes to see a strong General Committee formed, quite apart from the N. S. S., to aim at the repeal of the odious Blasphemy Laws."
16. Motion by Executive:—  
"That this Conference deplors the Sunday Closing of the Franco-British Exhibition as a grievous wrong and insult to French visitors; and calls upon the authorities to open the Exhibition on Sunday to visitors from France and other parts of the Continent, even if British working-men must be rigorously excluded on that holy day."
17. Motion by Kingsland Branch:—  
"That this Conference recommend the Executive to make arrangements for better securing Secular Funerals for deceased Freethinkers; and, incidentally, for the substitution of Cremation for Earth Burial."

The Conference will sit in the Secular Hall; the morning session lasting from 10.30 to 12.30, and the afternoon session from 2.30 to 4.30. Both are purely business meetings. Only members of the N. S. S. can speak and vote. A public meeting will be held in the evening at 7 o'clock in the Secular Hall. The President will occupy the chair on all three occasions. A luncheon for delegates and visitors will be provided at the Merchant's Hotel, Oldham-street, Piccadilly, at 1 o'clock.

By order of the Executive,

G. W. FOOTE, *President.*

E. M. VANCE, *Secretary.*

**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.****OUTDOOR.**

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S.: Victoria Park (near the Fountain), 3.15 and 6.15, C. Cohen.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S.: Station-road, 11.30, Mr. Galvanner, "The Atheist and Death: A Reply to Christians"; Brockwell Park, 3.15 and 6.15, Guy A. Aldred.

KINGSLAND BRANCH N. S. S.: Corner of Ridley-road, 11.30, F. A. Davies, "Blasphemy."

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S.: Parliament Hill, 3.30, F. R. Theakstone, "My Journey from Christianity to Atheism."

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S.: Outside Maryland Point Station, Stratford, 7, F. A. Davies, "Why I Blasphe-me."

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

**COUNTRY.**

EDINBURGH BRANCH N. S. S. (Rationalists' Club, 12 Hill-square): Meets every Thursday at 8.15. Social meeting.

SOUTH SHIELDS BRANCH N. S. S. (above Tram Hotel, Market-place): 7.30, Conference, etc.

**OUTDOOR.**

EDINBURGH BRANCH N. S. S.: The Meadows, 3, a Lecture; The Mound, 6.30, meets for Discussion; The foot of Leith-walk, 6.30, "Woman and the Bible."

**H. S. WISHART'S LECTURES.**

LIVERPOOL: Shiel Park (Shiel-road and Boaler-street), 3, "Christianity's Surrender to Freethought"; 7, "Faith in Christ an Obstacle to Progress."

BURY: Monday, May 25, Fair Ground, at 7.30, "The New Theology a Red Herring."

BOLTON: Tuesday, May 26, Town Hall Square, at 7.30, "Christism and Socialism"

WIGAN: Wednesday, May 27, Market-place, at 7.30, "The New Theology a Fraud on the People."

ROCHDALE: Thursday, May 28, Town Hall Square, at 7.30, "Christianity's Surrender to Freethought."

LEEDS: Friday, May 29, Town Hall Square, at 7.30, Debate—"That the Teaching and Example of Jesus Christ, as revealed in the Canonical Gospels, is Not Satisfactory or Sound for our Moral and Social Well-being To-Day." Aff., H. S. Wishart; neg., Mr Taylor, Preacher for the Church of Latter-Day Saints.

**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.

**BEAUTIFUL HOLIDAY CENTRE** (Dean Forest, Severn and Wye Valleys).—Spacious house, pretty grounds (altitude 600ft.); excellent piano, billiard-room, bath, tennis; good roads, magnificent scenery. Congenial Freethought company. Vegetarians accommodated. Boarders. 27s. week.—Photos, particulars, HALLAM, Littledean House, Newnham, Gloucestershire.

**TWO SECULAR BURIAL SERVICES.** By Annie Besant and Austin Holyoake. Large type, good paper. Price by post 1½d., from the N. S. S. SECRETARY, 2 Newcastle-street, E.C.

**WANTED** for Office, Complete Set of the *Free-thinker*.—State condition and price to E. M. VANCE N. S. S. Secretary, 2 Newcastle-street, E.C.

**DEFENCE OF FREE SPEECH**

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

Being a Three Hours' Address to the Jury before the Lord Chief Justice of England, in answer to an Indictment for Blasphemy, on April 24, 1883.

*With Special Preface and many Footnotes.*

Price **FOURPENCE.** Post free **FIVEPENCE.**

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

A NEW PROPAGANDIST PAMPHLET.

**Christianity and Social Ethics.**

By C. COHEN.

**SIXTEEN PAGES. ONE PENNY**  
(Postage One Halfpenny.)

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

A NEW (THE THIRD) EDITION  
OF

**FROM FICTION TO FACT.**  
By F. BONTE.

*(Issued by the Secular Society, Limited)*

REVISED AND ENLARGED.  
SHOULD BE SCATTERED BROADCAST.

**SIXTY-FOUR PAGES.**  
**PRICE ONE PENNY.**

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

THE

**MARTYRDOM OF HYPATIA;**

OR, THE

**DEATH OF THE CLASSICAL WORLD.**

*An Address delivered at Chicago by*

**M. M. MANGASARIAN.**

Will be forwarded, post free, for

**THREE HALFPENCE.**

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

Colonel Ingersoll's Last Lecture.

**WHAT IS RELIGION?**

An Address delivered before the American Free Religious Association at Boston, June 2, 1899.

Price Twopence.

## 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 1888 to afford legal security to the acquisition and application of funds for Secular purposes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Society's solicitors are Messrs. Harper and Battcock 23 Road-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.

Under the Ban of the London County Council.

THE POPULAR EDITION

(Revised and Enlarged)

OF

# "BIBLE ROMANCES"

BY

G. W. FOOTE

With a Portrait of the Author

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

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

SIXPENCE—NET

(Post Free, 8d)

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

## THE NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS:

OR,

## Christianity Completely Undermined.

WITH FAC-SIMILES OF MSS.

By JOSEPH SYMES.

A New Edition. Price THREE PENCE.

Post free, THREE PENCE HALFPENNY.

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

## WORKS BY G. W. FOOTE.

- ATHEISM AND MORALITY 2d., 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 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 1s. 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 Williams. 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 1s.

## WORKS BY COLONEL INGERSOLL.

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

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