

# THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXVIII.—No. 42

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1908

PRICE TWOPENCE

*But wise men are men, and the truth is truth.*  
—HOOKER.

## “G. B. S.” and Jesus Christ.

THERE is an old saying that adversity tries us. So it does, but not like prosperity. A hundred people can stand ill luck for one who can stand good fortune. The perils of success are peculiarly subtle. They attack us at the very points where a less happy experience has left us unguarded. He who is braced by the cold may be relaxed by the warmth. He whose strength has been called forth by combat may find all his weaknesses asserting themselves in repose. Just as a man is said to tell the truth when in drink, so he sometimes reveals unexpected elements of his character when he no longer needs to practise self-repression but is free to be verily himself at every point of the compass.

It seems to us that Mr. George Bernard Shaw is paying the penalty of success. The elfish side of his nature—the sporting, tricky, irresponsible side—has too many opportunities of basking in the sunshine. It sometimes looks as if it might monopolise his energies. He has achieved a great reputation for his “cleverness,” and is in danger of trying to live up to it. His public insists on his being always funny and original, and he is in danger of being funnily original rather than originally funny. His old public respected his principles and enjoyed his wit. His new public respect his wit and enjoy his principles. He set out to convert the Philistines, and in a sense they are converting him. This, indeed, was inevitable. Shakespeare deplored that he was too much like the dyer’s hand, subdued to what it works in. Mr. Shaw—a long way after the Master, though we are not sure he thinks so—is becoming subdued to the Philistine element in which he has long been working. The Philistines are converting him, we fear, a good deal faster than he is converting them.

The middle-class peril was bad enough, the upper-class peril was perhaps worse, but the clerical peril is the worst of all. Mr. Shaw, who used to call himself an Atheist, appears to be quite unable to resist the seductions of the pulpit. A popular preacher is too many for him. Donna Inez, vowing she would ne’er consent, consented; and Mr. Shaw she simpers his denials towards the very edge of the precipice, while the clerical Don Juan strives to hide a self-congratulatory smile. Mr. Shaw went down to the City Temple a year or two ago to preach his gospel, such as it was, to the Rev. R. J. Campbell’s congregation. The professional preacher expressed hopes of the amateur preacher on that occasion. Since then there has been a considerable lessening of the distance between the respective parties. Mr. Campbell has carried the New Theology a little nearer Mr. Shaw; on the other hand, Mr. Shaw has carried his unticketed, and perhaps unticketable, gospel a good deal nearer Mr. Campbell. For on his first visit to the City Temple the great “G. B. S.” was by way of finding God, and on his recent second visit he was by way of finding Christ. We shudder to think of what he will be finding next.

Is it that the devilish seduction in this case lies in Mr. Campbell’s “fine eyes,” as the French say? There is a wistfulness in them that “fetches” women. It appeals to their maternal instinct. They long to protect, to shelter, to comfort the poor sufferer. Now we are assured that Mr. Shaw is a man of genius, and we understand that genius—a man’s genius, of course, not a woman’s—is bisexual, and includes the “eternal feminine” which, as Goethe sang, is leading us on. May we suppose, then, that it is Mr. Shaw’s “eternal feminine” which has succumbed to the pathetic pleading of Mr. Campbell’s liquid optics?

Mr. Shaw ought to keep away from the City Temple. He may meet his doom there. He may find salvation. He may end by joining the Salvation Army, which is the only Christian sect that we remember his praising; and very comical praise it is, too—in the Preface to *Major Barbara*. And if he retained his old frisky humor, which is perhaps doubtful in such an environment, he would be a tremendous god-send to the Army of Blood and Fire, and might even stem the tide of depreciation caused by Mr. Manson’s book. There was a Captain Shaw of the London Fire Brigade. What would that be to Captain Shaw of the Salvation Fire Brigade? We almost rejoice that General Booth is getting too old for such gigantic enterprises.

Mr. Shaw’s new City Temple sermon—we beg pardon, lecture—was on “Literature and Art,” but his titles have very little to do with his discourses, which remind us of the happy title of one of Mr. Chesterton’s monthly volumes—“All Things Considered.” It was towards the end of this multifarious oration that Mr. Shaw made the further announcement of his progress on the road of faith. According to the *Daily News* report, he “declared that, whereas he had hitherto regarded Christ as a character in fiction, the Rev. R. J. Campbell had set matters before him in such a way that Christ had become credible at last.” The *Daily Chronicle* apparently gave Mr. Shaw’s own words, since it printed them between inverted commas. They were these:—

“Mr. Campbell has made me believe in Christ. The effect of Farrar’s *Life of Christ* was to make it quite impossible for me to believe in Christ at all. I could not go on believing in that particular Christ. Mr. Campbell put before me a credible Christ. He created Christ for me, he placed before me something interesting, something I desired to believe, something which an educated man at the end of the twentieth century could believe.”

Now if Mr. Shaw really said this he must have been far gone—under the influence of the place, and Mr. Campbell’s fascination. We hesitate to believe that Farrar’s biography of his Savior could ever have struck Mr. Shaw as being of the slightest importance in any direction whatever. We are also loth to believe that Mr. Campbell’s personal sentimentalities about Jesus could make the slightest appeal to Mr. Shaw’s intelligence. Moreover, we are confident that the old original “G. B. S.” was perfectly aware that it is of very little consequence, after all, what Farrar, or Campbell, or any other delineator of the Prophet of Nazareth says. The only possible biography of Jesus Christ is in the Gospels. Mr. Shaw is able to read them for himself. All the facts—such as they are—are there; and it is on the facts that every self-respecting thinker forms

his judgment. We venture to say that no one who has studied the subject could possibly understand how a well-informed, thoughtful man came to the conclusion that "Christ was a character of fiction" and was rationally converted from that view by anything that Mr. Campbell had written. Mr. Shaw must be hypnotised. Or else the City Temple atmosphere seriously impaired his powers of expression.

Mr. Shaw may turn round and say, "Oh, I wasn't talking literally; you don't expect exact language in such a place, do you? I don't always speak by the card, like prosaic people, who have something definite to say, and say it. I was humoring my audience, and paying pretty compliments to Mr. Campbell. What I do mean I will explain by-and-by. Meanwhile I am working up a good advertisement for my promised book on Religion." And with a sarcastic smile the great "G. B. S." may sail off "fancy free" as he has so often done before.

This device—we say it with all respect—is getting threadbare. Mr. Shaw, for all his humor and wit, is under every man's obligation to be serious at least up to the point of intelligibility. But where shall we find such seriousness in his concluding advice, "Never believe in a God you cannot improve upon"? It would be saner to say, "Never believe in a God you *can* improve upon." Mr. Shaw's advice overlooks the fact that, if God exist at all, he is what he is, and is certainly therefore an object, not of our wishes, but of our information. His advice, indeed, implies that God is an article in process of manufacture; which we most thoroughly believe—but then that is Atheism, and if this is what Mr. Shaw really means he should occasionally say so, in order that people who are not so subtle as himself (or Shelley's Peter Bell) may have an idea of what he is driving at. And while he is making up his mind to do this, we may suggest that there is no more meat on the "Christ" bone that suffices for the old practitioners.

G. W. FOOTE.

## Moral Instruction and Religion.—II.

(Concluded from p. 643.)

QUITE in keeping with the usual policy of those who champion the cause of religion, the speakers and writers at the International Moral Congress assumed, in a calm, almost cock-sure manner that religion was essential to any adequately constructed scheme of life. It is true that they admitted, even discussed, opposite views of the matter. But this was done with a certain amount of superiority, an air of indulgence to various irresponsible dreamers, that was, in its way, quite amusing. In no case was there attempted any serious justification of the assumption. In its way, and from the standpoint of the professional religionist, this is a wise policy. To say that religion is essential to morality, and to admit this to be a mere speculation, would destroy the spirit of dogmatism upon which all religious belief rests. To have tried to justify the belief by an intelligent appeal to history and experience would be a still more dangerous procedure. This might easily arouse more doubts than it dispelled. By far the safer plan is to take the position for granted, and gently insinuate that all who do not agree are irresponsible cranks or persons lacking insight into the deeper aspects of human nature.

Some of the writers and speakers did lay stress upon the long relationship of religion and morals, and hinted at the danger of disturbing the connection. Yet a re-adjustment, at least, is involved in the holding of the Congress, and this may very easily eventuate in a complete separation. In reality, the Congress was an impeachment of the adequacy of moral instruction given in connection with, or based upon, religious instruction. One cannot deny that all the Churches have given moral instruction, nor this has always been given upon a religious basis. Nor will it be questioned that, if the method pursued had universally, or even gener-

ally, resulted in producing a desirable type of men and women, the International Moral Congress would never have existed. Its existence is at least an indication that the type of character generally produced by existing methods is unsatisfactory. And this means either that morality cannot be taught or that its association with religion is eminently unsatisfactory.

The writer of one of the papers presented to the Congress describes ethics as a department of religion from which morality gains its power as a "living force." With far more truth, religion might be described as a department of ethics—although this would not be quite accurate—from which it derives all its value in a civilised community. As a matter of fact, religion and ethics have independent origins. Morality is nothing more than rules of social health, unconsciously developed, but later, consciously realised and expanded. Religion, on the other hand, is a crude, primitive science born of early man's contact with natural phenomena and the conclusions reached concerning them. The gods are not accepted because they appeal to man's moral sense, or because they in any way satisfy his moral requirements, but are taken, *de facto*, as he takes more concrete phenomena. And obedience is given to their assumed wishes simply because of their, also assumed, power to punish the tribe if it is withheld.

Incidentally, I may point out that this appears to be the real basis of the pretty widespread belief that society will suffer by the rejection of religious beliefs. Like most things connected with religion it is a survival from less civilised times. In its origin, it is a result of the belief that the gods will avenge any neglect of their desires. This belief continued over many generations assumes the character of a definite social asset, perpetuating itself as do many other beliefs equally baseless. In modern times, for the reason that social and ethical considerations are now all-powerful, it meets us in the shape of fears as to the risks run by society in forsaking religious sanctions. But its real and only groundwork is the stupid belief of primitive man. One, of course, has all the time to reckon with the influence of an interested priesthood in keeping such a belief alive.

But at a very early stage in human development, the moral or social sense begins to operate on religious belief, and has never yet ceased to operate. Just as an increase of knowledge concerning natural causation effects a curtailment of the actual powers of deity, so the development of the moral sense results in a modification of its qualities. The gods become amenable to the moral law, and their qualities are modified so that they may harmonise with the demands of the social consciousness. Every modification in the belief in deity has resulted from the operation of these two causes. So that the truth of the case is, not that religion has furthered the development of morality, but that every improvement in religious belief or practice has resulted from the influence of the moral or social sense.

None of the speakers or writers made any serious attempt to prove that morality was dependent upon religion, nor could they have succeeded had they made the attempt. For one of the plainest of facts is that they are separable both in theory and practice. Mr. Russell drove this point home in his paper, with a school experience of twenty-five years to support his arguments. Dr. Lyttleton, as I have already pointed out, admitted that as a last resource they were compelled to fall back upon the social feelings for moral leverage. Even Mrs. Sophie Bryant, who seems pathetically anxious to find something for God to do, admitted that religion had no influence on some children. Some, she said, cared little about the moral and social appeal, but were deeply responsive to the thought of God manifest in the universe. Others responded to the claim of a well-ordered human life, but were unaffected by the idea of God. This may be; but I confess that the child who is unaffected by the thought of relatives, friends, and neighbors, but who is morally influenced by the belief in God, is quite beyond my comprehension.

For extravagance of religious advocacy, a statement by Father Maher easily takes a first place. He said:—

"As a matter of fact the Christian religion has been the greatest moralising agency.....in the history of the human race. The morality of the modern world.....is a Christian morality. Its most fundamental principles and its most fruitful conceptions derive their illumination from Christian teaching. The notions of moral obligation, the intensity of the sense of moral responsibility, the sinfulness of action against the authority of conscience, the equality of man, the brotherhood of man, the elevation of woman, the establishment of monogamy, the esteem of moral purity, as well as many other of the most universally prized virtues.....are indisputably the fruit of the teaching of the Gospel."

Indisputably! Not only is every one of the above assertions highly disputable—nearly all are demonstrably false. For most of them the mere reading of the *Meditations* of Marcus Aurelius would be sufficient refutation. The Japanese delegate who explained that educated Japanese did not call themselves religious, because what Western people called religion the Japanese called mere superstition, must have smiled when he read Father Maher. His own nation proves how nonsensical are such statements. I do not now discuss at length Father Maher's claims; to do so would be as much out of place here as they were in being presented to an International Congress. Their proper place is in a volume of Christian Evidence lectures, where accuracy is neither looked for nor found.

Whether morality can be conveyed from teacher to pupil by direct moral instruction is as much an open question now as it was in the days of Socrates. But granted this, there are several considerations fatal to the claim that it can be best taught upon a religious basis. In the first place, the declining force of religious belief is undeniable. The religious lament the fact; the unbelieving rejoice at it; but there is unanimity of belief on this point. Children may have religion impressed upon them, but there is a strong probability that a large number will outgrow their religious beliefs, while with a still larger number they will undergo serious modifications. This being the case, it is surely in the highest degree unwise to rest moral conviction upon a set of beliefs that may one day disappear, or which at best can have only a fluctuating value. To teach that the only sure basis for morality is religion, when the conviction as to the truth of religion is likely to weaken or die out, is, in all cases where this occurs, to expose moral conviction to some danger. Professor Muirhead pointed out that "We have left behind us the idea of a connection between a man's religious devoutness and his temporal prosperity." We have now to realise that the connection between religious devoutness and moral health is equally imaginary or accidental.

And next the Congress will one day have to face the question—as the outside world will have to deal with it—whether morality is to be treated as a purely social product or as a supernatural endowment. One cannot hold both views, and one cannot for ever hesitate between the two. One day a choice must be made, and the nature of the choice marks one as either on the side of modern science or on that of a belated mediævalism. For the reply of modern scientific investigation is clear and decisive. Morality is a social product, and nothing else. The origin and development of the moral sense is fairly well known to all who care to seriously investigate the subject. The curious thing is that, in spite of this knowledge, the defenders of supernaturalism—and many others—continue discussing moral questions as though we were living in the fourteenth century instead of the twentieth. Discussion conducted on these lines is almost an insult to a really cultured intelligence. We really ought to make up our minds as to which side we agree with. If morality is a social product, then we must rely upon a development and a wise direction of the social forces for its cultivation. If it is not, then

we must fall back upon the Churches for our guides, philosophers, and friends. But in the name of all that is reasonable, let us be on the one side or the other, and not continue a half-hearted support of two wholly irreconcilable positions.

C. COHEN.

### Clashing Creeds.

A FEW weeks ago, this journal referred to "a little rift within the New Theology lute," which was indicated by the announcement which the Rev. Hugh C. Wallace, of Anerley, had inserted in the religious newspapers, to the effect that he was no longer to be identified with the New Theology. A similar intimation has now been issued by Mr. Wallace's colleague, the Rev. Dr. Warschauer. Dr. Warschauer had been closely associated with the revolutionary movement from the start. It was he who confidently asserted that the advent of the New Theology would eventuate in the annihilation of the Freethought party. Now we have arrived, he virtually said, there will be nothing for Freethinkers to do. The work they attempted to perform we have taken over, and already, as the result of our exertions, the old superstitions are as good as dead. But Dr. Warschauer's self-confidence was somewhat premature. Both the Old Theologians and the Freethinkers are still to the fore, while the New Theology seems farther away from victory than ever. Where exactly Dr. Warschauer stands it is impossible to determine. That he has severed his connection with the *Christian Commonwealth*, and disowned Mr. Campbell, are two significantly connected facts, which import either that Mr. Campbell and his organ have become too progressive, or that Dr. Warschauer has retrograded. At any rate, his retirement from the movement he did so much to initiate, and the presence of his name in the list of speakers at the forthcoming meeting of the Congregational Union, suggest the inference that his retrogression has been greater than Mr. Campbell's progress.

Be that as it may, however, the point we wish to emphasise is that Congregationalist theology is like a house divided against itself, because it has no decisive authority to which to appeal; and a house at war with itself has never been able to survive. Tennyson's well-known lines may be quoted as an apt description of the present situation and its possibilities:—

"Unfaith in aught is want of faith in all.  
It is the little rift within the lute  
That by and by will make the music mute,  
And, ever widening, slowly silence all."

Nothing is easier than to characterise the New Theology as disguised Atheism, for such it is, and the disguise is exceedingly thin; but is it not equally obvious that every other form of Christian theology is at bottom Atheistic? Take Calvinism in the purest version of it, and you will find that at the last analysis it is a virtual denial of God. The refusal to regard an unconverted sinner as a free agent is a tacit acknowledgment of the sovereignty of the Devil. The doctrine of Determinism, wielded by a Calvinist, delivers God a violent slap in the face. Or take a modified version of Calvinism, such as the one championed by the Rev. Dr. Robertson Nicoll, editor of the *British Weekly*. The leading article in that publication for October 8, is a review of Mr. Chesterton's *Orthodoxy*, which is said to be "the rough notes of a spiritual autobiography." "For most of us, happily," Dr. Nicoll says, "the influences of childhood make for Christianity." That is doubtless true, but by no means a feather in Christianity's cap. "The inevitable tests come," the reviewer adds, under which, evidently, the majority of budding Christians expire; "but there are those so strongly held by Christ that their faith outlives these, and they know little of doubt," which means, if it means anything, that those whose faith dies under the tests, are more strongly held by some-

body or something else. The fourth Gospel represents Jesus himself as speaking thus:—

"My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life; and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand" (John x. 27, 28).

Dr. Nicoll's words imply a complete forgetfulness of his Master's and an unconscious admission that the facts of life do not establish the truth of Scripture. Christ's omnipotent hold upon mankind is an illusion, even on Dr. Nicoll's own showing. Man's will is stronger than Christ's, though the latter is said to be identical with God's.

Dr. Warschauer's own teaching carries with it the same implication. If man is free, God's omnipotence is limited; and to limit omnipotence is to destroy it. If there is anything this divine hates, it is Determinism; but his loyalty to free-will necessitates something very like disloyalty to the Deity. He is perpetually telling us that God cannot do this, that, and the other, that he could not have made man perfect except at the cost of making him a fool, that he could not have prevented evil, and that he could not have created a holy and sinless Universe. Indeed, the only inference one is tempted to draw from his teaching is that the Deity is the weakest being in existence, which is, of course, equivalent to saying that there is no God at all. It is temptingly easy to find fault with Mr. Campbell's statement that "God is but a name for the grand self-conscious totality of being which gives value to ours," and with the consequent advice, "Do not, I beseech you, think of God any more as a personal being like yourself, though immeasurably greater." We are well aware that such utterances logically spell Atheism, pure and simple, for the Pantheism of Spinoza is accepted by Professor Haeckel as essentially identical with his Law of Substance. But we contend that the same thing must be predicated of Dr. Warschauer's Divine Person, who, though bravely spoken of as the "Eternal Other," is in reality the quintessence of all impotence. We hold that such a God is not worth having, or that Theism, on such terms, is identical with Atheism. This is why Dr. Warschauer is obliged to devote most of his time, and all his splendid gifts, to a never-ending defence of his God. "Atheism, if it were true," says Dr. Nicoll, "would leave man only the highest brute, imprisoned in the grasp of a power called nature, or fate, which is as often malignant as it is kindly." Well, but is it not incontrovertibly true that man is the highest animal, and that he is inescapably imprisoned by a power called nature? Neither the sovereign God of the Calvinist, nor the limited Deity of the New Theologian, has ever interfered, in the slightest degree, with that stern fact. Of course, except metaphorically or poetically, Nature is neither "malignant" nor "kindly"; but neither a malignant Devil nor a benignant Deity has ever snatched man from the inexorable grasp of her power. While the different schools are fiercely fighting for their respective creeds, while one theologian upholds the Divine Sovereignty, another the Divine Immanence, and another the identity of God and the Universe, man remains as he has ever been, at once Nature's son and slave, happy only in so far as he understands and obeys her "iron laws," but always impotent to slip away from under her dominion. Whether there is an "Eternal Other" or not, such is man's heritage, and he must put up with it and make of it the best he can, by bringing his own intelligence to bear upon all the problems to which it necessarily gives rise.

"The pity of it, Iago, the pity of it!" Yes, truly! but we indulge in that exclamation, not as regards Mr. Campbell's curious developments during the last eighteen months only, but as we contemplate the endless war of words between all the schools of theology. This weary, wasteful contest is coeval with religion, and shall never end until religion itself is a thing of the past. You can hear the clashing of the creeds as you turn the pages of the New Testament. The conflicts of to-day are precisely the same as the conflicts of that primitive period, and they

filled the whole interval with their blinding dust, their deafening noise, and their soaking blood; and the points at issue are no nearer settlement to-day than they were at the beginning. *And the matters in dispute remain unsettled simply because they transcend all knowledge.* Dr. Nicoll, Dr. Warschauer, and Mr. Campbell differ so violently from one another, and each argues for his own position with such sublime cocksureness, because the three alike deal with subjects concerning which no information whatever is procurable. If knowledge were obtainable the controversies would speedily be terminated; but because it is not, they continue from age to age.

"But," someone may object, "does not this total lack of knowledge render Atheism quite as untenable as any species of Theism?" No; because Atheism is not a belief, but the absence of belief. Atheism is merely a term appropriated by those who are not Theists. It is a frank confession of utter ignorance of such a being as the God so variously and contradictorily described by the numerous schools of theology. The glory of Atheism is that it requires absolutely no proofs. It is not an affirmation needing evidential support, but a mental attitude assumed because no affirmation is logically justifiable. An Atheist may legitimately ask a Theist, "How do you know that there is a God?" But the Theist has no right to return the compliment by asking the Atheist, "How do you know there is no God?" because what the Atheist affirms is not his knowledge, but his ignorance. He does not believe in God because he has no knowledge of him, and because the whole God-region is non-existent to him. Clearly, therefore, the burden of proof rests on the believer, not on the unbeliever. Of one thing, however, the Atheist is most profoundly convinced, namely, that believers are equally ignorant as himself. All sources of knowledge are as accessible to him as to them. This is the one point on which he is absolutely dogmatic, and consequently he firmly disbelieves all their beliefs.

Atheism is not a creed, but it has brought into existence the beautiful and all-sufficient creed of Secularism. Secularism is merely the Atheistic philosophy of human life. It consists in the application of exact scientific knowledge to man's one business of discharging all the duties he owes to the society of which he is a member. To the theologians he says: "You are fighting about shadows; the God for your respective conceptions of whom you do such valiant battle cruelly leaves you in the lurch, taking no heed whatever of your angry warfare; and the supernatural realm to which you so confidently appeal has never yet declared itself. Drop your vain and useless wranglings over the unknown and unknowable, and concentrate your attention on the task of ameliorating the conditions of life in the only world known to you."

J. T. LLOYD.

## What is Atheism?

(BY THE LATE CHARLES BRADLAUGH.)

BY Atheism I mean the affirmation of one existence, of which existence I know only mode; each mode being distinguished in thought by its qualities. This affirmation is a positive, not a negative, affirmation, and is properly describable as Atheism because it does not include in it any possibility of *Theos*. It is, being without God, distinctly an Atheistic affirmation. This Atheism affirms that the Atheist only knows qualities, and only knows these qualities as the characteristics of modes. By "existence" I mean the totality of phenomena and all that has been, is, or may be necessary for the happening of any and every phenomenon. By "mode" I mean each cognised condition (phenomenon or aggregation of phenomena). By "quality" I mean that characteristic, or each of those characteristics, by which in thought I distinguish that which I think. The word "universe" is with me an equivalent for "existence."

Either Atheism or Theism must be the true doctrine of the universe. I assume here that no other theory is thinkable. Theism is either Pantheism, Polytheism, or Monotheism. There is, I submit, no other conceivable category. Pantheism affirms one existence, but declares that some qualities are infinite, e.g., that existence is intelligent. Atheism also affirms qualities for phenomena. We know each phenomenon by its qualities; we know no qualities except as qualities of some phenomenon. By infinite I mean illimitable. Phenomena are, of course, finite. By intelligent I mean able to think. Polytheism affirms several Theistic existences—this affirmation being nearly self-contradictory—and also usually at least one non-theistic existence. Monotheism affirms at least two existences: that is, the Theos and that which the Theos has created and rules. Atheism denies alike the reasonableness of Polytheism, Pantheism, and Monotheism. Any affirmation of more than one existence is, on the face of the affirmation, an absolute self-contradiction, if infinity be pretended for either of the existences affirmed. The word "Theos" or "God" has for me no meaning. I am obliged, therefore, to try to collect its meaning as expressed by Theists, who, however, do not seem to me to be either clear or agreed as to the words by which their Theism may be best expressed. For the purpose of this argument I take Monotheism to be the doctrine "that the universe owes its existence and continuance in existence to the wisdom and will of a supreme, self-existent, eternal, infinite, omnipotent, omniscient, righteous, and benevolent personal being, who is distinct from, and independent of, what he has created." By wisdom and will I mean that which I should mean using the same words of any animal able to perceive, remember, reflect, judge, and determine, and active in that ability or those abilities. By supreme I mean highest in any relation of comparison. By self-existent I mean that the conception of which, if it be conceivable, does not involve the conception of antecedent or consequent. By eternal and infinite I mean illimitable in duration and extent. By "omnipotent" I mean supreme in power over everything. By omniscient, knowing everything. By "righteous and benevolent" that which the best educated opinion would mean when applying those words to human beings. This doctrine of Monotheism appears to me to be flatly contradicted by the phenomena we know. It is inconsistent with that observed uniformity of happening usually described as law of nature. By law of nature I mean observed order of event. The word "nature" is another equivalent for the word universe or existence. By uniformity of happening I mean that, given certain conditions, certain results always ensue—vary the conditions, the results vary. I do not attack specially either the Polytheistic, Pantheistic, or Monotheistic presentments of Theism. To me any pretence of Theism seems impossible if Monism be conceded, and, therefore, at present, I rest content in affirming one existence. If Monism be true, and Atheism be Monism, then Atheism is necessarily the true theory of the universe. I submit that "there cannot be more than one ultimate explanation" of the universe. That any "tracing back to two or more" existences is illogical, and that as it is only by "reaching unity" that we can have a reasonable conclusion, it is necessary "that every form of Dualism should be rejected as a theory of the universe." If every form of Dualism be rejected, Monism, i.e., Atheism, alone remains, and is, therefore, the true and only doctrine of the universe.

Justice and benevolence result from the elementary laws of the human mind.—*Shelley*.

Repentance is not a virtue, or in other words, it does not spring from reason; on the contrary, he who repents of an action is twice miserable or impotent.—*Spinoza*.

## Acid Drops.

Sir Edward Grey's tribute to the Young Turks movement was a singular reply, though not meant as such, to the Christian champions who have always protested (in the very teeth of former history) that Mohammedanism was incompatible with anything like progress. This is what happened when the old absolutist regime was swept away:—

"In Macedonia crimes of violence on any large scale ceased almost immediately. In Armenia the improvement came later, but when it did come on, the reports we have received during the last month show the change was equally favorable and complete. Hatred, strife, and oppression have been swept away, and they have been replaced by fairplay, peace, and goodwill—goodwill which is the surest guarantee of peace; more sure than any treaty or any constitution or anything else. Not in history, I think, has there been a change more sudden and so beneficent. It would have been incredible if it had not occurred, and a profound impression has been produced upon all who have been in contact with it by the upright character, the purity of motives, of the men who have brought this change about. This has been patriotism in the best sense of the word—a patriotism which was peaceful and unaggressive, desiring nothing but the good of their own country, without designs upon any other."

"It would have been incredible if it had not occurred." We thank Sir Edward Grey for that expression. And also for the statement that "not in history" has there been "a change more sudden and so beneficent." This will not silence Christian bigotry, but it will open the eyes of the more sensible people who have been misled by it.

Austria, Bulgaria, and Greece, three Christian Powers, could not wait a minute out of respect for the present position and efforts of Turkey. They have shown the real value of their "gospel of love." At the risk of stirring up a general European war, they have clutched at all they thought they could get at this convenient juncture. Austria, in particular, has violated treaties and private understandings to gain her ends. And Austria is a particularly Christian country. Even the *Daily News*, in a moment of virtuous indignation, felt constrained to write thus:—

"The Young Turks, having in a few weeks established reforms more beneficent than any that the Powers had been mumbering over for years, have received three slaps in the face almost before they could stand, and each slap from a professing friend."

The Young Turks are Mohammedans; the Powers are Christians. This fact brings out the moral of that candid confession.

In the *Townstal and St. Savior's Parish Magazine* (Dartmouth) the Vicar rebukes the "clever editor of the *Freethinker*" for quoting Jesus Christ as saying "Take no thought for the morrow," when he really said "Be not anxious for the morrow"—as the Revised Version puts it. This is a case, the worthy vicar says, which shows "the value of the Revised Version." The translation of the passage in the Authorised Version is "not only misleading but mischievous in the extreme." But is not this a domestic question which the Christians should settle amongst themselves? Why should Freethinkers be called upon to take sides in the dispute? It is those who claim the Bible as a divine revelation that should make up their minds as to what it means. And when they differ amongst themselves, and put forward various versions of the Book of God, are they not strengthening the Freethinkers' objection to such a book as "inspired"? When we are asked to believe that "thus saith the Lord," the message should surely be as clear as daylight, and beyond the possibility of cavil or misunderstanding.

Vicar Tracey must pardon us for saying that the difference, in this instance, between the Authorised and Revised Versions, is not exactly what he appears to think. The 1611 text meant then very much what the revised text means now. To "take thought" was equal to "forethought," and that is an essential element of "anxiety." To "be anxious" may mean little or much, according to circumstances; it may imply a slight or a dreadful apprehension; and the precise meaning of the expression must necessarily depend upon the context. Now the context in the sixth chapter of Matthew (not the *fourth*, as the reverend gent. prints it) shows that Jesus Christ was teaching his hearers to dismiss all thought of the morrow from their minds as a mistrust of the fatherly care of God. They were not to trouble about their food, drink, or raiment. God knew what they wanted, and he who clothed the lilies and the grass of the field would clothe them. Their business was to seek the Kingdom of God, and the Lord would see to all the rest. This, in our opinion, was the teaching

of Jesus Christ. And it does not matter much whether it is called "taking no thought for the morrow" or "not being anxious for the morrow"—the meaning is that the morrow must take care of itself; and this subverts the very basis of human civilisation. Whoever is not reasonably "anxious" about the future simply leaves the "anxiety" to someone else. There is no getting over that.

Nothing but the old spirit of orthodox Christianity could prompt the cruelty which is meted out to persons who try to commit suicide and fail. If they succeed, of course, they cannot be punished. Men and women driven to desperation of mind should be treated with a little tenderness by their less unhappy fellow-beings. Instead of that, they are treated as common criminals, when they really ought to be in the doctor's hands. We noticed a shocking case in the papers recently. A commercial traveller, Max Rapperport, fifty years of age, residing at Weaver-street, Bethnal Green, attempted suicide by hanging. Not succeeding in escaping to the place where the weary are at rest, and where (oh happiness!) the wicked cease from troubling, he was lugged off to the Old-street Police Station and charged with trying to remove himself from the reach of the police. They called it "attempting suicide." He was remanded for a week and lugged off to Brixton Prison. It was enough to deprive the poor wretch of the senses that were left him—and it did. He grew delirious (they called it "violent") and he was locked up in a padded cell. What happened there might have been expected. He tore off a strip of his blanket, rammed it down his throat, and found release from his tormenters. All they could do was to hold an inquest on his dead body. The jury returned the usual verdict of "Suicide whilst of unsound mind." Which was right enough. But they might have asked whether a prison was the proper place for a person of unsound mind. The whole case was a most miserable tragedy.

"Give to everyone that asketh," said Jesus Christ. Well now, England is a Christian country. Only last February a public speaker was indicted and found guilty at the Central Criminal Court for bringing the Holy Scripture and the Christian religion into disbelief and contempt. Yet the law of England also provides imprisonment for "every one that asketh." Begging is a crime in this country. It certainly seems a bit strange that one human being should be sent to gaol for asking another human being's assistance. It would not be possible, we believe, in "heathen" countries. But everybody knows that England is a Christian country, and the Savior it worships (on Sundays) taught his followers to "Give to every one that asketh," so the law against begging is worthy of a Christian nation. And here is a case in point—taken from the *Daily News* of October 8:—

"Eliza Evans, aged 43, a married woman, was committed by the Lancaster Bench yesterday for fourteen days' imprisonment without hard labor for begging at St. Thomas' Vicarage. She protested she wanted a recommendation to the infirmary owing to illness, but her previous history caused her to be disbelieved by the police. After being assisted from court she was conveyed to gaol, and died just after admission."

The poor woman begged at the house of a paid professor of the gospel of "Give to every one that asketh." She was arrested, charged, found guilty, sentenced, and dragged off to prison by other professors of the same gospel. But she cheated them all. They couldn't keep her in prison. She died. And we suppose another professor of the dear old gospel of "giving" stood up and "said a few words" over her grave.

It is really extraordinary, after all these years, what ignorance of Charles Bradlaugh's "Oaths Act" still prevails in courts of law. We take the following item of news from the *Northern Echo* of Tuesday, October 6:—

"OBJECTED TO TAKE AN OATH.

At Hebburn yesterday James Ewing, night watchman at the United Alkali Co.'s works, was called as a witness in a case of alleged coal stealing from the works of the company, but as he declined to take an oath he was not allowed to give evidence.

When told to take the Testament in his hand Ewing objected, and said, 'My Bible tells me that I am not to take an oath on any account.'

Mr. C. W. Newlands (the clerk): Do you mean that you cannot take an oath at all?

Ewing: Yes.

Do you object to be sworn on the Testament?—Yes.

You are employed by the company to see that their property is not taken away?—Yes.

And you are refusing to assist your employers to punish the offenders?—No, I am willing to assist them if you will take my word without an oath.

The case was adjourned for a week so that the company might send evidence as to the ownership of the coal."

This witness should have been told at once that he could make an affirmation instead of taking the oath, on the ground stated in the Oaths Act, namely, that the taking of an oath was contrary to his religious belief. Neither the clerk of the court nor the legal gentleman in charge of the case on behalf of the Company had the knowledge or the wit to give the witness this information. Had they done so, it would have saved both trouble and expense. Surely it is high time that the Lord Chancellor sent a circular letter on this subject to all the courts of law in England. The present position of affairs is little short of scandalous.

The Rev. Dr. Horton cries, "We can meet Catholicism only by Christ; the only reply to Catholicism is Christ." But that is the emptiest twaddle ever spoken. Why, in Catholicism Christ is everything. The Pope is Christ's Vicar. His Church is Christ's body. His priests are Christ's ambassadors appointed through him. What more does Dr. Horton want? Is Christ a monopoly of the Free Churches? Had he said that he prefers his own Christ to that of the Catholic Church, he would have been intelligible, for there are Christs many. Dr. Horton may have his Christ as long as he can hold him; but let him not forget that at present all Christs alike are vanishing quantities, and that their very existence is a convincing proof that Christ neither is nor ever was.

Principal Fairbairn says that "in revelation God speaks, not simply has spoken, to living men." Does it not seem odd to the Principal that so few living men hear him? Indeed, though the number of his people is but small, yet the sad complaint of so many of them is that their loving Heavenly Father is so painfully and persistently silent. Is it because his voice is too weak?

If "Holy Silence is itself a speech," what is unholy silence? Or how can silence be either "holy" or "unholy"? To speak of an ear that can hear silence is sheer nonsense, for what can be heard is not silence. How men of God love to deal in silly paradoxes!

Professor Burkitt, of Cambridge University, disturbed a hornet's nest at the Manchester Church Congress, when he vehemently declared that every one knows perfectly well that we cannot believe the stories in Genesis, or "accept St. Paul's doctrine of sin and death." "You know we can do nothing of the kind," he shouted, after a pause. His audience angrily resented the utterance, grew wild with excitement, and hissed out at him the stinging words, "Shame," "Nonsense," "Blasphemy," "No, no," until they were hoarse. Under the circumstances, our sympathy is with the audience. From a Freethinker, such an expression would have been sensible, but from a professor of a theology founded on the Thirty-Nine Articles, it was rank heresy, and ought not to be tolerated. Professor Burkitt's rightful place is in the Freethought Party, not in an orthodox Church. Let him resign his lucrative chair, and join the army of truth and honesty.

But Professor Burkitt has his limitations. Having pointed out that critics should be encouraged to deal with the Bible as they would deal with any other book, he explained that their criticism must be "confined to matters of form and authorship." "When it came to denying the substantial truth of the Scripture record—then for Christians at all events, the time had come for exclaiming, 'Hitherto shalt thou go, but no further; and here shall thy proud words be stayed.'" So that eventually the Cambridge professor of divinity adopts the usual attitude—critics are to be allowed to criticise so long as they leave alone what he regards as the fundamental truths of Christianity. It must be criticism with a snaffle. There was once a king who told the sea to go back, and we all know what happened. Those who give the same command to modern thought are doomed to go through the same experience.

The Rev. W. K. Greenland is of opinion that "Ireland wants a new theology"; but we are of opinion that theology has been the curse of Ireland, and that the sooner she gets rid of every form of it the better it will be for her. A priest-ridden country can never prosper; and between the Catholic and Protestant species there is very little to choose. What Ireland wants is emancipation from the cruel bondage of ecclesiasticism.

The Rev. T. H. Darlow says that "no heart is pure which is not passionate." But surely passion and purity are two different qualities, and it would be truer to say that no passionate heart can be pure, because purity is not heat,

but clearness, transparency. By purity Mr. Darlow must have meant religion, which is dependent, not upon clarity of judgment, but upon an unnatural excitation of the emotions, not upon calm, balanced thinking, but upon feverish frenzy and morbid fancy.

What shocking, intolerable cant preachers do talk! A man had a fatherless neice whom he dearly loved. She fell ill, and, despite his most fervent prayers for her recovery, died. In his keen sense of loss, and feeling that God had failed him, he went to the minister for an explanation, and this is what the holy man said to him: "Believe me, your prayer has been answered, not as you desired, but in a far better way." What contemptible hypocrisy! What culpable trifling!

How wonderful are the thoughts of God! "They fill all heaven, they reveal infinity, they dwell upon the sublimity of the eternal state"; and "while we follow them," one elevated saint informs their supposed author, "we are lifted up into noblest elevation, and forgetting earth and time and space, we see heaven opened, and the whole creation gathered at the feet of Christ." That is a prayer made to order. It is an effort in composition. If the Lord sees it or hears it, he will condemn it as too ornate, too literary, too artificial, and too insincere. We would call it utter rot.

It looks much as though Churchmen are already beginning to back out of their professed friendship for Socialism. Or perhaps it is that they feel they have made all the use they can of it for the present, and now wish to gain the goodwill of the opposite parties. At any rate, the Bishop of Manchester—and he is not alone just now in this matter—recently explained to an interviewer that Christianity only met Socialism on a common ground in the matter of ideals. In holding up the ideals of brotherhood, social service, and the strong helping the weak, Socialism and Christianity are at one—so says the bishop. But political or State Socialism, he explains, is another thing altogether; and that, apparently, is not Christian. But Socialism is either a scheme of State organisation or it is nothing. Nearly all people profess to believe in brotherhood, social service, and the succor of the weak by the strong. Where they part company is on the method to be employed. Socialism is one of these methods, and must be judged as such. The Bishop of Manchester is, therefore, bluffing the more simple-minded of his readers—not at all an unusual practice with the dignified clergy. The truth is that the bishop finds himself between the Devil and the deep sea. On the one side he wishes to appease the Socialists, and on the other he must avoid offending the class that form the real support—financial and religious—of the Church. So a little empty talk about a community of ideals is served out to satisfy the former, while the latter class is assured that it need be under no apprehension; the Church will continue to do its best to keep the people in order.

"Mr. Aked having objected," the *Evening News* says, "to the Fifth Avenue Baptist Church being called 'Rockefeller's Church,' the Oil King lately withdrew the light of his presence, and Mr. Aked found himself faced by a steadily dwindling congregation. Some people in New York appear to go to church to worship the almighty dollar, for the head money-changer having been coaxed back to the temple, the congregation have assumed its usual proportions. It was Rockefeller's church after all."

On the grounds that his brother, with his wife and their daughter had become revivalists, and "so covered themselves, and in a measure the testator also, with ridicule," Mr. J. F. Obree revoked a large bequest formerly made to them. Mr. Obree died worth £63,000, over £50,000 of which now goes to various charities.

The story of the Christian sect that was gradually reduced, by a series of splits, to two members, one of which confided to a friend that he had grave doubts of the other's orthodoxy, seems to be repeating itself with the New Theology movement. We noticed recently that Mr. H. C. Wallace had written withdrawing himself from association therewith. Now Dr. Warschauer writes in the *Christian World* that he must no longer be considered as endorsing Mr. Campbell's views. Mr. Campbell's offence is that he is now preaching a "pitiless Pantheism" (we presume "pitiless" is inserted for the sake of alliteration, there seems little else in it) he has cast doubt on the personality of God, and declared that there is no argument present to the human mind which can overthrow the argument of Determinism. Finally, Mr. Campbell says "there can be no escaping the conclusion that He [God] is ultimately respon-

sible for all the evil and suffering in the world." On these counts, Dr. Warschauer solemnly challenges Mr. Campbell's right to the title "Christian," and formally dissevers himself from association with so dangerous a personage.

Now we are far from denying that Dr. Warschauer has good grounds for denying that Mr. Campbell is, in any really rational interpretation of the word, a Christian. But then we fancy Dr. Warschauer, with many others, would merit the same condemnation. And we think that a more profitable course would be to show wherein Mr. Campbell, in taking up and using some of the old Freethought arguments, is wrong in the light of reason, instead of testing their validity in the light of faith. However, we can assure Dr. Warschauer, if it will give him any satisfaction, that Mr. Campbell is in many directions as irrational as the most convinced and orthodox Christian could desire. Indeed, when it comes to following up the conclusions of their own statements, there is a much greater agreement between Dr. Warschauer and Mr. Campbell than the former imagines. It is true that Mr. Campbell says there is no reason against Determinism, but then he does profess belief in a "free will." It is true he casts doubt on the personality of God, but he continues to endow him, or it, with all the qualities of a human being. He admits that the presence of evil and the existence of an all-wise and all-powerful Deity cannot be harmonised; but then, he says, the fact of our being unable to harmonise the two things leaves us with no alternative but to believe that "there is some meaning in suffering which we have not yet fathomed," and we must therefore read a meaning into it in harmony with our religious belief. And if all this does not meet Dr. Warschauer's requirements, and prove that Mr. Campbell has some claim to the title of Christian, we hardly see what is to be done to mend matters.

A writer in the *Christian Commonwealth* gives the following sketch of the Welshman and his religion: "He lacks the spirit of Christian brotherhood because his leaders and preachers have taught him wrongly. He is, again, a man of timid faith and narrow outlook upon life. The latter is due to his lack of education and of travel. He only knows his own little circle, and thinks that Welsh was the language of Eden, and Gomer, son of Noah, the ancestor of his people, and that Wales is the last and most enlightened country in the world—whereas it has been the land of small things and of superficial knowledge for many centuries.....He still regards science as the enemy of faith, and prefers to believe in the literal interpretation of Genesis, and that all the miracles of the Old Testament were literally true. He believes in the infallibility of even the figures which contradict one another in the Old Testament.....The rest of the religion consists in accepting the creed of his sect, in attending faithfully all the meetings of his chapel, and this is a great virtue among the sects; in contributing regularly towards the cause, and finally being a good, narrow, sectarian zealot." This doesn't sound very complimentary; and yet—one can never tell—it may be taken as such.

Mr. Thomas Hardy, in an article in the *Times*, of Oct. 9, on "Maumbury Ring," which is being excavated by the Dorset Field and Antiquarian Club, refers to the horrid execution there of a young wife hardly nineteen years of age on March 21, 1705-6. Mrs. Channing was sentenced to death for the murder of her husband, although the evidence was very far from conclusive. She pleaded that she was pregnant, and the execution was postponed until her child was born. She became a mother in the common room of the prison, without even a bed to lie on. After her lying-in she was attacked by an intermittent fever which lasted a long while and reduced her almost to a skeleton. But after the lapse of more than eight months the authorities concluded that she might undergo her sentence. She was first strangled and then burnt to ashes. She was apparently not dead when thrown into the flames. An ancestor of Mr. Thomas Hardy's, who witnessed the scene, left it on record that "her heart leapt out" during the burning; with other "curious details that cannot be printed" now. Mr. Hardy's comment on this shocking tragedy takes the form of a question. "Was man," he asks, "ever 'slaughtered by his fellow man' during the Roman or barbarian use of this place of games or of sacrifice in circumstances of greater atrocity?"

Mr. Philip Vivian's admirable book, *The Churches and Modern Thought*, has been under discussion at Canterbury by the Committee of the Royal Museum and Free Library. Mr. Vivian's book was already in the reference department, and he asked that the new edition should be placed in the circulating department. Alderman Hart, as chairman, had the first say on the matter. He said that the author of the

book was a thorough gentleman, and was also very clever, but if it fell into the hands of the young it "might be the means of undermining their faith." He thought, therefore, that the book should not go out into general circulation. Councillor Dodden agreed. He added that this was a most dangerous book, on account of the author's "great care in expression" and "the way in which he put his theories." Besides, the British Empire rested on religion, and were they going to see it subverted? But as they were bound to be tolerant to some extent, he thought the book should remain in the reference department—where, no doubt, he believed few people would ever read it. Councillor Winder supported both the previous speakers; he would even go further, and clear a lot of other sceptical books out of the lending library. Councillor Stone took the opposite view. He declared it was hypocritical to place the book in one part of the library and exclude it from another. If it was not fit to read, it should be excluded altogether. He wanted to know if they were going back to the Inquisition and the Dark Ages. But the Committee were deaf to Mr. Stone's common sense. They had made up their minds to protect religion and the British Empire, and they decided that Modern Thought should not get at the Churches, if they could help it; so they ordered Mr. Vivian's strong drink not to be taken out in jugs and bottles, but to be consumed only on the premises.

Councillor Dodden, by the way, was quite right. Mr. Vivian's book is a dangerous one. That is why we want to see it widely circulated. We appeal to Freethinkers to push the book along. We should like to see it in the hands of ten thousand fresh readers before Christmas.

We hear that Mark Twain has read *The Churches and Modern Thought* through three times. That ought to be a splendid recommendation—especially when the pious Canterbury Councillors don't want anybody to read it once.

The Rev. W. Cunningham, D.D., has just published a book, entitled *The Cure of Souls*, in which occurs the following significant sentence: "Christianity has nothing whatever to do with modern social ideals, as I understand the term." Dr. Cunningham is quite right. The Gospel Jesus was anything but a Socialist. He pronounced a beatitude on poverty: the chief aim of Socialism is to abolish poverty. For eighteen hundred years Christianity knew nothing of Socialism, and the Church organised itself on a totally opposite basis. But now Christianity is disintegrating and threatened with extinction, a few ministers, in sheer desperation, are doing their utmost to foist Socialism upon it, on the false plea that, in reality, the two have been identical from the beginning, although the Divine Spirit, for some wise reason, is only now revealing the fact to the world. How surprised the Holy Spirit must feel at receiving such information about himself.

The *Church Times* cherishes "chastened hopes" as to the future of society under the dominion of the Church. But those hopes are as vague as they are chastened. "We know that the Church of God," our pious contemporary observes, "will produce a new order out of the chaotic conditions of our day, but no man can trace even its outline." The latter clause of the sentence is true enough, but the former embodies a strange hallucination. That "new order" has been promised from the beginning; but the fulfilment is yet to come. Surely, with the experiences of the last two thousand years before it, the *Church Times* is over-bold in saying, "We know." "We hope" would have been better, only, judging the future by the past, the hope would prove as vain as the knowledge is false. And yet it is on unfulfilled hopes that "the Church of God" has always subsisted.

An East Anglian paper recently devoted two leaderettes to the views of the Bishop of Norwich on the Athanasian Creed. From a Nonconformist point of view, the Bishop was rebuked for his nebulousness and the Athanasian Creed censured for its want of common sense. This elicited a letter from our old friend and veteran Freethinker, Mr. J. W. de Caux, who asked whether the Athanasian Creed were not "the bed-rock of Christianity." Heaven and hell, and everlasting salvation and damnation, at any rate, were taught in the New Testament. It was also taught there that the poor go to heaven and the rich to hell; and Mr. de Caux pointed out that, according to their own Scriptures, the Bishops were qualifying for the wrong place. Thirty-nine of them, between 1856 and 1885, had left personal property to the value of £2,105,000—or about £54,000 apiece. The Bishop of Norwich, therefore, stood in more danger of the pains and penalties set forth in the Athanasian Creed than did most of the inhabitants of his diocese. But naturally,

we suppose, Mr. de Caux's letter was not inserted. The editor returned it with the remark that—"I do not think the destination of Dives and Lazarus, or even of the Bishops, is a suitable topic for discussion in our columns." Very likely. But why did the editor start a theological discussion? Is not the "destination" of people after death the be-all and the end-all of that fantastic system of guesswork which is facetiously called theology? We are afraid that the editor of that East Anglian paper mistook the proper "destination" of his own leaderettes. He should have sent them to a religious weekly.

The attitude of Christians to Freethinkers is perfectly intelligible, after all. We have the authority of no less a personage than the Rev. Mr. Jowett, of Birmingham, for saying that the God worshiped to-day is no other than the Jehovah so graphically portrayed by the prophet Naham. Towards his enemies, among whom Freethinkers must be placed, this Deity is "furious," "like the terrible flame of Vesuvius," "vengeful and full of wrath," he "taketh vengeance on," and "reserveth wrath" for them. None of them "can stand before his indignation," or "abide in the fierceness of his anger," for he "poureth out his fury like fire." In the light of such expressions one is not surprised at the action of the Lincoln magistrates. Mr. Jowett says that if God's attitude to his enemies were different, he could not be "good and a stronghold in the day of trouble" to his friends. And, of course, nothing is more natural than for people to imitate the God they believe in and worship.

The Wesleyan Methodists wanted a new hall at Sheffield. £15,000 was required to finish the purchase. They prayed to the Lord for £10,000 and got £9,000. That wasn't bad. But it wasn't enough. Some of them must be wondering why the Lord didn't send along the last £1,000. Was it a "celestial tip" that the purchase-price was too high?

Clement Gregory Hugh Clifford, better known as Cecil Brown Smith, and now still better known as "the paralysed beggar"—the paralysis being only a part of his little game—is now doing three months in Brixton Prison in default of paying £88 odd due to his wife under an alimony order granted her by reason of his desertion. This enterprising rogue had joined religion to fraudulent begging and wife desertion, and had preached the gospel on Clapham Common, where he got into a public debate with Mr. Boulter. The debate was adjourned, and was to be continued this month, but of course it is "off" now. The noble "Clifford" will be able to compare notes with a former opponent of Mr. Boulter's, the Rev. W. Brown, who is at present the chaplain of Brixton Prison. Perhaps they could fix up something really serviceable to Christianity between them.

At one of the meetings of the Church Congress there was a lively dispute as to what kind of drapery a clergyman should put on for the celebration of the Lord's Supper. There was no possibility of agreement. These men of God are forever fighting, either about things that are outside the range of knowledge, or about things that don't in the least matter.

It is suggested by the Boston *Zion's Herald* that instruction in the art of story-telling should form a prominent part of the training of preachers. The suggestion is superfluous. Students for the ministry have never been trained in anything but the art of story-telling. Every preacher is the reciter of fairy tales: they constitute his only stock-in-trade.

Bishops are all having motor-cars, and Nonconformist leaders are not going to be left behind. Rev. R. J. Campbell has long had a four-wheeled scorcher. We see it is now announced that the Rev. Dr. Campbell Morgan's congregation has just presented him with a £1,000 motor-car. "Blessed be ye poor"—"take up thy cross and follow me"—"for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

#### THE RAINMAKERS.

The lands were parched and dry. The grass had withered and the tall corn stalks bowed their sun-browned heads and seemed to cry for moisture. The river beds showed signs of dust and the streams and springs were unmarked by even a drop of water. The farmers were in despair. The clouds refused to sprinkle their precious drops of rain on the land and rapidly the crops were becoming ruined. Rainmakers were employed without success. Every effort was seemingly exhausted when relief came and the rain fell. The village church had given a picnic.



### Mr. Foote's Engagements.

Sunday, October 18, Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, All Saints, Manchester: at 3, "Socialism at the Church Congress"; at 6.30, "The Present Position of God."

October 25, Stanley Hall, London. November 1, Birmingham; 8, Nelson; 22, Stratford Town Hall; 29, Liverpool.

### To Correspondents.

C. COHEN'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—241 High-road, Leyton.—October 18, Glasgow. November 15, Tyneside Sunday Lecture Society; 22, Failsworth; 29, Birmingham.

J. T. LLOYD'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—October 18, Stanley Hall, London.

THE PRESIDENT'S HONORARIUM FUND: Previously acknowledged. Annual Subscriptions, £269 0s. 8d. Received since.—J. E. Luckpins, 2s. 6d.; Signet, 10s.; Robert Stirton and Friends—Dundee (quarterly), £1 6s. *Per E. Pinder*:—H. H. Wooley, 5s.; Well Wisher, 2s. 6d.

J. BROUGH.—Thanks for cuttings, which are useful.

JOHN SUMNER.—There is no need for a Defence Fund in connection with the Boston case at present. It may be necessary if the local authorities go on acting foolishly. Perhaps they won't. They have had one good lesson. *John Bull's* article was a strong one, as you say, and we were glad to see it.

L. GENTLE.—Dr. Warschauer has had attention enough, we think, in our paragraph department.

G. BRADFIELD.—Glad to see the report of your intervention in the debate at Cheltenham on behalf of Secular Education. Fortunately, the vote of the Trade Union Congress is more important than the opinion of Mr. J. Davis of the Cheltenham Independent Labor Party.

GEORGE SMITH.—How could we "blame" you? We are obliged.

KARL BRENER.—Glad you find so much pleasure in reading the *Freethinker* and only regret it is not published daily. We went into the Smyth-Pigott affair years ago. Other journals are now following in our wake—which is not unusual.

W. K. L.—The verses are good, but rather "too too" for publication. The performances of the Spaxton Messiah are a ticklish subject.

T. W. WHITEHORSE.—See "Acid Drops." Thanks.

J. KNOX.—Pleased to hear from one who has read the *Freethinker* for twenty years and never missed a copy. Your letter is interesting and encouraging.

J. E. LUCKPINS.—(1) Ruskin was brought up in "low evangelicalism" and at one time even sat at the feet of Spurgeon. He was almost suckled on the Bible, and this accounts for his frequent references to that book. But he broke away in later life from the cramping theology of his youth. His view of the "inspiration" of the Bible changed; so did his views of many other things; and towards the end he appears to have lost even the belief in a future life. He was a man of genius and a very great writer; what is better still, perhaps, he was a man of noble character. (2) It is not for us to state Mr. Bottomley's religious opinions. He himself is the proper person to do that. (3) We have always emphasised the fact that Secular Education does not mean teaching Secularism.

J. W. REPTON.—Pleased to have your letter. Introduce yourself, by all means, after one of Mr. Foote's lectures. He nearly always stays a while to shake hands with "saints." Mr. Chesterton's *Orthodoxy* may receive our attention shortly. Our hands are rather to full at the moment.

CONSTANT READER.—Too late for this week; will deal with it in our next.

E. W. JAMES.—Yes, the men of God do let the truth out for an airing occasionally.

H. WISHART.—Glad to hear of your good meeting on Woodhouse Moor. Why does the Leeds Branch get no further with the matter of Mr. Foote's visit? Is it too difficult to find a suitable hall?

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 Manager of the Pioneer Press, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C., and not to the Editor.

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

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

### Sugar Plums.

Mr. Foote visits Manchester to-day (Oct. 18) and delivers two lectures, afternoon and evening, in the Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, All Saints. There is pretty sure to be a crush in the evening, and "saints" who want to secure a good seat should be early.

Mr. Foote had a very good audience at the Leicester Secular Hall on Sunday evening, in spite of great counter-attractions in the town on that occasion. Mr. Sydney A. Gimson acted as chairman. The meeting was appreciative and enthusiastic. The Leicester Secular Society has a somewhat difficult task just at present, but it is full of energy and hopefulness, and, we believe, is bound to succeed. Naturally the loss of Mr. Gould throws a lot of additional work and responsibility on the shoulders of the President (Mr. Gimson), but he bears it smilingly.

The third lecture of the Stanley Hall course, under the auspices of the Secular Society, Ltd., will be delivered to-night (Oct. 18) by Mr. J. T. Lloyd. It is a considerable time since Londoners have had an opportunity of hearing Mr. Lloyd. We hope he will have a large audience and an enthusiastic welcome on this occasion. Mr. Foote winds up the Stanley Hall course on the following Sunday (Oct. 25).

Another course of Sunday evening lectures, under the auspices of the Secular Society, Ltd., has been arranged for at the Stratford Town Hall on November 8, 15, and 22. The lecturers will be Mr. Cohen, Mr. Lloyd, and Mr. Foote.

The Glasgow Branch's Annual Report for 1907-1908 is a healthy document. The Glasgow Branch shows what good and successful work can be done by a devoted band of men and women who have the interest of a great cause at heart.

The Establishment Committee of the Woolwich Town Council received the N. S. S. Branch deputation, but declined to reverse its decision not to let the Branch have the use of the Town Hall on payment for the same like other bodies in the borough. The Branch's next move will be a deputation to the Town Council. Meanwhile big meetings are being held in Beresford-square, and many fresh faces are rallying round the Secular standard.

The Newcastle (on Tyne) Rationalist Literary and Debating Society is now in its eighth year and is full of youthful vigor. It exists for the free discussion of all subjects—from Christianity to Cookery, as the secretary says. A good many of its members belong to the local N. S. S. Branch, but persons of all degrees of open-mindedness are welcome. A printed syllabus of the new session's meetings is a very varied one. Copies can be obtained of Mr. A. L. Coates, 26 Brandon-grove, Newcastle-on-Tyne, or at Mr. J. Charters' bookstall in the Market.

Rev. Francis Haydn Williams, one of the exponents of the New Theology, sends us a circular dated September 25, 1908, in which he says that "Personal God-ism is dead, or in its last throes, and Martineau's theological philosophy is already obsolete and stiffening into a fossil." Mr. Williams also says that "Our Father which art in heaven" expresses a pathetic belief that is rooted in the geocentric view of the universe, and the separate creation of species, as set out in the book of Genesis. Hence, with all its pathos, it must be dropped." Mr. Williams further says that "the time has come for an Organised Movement of Veracity" among Unitarian ministers. We fear this is a very large order.

The newspapers, including even the *Clarion*, have claimed Joseph Bates and Harold Catlin, who have just done a fortnight in Lincoln Gaol as "Socialist speakers." This is a way the newspapers have. They do their utmost to hide the fact that there is any active Freethought movement in England. Mr. Bates's lectures at Boston have all been Freethought lectures. That is why he was told in court that he might have been prosecuted on "a more serious charge"—namely, "blasphemy." We thought Mr. Catlin was a Socialist speaker, but we appear to have been misinformed. He is a young disciple of Mr. Bates's, and has spoken very little. He simply stood by his leader when the trouble came along.

A long report, but naturally satirical, of the reception of Joseph Bates at Boston, appeared in the local *Independent*,

which is a Conservative organ. A longer and fairer report—a *real* report—appeared in the local *Guardian*, which also reproduces a large part of our own article on the Bates case. We are glad to see the *Guardian* protesting editorially against the persecution of Joseph Bates. It reminds the authorities that they got him punished for his Atheism; it warns them that this sort of religious partiality is a dishonor to the town and will have to cease.

Mr. Joseph Bates sends us a letter expressing "gratitude" for the "prompt measures" taken on his behalf to protest against the unjust treatment meted out to him by the Boston magistrates. He says that he hardly thinks, after the great demonstration which welcomed him back from gaol, that there will be a repetition of their action; although there is a rumor that the Watch Committee are consulting counsel with a view to a prosecution for "blasphemy." Mr. Bates says that he always meant to form a Branch of the N. S. S., and that he is now working with the Branch started by Miss Vance during her visit. He adds that there are "indications of a heavy enrolment of members."

Here is an extract from the letter of a Unitarian minister to one of our correspondents:—"The *Freethinker* is better every week. Mr. Foote is one of the truest heroes of the age. I wish it were in my power to free him from financial embarrassments." We are glad to learn that the *Freethinker* helps to liberalise the discourses that are listened to by this gentleman's congregation.

"Secularist propaganda" was discussed at a largely-attended meeting in the Midland Hall in connection with the Church Congress. A long report appeared in the *Manchester Guardian*. There was no mention in it of the National Secular Society or the *Freethinker*, although the Rev. J. Watts Ditchfield, the first speaker, clearly quoted from the N. S. S. principles in stating what Secularism was. We merely note this omission, without complaining of it, for we are thoroughly used by this time to the careful conspiracy of silence against the only national organisation of Secularism and the only weekly Freethought paper in England. Mr. Ditchfield admitted that the propaganda of Secularism was "being carried on by men and women with an earnestness and power which commanded attention." The mass of working men were outside all churches and chapels. It might not be "distinct and absolute infidelity" on their part, but "there was an indifference to religion as deadly in its results as active opposition." Rev. Conrad Noel talked a good deal of nonsense about Secularism, and made some absurdly inaccurate statements about its "leaders"—though some that he mentioned do not call themselves Secularists at all. He admitted, however, that the Secular movement "did on the whole stand for freedom of thought"—which is rather faint praise, considering that the Secular party is the only one that can be depended upon to fight for freedom of thought when it is attacked. Canon G. S. Streatfield declared that "many advocates of Secularism were persons of the highest integrity. He warned his fellow Christians against the idea that "because a man opposed the Christian faith he must be of doubtful if not dangerous moral character." He also warned them that "the attack of Secularism on the Christian religion could not be effectually met without some modification on the part of the Church generally of traditional views, both as to the inspiration and interpretation of Scripture." Rev. A. J. Waldron, who is usually occupied in blackguarding Secularists, appeared on this occasion in a new character. He confessed that "the clergy, for the most part, were vastly inferior speakers to their opponents," and they were too fond of giving "puerile and often infantile teaching" from their pulpits, while it was necessary that they should "know how to speak, not to mumble." Mr. Waldron also stumbled upon a truth which is even a truism. He said that "the main cause of modern scepticism was to be found in the spread of education." Quite so. And as the spread of education will certainly continue, the future of scepticism is fairly well assured.

#### PERSECUTION.

Persecution is the only name applicable to punishment inflicted on an individual in consequence of his opinions. What end is persecution designed to answer? Can it convince him whom it injures? Can it prove to the people the falsehood of his opinions? It may make *him* a hypocrite, and *them* cowards; but bad means can promote no good end. The unprejudiced mind looks with suspicion on a doctrine that needs the sustaining hand of power.—*Shelley*.

#### Genesis and Science.

THE Rev. John Tuckwell, a valorous Bible Leaguer, has devoted some ten years to the study of the first chapter of Genesis, and has carefully examined every Hebrew word, and endeavored to inform himself upon the various scientific subjects involved in it, and he has been unable to find a single mistake in a single word from beginning to end. Thus equipped, he has been bravely challenging the English-speaking world to point out to him any such mistake, and not one has been able to do so. "From the north of Scotland to the south of England," has this valiant knight-errant gone, snorting like a high-spirited war horse, and asking "tens of thousands of people" to venture out against him on this his favorite theme; but in all the millions thus addressed there was not one found with the temerity even to open his mouth. This persistent silence fanned the confidence of this Bible champion into a vehement flame, and he became more defiant than ever. Would no one pick up the gauntlet so heroically thrown down? At last, Mr. Joseph McCabe stooped down and seized it, and, as a result, a two nights' debate was arranged between the two, which duly came off on the evenings of Monday and Tuesday, October 5 and 6. What Mr. Tuckwell undertook to prove was, "That the agreement of the first chapter of Genesis with the accredited facts of modern science is such that its composition can be accounted for only as the result of supernatural knowledge." It is not too much to say that the whole debate turned out a complete fiasco. In no true sense could it be called a debate at all. There was a crowded audience each evening, composed chiefly of Freethinkers, but with a fair sprinkling of ardent Bible Leaguers. One of the latter partook so freely of the strong wine of Bibliolatry that at the close of the first evening's entertainment he started singing the Doxology, "Praise God from whom all blessings flow," and got right royally angry when the godless mob around him shut him up with hilarious laughter. So elevated was another member of the same party, that when he got outside he made a violent attack upon the blasphemous opponent of the Lord's anointed.

Of the debate itself the least said the better. Mr. Tuckwell trotted out what he called ten points of agreement between the first chapter of Genesis and modern science; but on any legitimate system of exegesis the whole ten were entirely foreign to the Hebrew text. Not one of them was there until Mr. Tuckwell inserted it after stealing it from the text of modern science. He made a great parade of his knowledge of the real meaning of each of the Hebrew words employed, and constantly mentioned the great Gesenius as his authority. Unfortunately for him, however, Mr. McCabe, being a good linguist, with a thorough knowledge of Hebrew, had no difficulty whatever in making it perfectly clear to the dullest understanding that Mr. Tuckwell had forced upon Genesis an interpretation which had never been dreamed of by the spirit-guided and spirit-illuminated Church of Jesus Christ. To this there was no reply, and the reverend gentleman offered none. He merely repeated his former assertions without even attempting to prove one of them.

Mr. McCabe opened the second evening with a lucid exegesis of the Hebrew text, which is now accepted by all accredited scholars in Christendom. This was totally lost on the reverend gentleman. Even when pelted with literal quotations from Gesenius, his own chosen authority, the man of God appeared to be quite insensible of their crushing force. "I admit," he weakly answered, "that Gesenius's knowledge of Hebrew was accurate *as far as it went*; but Gesenius did not know everything." After that, what could be said? The debate ended before it really began. Under such circumstances, debate there could not be. To argue with any degree of success, one must possess some rudimentary acquaintance with logic, and of this Mr. Tuckwell is utterly devoid.

In his closing address, the Rev. Mr. Tuckwell revealed the fact that he is only very partially, if at all, an evolutionist, that he verily believes that all the different species of plants and animals were specially created, and that so far at least as living organisms are concerned, there is no need for the supposition that life has existed on our globe for so many millions of years. And yet the defence of Genesis is meaningless except on the assumption that the theory of evolution is true, true of all living species on our globe as well as of the solar system. To be consistent, Mr. Tuckwell must either disbelieve in the infallibility of the first chapter of Genesis, or reject the teachings of modern science. To reconcile the two is beyond the power of any living man, as most of the theologians of to-day are discreet enough to acknowledge. To debate with Bible Leaguers is a lamentable waste of time and energy, a fact of which Mr. McCabe is now, doubtless, fully aware.

CELTICUS.

### Hubbard and the Censors.

ANOTHER STIMULATING MESSAGE TO THE EAST AURORA LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

AFTER the Board of Education of East Aurora, N.Y., had declined to receive into the town library a set of Ingersoll's works, proffered by Mrs. Marilla M. Ricker, the members were asked if they would accept from Elbert Hubbard the gift of his own writings in forty volumes. The Board replied that it would take the books, but might place them in the Department of Objectionable Literature. Thereupon Mr. Hubbard withdrew the offer, addressing to the Board the following letter:—

"Gentlemen: I am in receipt of your kind letter of August 11, wherein you accept my offer of a complete set of my books.

I also note that you contemplate the inauguration of a 'Department of Objectionable Literature.' By a peculiar coincidence it seems that this innovation had not occurred to you until I offered you my books. You add: 'We may find it necessary to place a certain number of the forty volumes which you offer in this department of objectionable literature.'

This is surely an honor which I had not contemplated when I proffered you the volumes. Quite naturally I do not consider my writings worthy of this special distinction. And most certainly not those which have been approved by time and then reprinted in the *de luxe* form of the books I tendered you. We have all heard of gifts that had a string attached, but it is seldom that one hears of an acceptance with a proviso.

I must thank you for your frank intimation as to the probable destiny of my books at your hands, and although I cannot decide whether your reference to 'objectionable literature' came as a threat or a promise, yet the thought of seeing certain of these children of my brain separated from their companions in a case labelled 'Objectionable' is so painful that I beg to withdraw my original offer.

Imagine my masterpiece, *The Essay on Silence*, muzzled, locked and guarded in your 'Department of Objectionable Literature'!

So I have decided to place the volumes in the Roycroft Library and then simply notify my neighbors that the books are at their disposal without let or hindrance, and not deceive them by adding to the natural pleasures of reading the further spice of perusing things only dubbed 'Objectionable' by a School Board.

If perchance no one wishes to run the risk of a soul-smirch by reading them, they can serve for seats for children who need a little elevation at the Roycroft round tables, or for the pressing of butterflies or botanical specimens.

Your statement that the Library Department of Albany had refused to approve of the purchase of the writings of Robert G. Ingersoll, is interesting if it were relevant. Why you should refuse as a gift what the Department declines to buy, is not exactly pertinent to the issue, unless you wish to convey the idea that you are not allowed to accept the books at all. If this is the case, I beg to disillusion you, and relieve you of the handicap. You may buy or accept any book you choose and the Department has no authority to trouble you.

It is true, as you explain, that the Department has refused to sanction the purchase of Ingersoll's works. But you neglect to state that the Department expressly stated that it did not undertake to condemn the works of Ingersoll, but that where a limited amount of money only was at command,

it was simply a matter of taste or judgment in selection as to what books it was best to buy.

You quote as authority for condemning Ingersoll the late Judge Black and Wm. E. Gladstone. You should have followed the example of Ingersoll and given the full text of both the articles by Black and Gladstone, with Ingersoll's reply, or not have quoted these men at all. Their articles on Ingersoll's philosophy are to be found in full in the complete Dresden edition of Ingersoll (which unfortunately is not in your library). So if Ingersoll gave the bite he also supplied the antidote. See Vol. VI. Dresden Edition of Ingersoll's Works, page 221.

You refer me to certain census reports. It has been said that statistics lie like epitaphs, but I will call your attention to the fact that the last census gives six hundred and sixty church members in East Aurora, out of a population of eighteen hundred.

Your desire to preserve a static religion and prevent the children from surpassing their parents is worthy of a better cause. Had no man in the past improved upon the religion of his mother we would all be under the domain of augury and astrology, eating raw meat and worshiping fire as a thing too sacred for use.

As I understand it, it is not the business of a School Board to uphold, protect, defend, and perpetuate the particular religious faith of the parents of the children. If education means anything it means access to books, not their suppression. Is it the desire of the School Board that no child shall surpass its parents?

Surely the duties of a Board of Education do not lie in the direction of limiting the opportunities for knowledge, but in extending them.

Education through suppression is popular to-day only in Russia.

That the people should know what Robert Ingersoll really taught, is, I believe, a very vital thing. And in order to know what is taught in Ingersoll's books the people should not be forced to depend upon interested and prejudiced partisans who have never read them. America does not recognize any Index Expurgatorius.

I note your statement that the village of East Aurora has nine churches. This, I believe, is incontrovertible. And by a singular coincidence East Aurora also has nine saloons. Strangely enough, the only people of the village with whom I am *persona non grata* are the zealous upholders of one or the other, or both, of these institutions.

With nine churches struggling for existence in a small town there is of necessity much strife, often ill-concealed; and this strife and emotionalism, with the aid of the nine saloons aforesaid, often finds form in disease, poverty, ignorance and incompetence.

The man who is so prejudiced against the Great Agnostic that he refused to allow his son to carry an Ingersoll watch is typical.

But no one claims that the ignorance, poverty and incompetence to be found in our village is owing to the influence of liberal thought.

Rather it is a fact that the cigarette-smoking boys who hang round the station and against whom the constable was recently ordered by the president of the village to enforce the gambling ordinance, are mostly the children of church members.

A taste for books tends towards sobriety, industry, and economy. The young people in the Roycroft Shop who have savings banks accounts are those who read Ingersoll, not those who don't. Your slipshod, idle, profligate and unreliable youth may get 'converted' once a year, but he does not read or study anything. His nights are given to 'pool,' 'craps,' and the insidious 'fish-fry.'

If the preachers of this town would work with the School Board for a higher intellectual life, and encourage independent thinking and healthful living, we might indeed have an ideal village. But this is not possible as long as a campaign of suppression is deemed desirable, and a 'Department of Objectionable Literature' is a feature of your Public Library.

Down to comparatively recent times all books were refused to the common people. Until Martin Luther came upon the stage the Bible had a padlock on it, and this condition continued almost to our own time. The Dark Ages were dark simply because men were not allowed to see the light. And darkness will be upon the face of the land just as long as Boards of Education seek to render tabu the writings of men who stand for a wider intellectual horizon, and the liberty of man, woman and child.

I wish you well in your 'Department of Objectionable Literature.' Once you have started the Department, I am sure you will feel a personal pride in making a conspicuous success. But you will please excuse me from pushing myself forward for honors in this particular direction—my modesty forbids. Sincerely yours,

ELBERT HUBBARD."

—Truthseeker (New York).

### Mercury and the Devout Athenian.

A CITIZEN was driving to the market of Athens the produce of his farm, and, by the way, fell into deep cogitation respecting the nature and attributes of Jupiter. "How great, how wise, how powerful, how wonderful art thou," he exclaimed, "O king of Heaven, and ruler of the earth! Thy majesty is beyond conception, and thy goodness beyond praise. All things were made by thy power, and are sustained by thy providence. Thy hand upholdeth the frame of heaven, and keepeth the foot of man from stumbling."—So saying, with his eyes uplifted in devout ecstasy, he plumped into a well.

On recovering his senses, which the suddenness and depth of his fall had somewhat stunned, he lifted up his hands and voice in the darkness, and fixing his gaze on the narrow circle of blue sky which closed the mouth of his prison. "O Jupiter!" he exclaimed, "have I neglected thy service or thy altars? Have I failed to attribute to thee all my good fortune, and to absolve thee of all my evil? Have I doubted thy power, or thy goodness, or thy providence? Oh, Father of Gods and men! have mercy, and draw me out of this pit, where, doubtless, in thy wisdom, thou hast thrown me, that I may sing aloud thy praises in the ears of all men, and moisten thy altars with the blood and fat of sacrifice in the sight of all eyes!"

Now it chanced that Mercury had occasion to pass that way on some especial business with the pickpockets of Athens. Hearing the wailings of distress, and being a person of curiosity, he stopped, and, gazing from right to left, at length looked down into the well, and shouted to ascertain the nature of the disaster. "Hollo!" said the pleasant Deity, as the voice now rose more distinctly to his ear, "hath a man taken the position of a frog? What do ye there, i' the name of the seven sages, and of Lycurgus, my especial patron?"

The citizen, who espied the winged cap of the Olympian messenger bending over the abyss, nothing doubted the success of his supplications, and shouted his acknowledgments in a passion of gratitude. "O thou most wise, most just, most benignant Deity! O Jove, Father of Gods and men, thou hast heard the prayer of my affliction, and my soul shall bless thee all the days of my life!"

"By my divinity," cried Hermes, "but here is one of the mad philosophers of Minerva's mad city, comfortably entombed in a lodging, doubtless, of his own choice and fashioning! The fates forbid that I should disturb thee, friend! A long life to thee, or a speedy death, as thou wilt, and after thy decease all the honor which fell to Empeocles! Good morrow."

"Stay! O most divine Jupiter! Fulfil the purpose of him who sent thee, and draw me out of this watery pit into the light of the sun!"

"Nay! an' thy acquaintance be with Jupiter, and thou waitest his sending, by my six wings! I have nought to do with thee. I have no commission from the son of Saturn; and, seeing thou art in correspondence with him, interference on my part would be contrary to the rules of celestial politeness. Good morrow."

"Nay, but Hermes! Hermes! most amiable and most excellent divinity! forsake me not in this misery! Hear me, I pray thee, and let my extremity move thee to compassion."

"But if Jupiter has promised a rescue?—it would be unhandsome on my part to anticipate his charity. Or if thou art there under his sentence, in punishment of some offence offered to his authority—I tell thee my meddling in such a case would impeach my divine honor and my standing as a God of good breeding in the eyes of all Olympus."

"Thy divinity misconceives the matter, O most excellent son of Maia! I am not here by the decree of Jupiter, nor have I to my knowledge offended against his will, neither have I any warrant to expect his assistance!"

"Then how i' the name of all disasters came ye into your present station, or why heaped ye so many blessings on the head of my respectable father? If thou hast eyes thou canst have little wit; if it was thy own wisdom which lodged thee in thy present habitation, seeing that Sol shines at his brightest and that the road runs smooth and straight a good stone's pitch to the right."

"May it please your divinity," said the citizen, "I was guiding my beast to market charged with the fruits of my garden, under the blessing of your providence perhaps, if not of Jupiter's —"

"Not of mine, truly," interrupted the God; "nor of Jupiter's either, to my fancying, for I left him but now breakfasting heartily on Ambrosia, after singing a catch with Apollo to the lyre of the laughing Euphrosyne."

"Ah, well!" sighed the unhappy citizen, "your divinity doubtless knows best. But, even as I said, I was driving my

beast to market, and by the way raised my thoughts to the contemplation of the Gods, and my voice in their praise; when, lo! as my eyes were upcast towards the heavenly residence, and my voice uplifted in honor of the divine company, and, yet more especially, in that of the divine Jupiter, the Father of Gods and men, I stumbled into this region of water and darkness even as thou seest. And hearing thy divine voice and perceiving thy divine wings, Oh most excellent Hermes! I even thought that it had pleased the divine Jupiter, the Father of Gods and men, to accept my homage, and that in his infinite goodness he had despatched thee to my aid, Oh most divine messenger!"

"Now, thou most divine ass, or divine father of asses, which thou wilt"; said Hermes, holding his sides, and laughing until the nectareous moisture trickled from his celestial eyes: "Truly, but thy folly overtops that of Athæna's philosophers; and, but that it were pity to deprive that learned city of so excellent a fool, I could find in my heart to leave thee where thou art to prosecute thy celestial contemplations, and practise patience until Jupiter stooped his ear from heaven to listen to thy flattery, and I made a flight hither expressly for thy rescue. But, come! thou hast furnished a joke for the celestial Symposium which shall lose nothing in my relation, and hast afforded me a most excellent laugh, for which Mercury was never ungrateful. So! up with thee!" and, lowering his caduceus to the touch of the half-frozen, half-drowned votary of Jupiter, he drew him like a feather from the depths of the dark abode, and landed him on the dry, warm earth.

"Come, shake thyself! Find thy beast, and betake thee to thy business! And, understand, that thou art more likely to thrive by fixing thy thoughts on what concerneth thee and thy fellow-mortals, than by occupying them in imagining and admiring the concerns and perfections of the gods. Your nature is one, and theirs is another. Improve your own, of which you know something, instead of praising theirs of which you know nothing. And, bethink you another time, that if you have a beast to drive and figs to sell, so has Jupiter his business and pleasure to pursue, and I mine."

—Francis Wright's Fables.

### The Boston Fight.

TAKING up the story of the Boston fight from the point at which the editor of the *Freethinker* concluded, I have to report that, instructed by the N. S. S. President, I sent Mr. Wishart to Boston, on Sunday, October 4, to deliver two lectures on the rights of free speech and the principles of Secularism, in the Bargate. Both addresses were listened to by large and enthusiastic audiences, and collections to defray the expenses of the Reception were taken up. Mr. Wishart's remarks were greatly appreciated, notwithstanding the fact that two pious Bostonians had to be ejected from the crowd—one for throwing gravel and the other for assault.

At the desire of the Reception Committee, I started for Boston on Thursday last to meet Mr. Bates and Mr. Catling when released from prison. I decided, however, to go first to Lincoln, and, on my arrival, discovered that in order to prevent the proposed Reception there, the Governor of Lincoln Gaol had released them an hour earlier than was expected. However, a prominent citizen of Boston, Mr. F. Lucas, whose indignation had been aroused by the treatment of these young men, had slept at Lincoln over-night and met the prisoners in spite of the Governor's ruse.

After a visit to a local "saint" and valued contributor to the *Freethinker*, we—Mr. Lucas, Mr. Bates, Mr. Catling, and myself—reached Lincoln Station to find a deputation of local Freethinkers and some Socialists, who gave us a hearty send-off. Arriving at Boston, the scene suggested to me a miniature repetition of one of the Northampton elections. An unfriendly newspaper gives the numbers assembled as between three and four thousand, I myself should say six thousand was nearer the mark. Terrific cheers and applause greeted the victims of Christian bigotry as we stepped into a brake, drawn by many willing young sympathisers, and preceded by a brass band and flaming torchlights, we "processed" right through the main streets into the Bargate. Scarcely had we started, when a token of appreciation in the shape of a large rat, whose death had preceded our arrival by some days, struck Mr. Catling in the face and landed in my lap; this and a rotten turnip, which later on hit me unexpectedly on the back of my head, were the only outward signs of hostility. The municipal buildings and the residences of some of the magistrates were greeted with tremendous "boos" as we passed. One of these had boarded up his business premises, reminding one of the text, "The wicked fleeth when no man pursueth." The procession increased in numbers at every step, and at the

Bargate we found another huge crowd. An enthusiastic meeting was briefly addressed by Messrs. Bates and Catling, and a presentation was made of a mackintosh to Mr. Bates and of a sovereign to Mr. Catling (who has lost his employment through his imprisonment). Being requested to address the meeting, I assured them that the N. S. S. would now, and at all times, support a fight for Freethought and Free Speech.

A resolution pledging the meeting to support the movement for the full right of free speech was carried unanimously. Mr. Bates expressed his gratitude for the assistance rendered by the N. S. S., and assured me that future opposition will but increase his activity in the Freethought cause. As the London press particularly has insisted on describing them as Socialists, both young men inform me that, though they have occasionally filled a gap on the I. L. P. platform, they have never belonged to any Socialist organisation, nor have they received help from any Socialist organisation as such. Mr. Catling is a young and enthusiastic admirer of Mr. Bates, and until recently belonged to the Wesleyan persuasion.

The result to Freethought is a N. S. S. Branch at Boston, with Mr. Bates as secretary, thirteen members to date, and hundreds of sympathisers. The new secretary will hold his meetings on Sundays as usual, is most anxious to arrange for a visit from Mr. Foote, and quite ready for another batch of summonses.

EDITH M. VANCE, N. S. S. General Secretary.

### An Omar Bibliography.

Los Angeles, U.S.A., Sept. 10, 1908.  
339½ So. Hill-street.

THE undersigned desires the co-operation of all who are interested in the literature pertaining to and for the publication of "A Bibliography of the *Rubaiyat* of Omar Khayyam, with Notes for an Anthology of Kindred Literature."

Aside from the various translations in English, as well as many foreign languages and the numerous editions of the *Rubaiyat* published both in America and abroad, all matter on the subject will be included, such as verses, parodies, side degrees, criticisms *pro* and *con.*, magazine and newspaper items, allied degrees, etc., etc. It is especially desired to procure the dates and original sources of everything printed on the subject.

The work will be issued during the early months of 1909, and not later than March 31, the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Edward Fitzgerald. The book will be dedicated to the Omar Khayyam Club of America, and the edition will be a strictly limited one. Book lovers are advised to make reservations early.

Desiring to make this bibliography as complete as possible, any suggestions to be offered, and all communications and items of interest, will be gratefully acknowledged by the compiler and publisher,

H. M. SCHROETER.

A common sophism, which, like many others, depends on the abuse of a metaphorical expression to a literal purpose, has produced much of the confusion which has involved the theory of morals. It is said that no person is bound to be just or kind, if, on his neglect, he should fail to incur some penalty. Duty is obligation. There can be no obligation without an obliger. Virtue is a law, to which it is the will of the lawgiver that we should conform; which will we should in no manner be bound to obey, unless some dreadful punishment were attached to disobedience. This is the philosophy of slavery and superstition.—*Shelley*.

You may call space "a thing," but it is only indefinite extension, as time is indefinite succession. The metaphysical difficulty arises when we try to use the word *infinite* in a positive sense. Then we are brought face to face with antinomies because we are trying to transcend the limits of our faculties. Still, it is absurd to affirm that "space is quite as impossible to conceive as God." We know extension by experience, and increasing it *ad infinitum* is rather an exercise in transcendent geometry than in practical reason. But what experience have we of God? Is it not easier to conceive that to be unlimited of which we have knowledge than that of which we have no knowledge at all? And if God be considered as a personality—without which he is not God—is it possible to combine infinitude and personality in the same conception?—*G. W. Foote, "Ingersollism Defended Against Archdeacon Farrar."*

### Quatrains from Abul-Ala.

(PERSIAN POET, 974—1058.)

V.

Our nights and days around each other spin,  
And we, like planets, end as we begin;  
Our feet are on the heads of those that passed,  
And as the cradle cries, the graves all grin.

XVIII.

Why drinkest from the fountain of Belief?  
Why seekest at the Saki's door relief?  
A lie imbibed, a thousand lies will breed,  
And in the end, thyself will come to grief.

XXIII.

How oft around the well my soul would grope  
Athirst; but lo, my pail was without rope;  
I cried for water, and the deep, dark well  
Echoed my wailing cry, but not my hope.

XL.

A church, a temple, or a Kaba stone,  
Koran or Bible, or a Martyr's bone—  
All these and more my heart can tolerate,  
Since my religion now is love alone.

XLI.

To all humanity, O consecrate [prate  
Thy heart, and shun the thousand sects that  
About the things they little know about—  
Let all receive thy pity, love, or hate.

LVII.

These superstitions, sacred books and creeds,  
These cults and myths and other noxious weeds—  
So many lies are crowned in every age,  
While truth beneath the tyrant's heel still bleeds.

LXX.

Or wed thyself to reason and behold  
The snakes of persecution (young or old  
Around thee hissing, poisoning the well  
Of life's devotion true) their nets unfold.

LXXXI.

Hunt not the beast, O, be thou more humane,  
Since hunter here nor hunted long remain;  
The smallest grub a life has in it which  
Thou canst not take without inflicting pain.

CI.

My goal's the grave, my hours are my good steed;  
My life the road on which I blindly speed;  
A little while and then the one unseen  
Strikes, and behold! I'm but a sapless weed.

CXIV.

"A hell," some shriek; its fire tho' I do know  
Is set by evil deeds, that in it blow;  
Our hells we make and unmake as we live—  
The flames that smoke and burn will warm and glow.

CXVIII.

But even Sultans will to clay return  
And, chancing, serve us as a coffee-urn;  
Perchance remolded to a pot, and then  
Drinks from it whoso wishes in his turn.

ARE UNITARIANS CHRISTIANS?—"In no proper sense of the word can I call Unitarians and Socinians believers in Christ; at least, not in the only Christ of whom I have read or know anything."—*Coleridge*.

Humility is not a virtue; in other words it does not spring from reason.—*Spinoza*.

**SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, etc.**

Notices of Lectures, etc., must reach us by first post on Tuesday and be marked "Lecture Notice," if not sent on postcard.

**LONDON.**

STANLEY HALL (Junction-road, N., opposite Tufnell Park "Tube" Station): 7.30, J. T. Lloyd, "Is Man a Machine?"

**OUTDOOR.**

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

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S.: Outside Maryland Point Station, Stratford, 7, W. J. Ramsey, a Lecture.

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

WOOLWICH BRANCH N. S. S.: Beresford-square, 11.30, a Lecture.

**COUNTRY.**

EDINBURGH BRANCH N. S. S. (Rationalists' Club, 12 Hill-square): 6.30, J. Ralph S. Ommundsen, "Is the Bible the Word of God?"

FAILSWORTH (Secular Sunday School, Pole-lane): 6.30, Concert by Mr. Haslam's Concert Party.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (Hall, 110 Brunswick-street): C. Cohen, 12 noon, "The Vice of Christian Virtue"; 6.30, "The New Science, the Old Faith, and God."

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N. S. S. (Central Buildings, 113 Islington): Sydney Wollen, 3, "God, Polygamy, and Mormonism"; 7, "The Mistakes of Jesus Christ." General meeting after evening lecture.—Debating Society, Thursday, October 15, at 8, C. C. Nathan, "The Licensing Bill."

MANCHESTER BRANCH N. S. S. (Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, All Saints): G. W. Foote, 3, "Socialism at the Church Congress"; 6.30, "The Present Position of God." Tea at 5.

NEWCASTLE (Rationalist Literary and Debating Society, Lockhart's Cathedral Café): Thursday, October 22, at 8, W. Richardson, "The Infinitely Little." A Peep through the Microscope.

**OUTDOOR.**

BOSTON BRANCH N. S. S.: Bargate Green, at 3, Joseph Bates, "Why Christianity Fails in its Mission."

DALKEITH: High-street, Saturday, October 17, at 7, "Was Jesus Christ the Son of God?"

EDINBURGH BRANCH N. S. S.: The Meadows, 3, a Lecture; The Mound, 6.30, a Lecture.

**TRUE MORALITY;**

Or, The Theory and Practice of Neo-Malthusianism,

AS I BELIEVE,

**THE BEST BOOK**

ON THIS SUBJECT.

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

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

A POPULAR EDITION IN PAPER COVERS.

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

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

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

Orders should be sent to the author.

J. R. HOLMES, EAST HANNEY, WANTAGE.

**H. S. WISHART, Freethought Advocate,**

Lectures, Debates, or Missions on behalf of Mental Freedom and Social Happiness.

For dates, etc., write.—22 Sandhurst-avenue, Harehill, Leeds.

**SALE.**—*Freethinkers*, unbound, clean, 1891-9, and *National Reformers*, 1891-3; cheap.—Write, O. R. FEATHERSTONE, 33 Sandemere-road, Clapham.

**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.

**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.

**PAMPHLETS by C. COHEN.**

Foreign Missions, their Dangers and Delusions ... .. 3d.

Full of facts and figures.

An Outline of Evolutionary Ethics ... 6d.  
Principles of ethics, based on the doctrine of Evolution.

Evolution and Christianity ... .. 2d.

Socialism, Atheism, and Christianity.. 1d.

Christianity and Social Ethics ... 1d.

Pain and Providence ... .. 1d.

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

"**NATIONAL REFORMER**," cloth bound, good condition; May 1, 1870; December 18, 1870; 1871-1885; 18 vols.—Send offers to OWEN FEATHERSTONE, 33 Sandemere-road, Clapham.

# CLEARANCE SALES.

## Great Reductions.

### MAKING ROOM FOR FRESH STOCK.

The first figure after each book or pamphlet represents the original published price.

The second figure is the price at which it is now offered.

P. means postage.

|   | s. | d. | d. |       | s. | d. | d. |
|---|----|----|----|-------|----|----|----|
| <b>BACON, LORD</b>  |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| PAGAN MYTHOLOGY: or Wisdom<br>of the Ancients ... ..                                    | 1  | 0  | 2  | p. 1½ |    |    |    |
| <b>AVELING, Dr. E.</b>  |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| DARWIN MADE EASY ... ..<br>A valuable work.   | 1  | 0  | 8  | p. 2  |    |    |    |
| <b>BENTHAM, JEREMY</b>  |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| CHURCH OF ENGLAND CATECHISM<br>EXAMINED ... ..  | 1  | 0  | 8  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| A masterly work, narrowly escaped<br>prosecution.                                       |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| <b>COHEN, C.</b>  |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| FOREIGN MISSIONS ... ..   | 0  | 9  | 8  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| A complete exposure of the Mission-<br>ary movement.                                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| <b>FEUERBACH, LUDWIG</b>  |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| THE ESSENCE OF RELIGION ... ..  | 1  | 0  | 8  | p. 1½ |    |    |    |
| Demonstrates and explains the<br>purely human origin of God.                            |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| <b>COLLINS, ANTHONY</b>   |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| FREE WILL AND NECESSITY ... ..  | 1  | 0  | 8  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| "Collins writes with wonderful<br>power and closeness of reasoning."—<br><i>Huxley.</i> |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| <b>FOOTE, G. W.</b>   |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| PUBLIC DEBATE WITH REV. DR.<br>McCANN ... ..  | 1  | 0  | 8  | p. 2  |    |    |    |
| COMIC SERMONS ... ..  | 0  | 8  | 2  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| LETTERS TO THE CLERGY ... ..  | 1  | 0  | 8  | p. 2  |    |    |    |
| REMINISCENCES OF BRADLAUGH... ..  | 0  | 6  | 2  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| OPEN LETTERS TO JESUS CHRIST ... ..   | 0  | 4  | 1  | p. ½  |    |    |    |
| PHILOSOPHY OF SECULARISM ... ..   | 0  | 8  | 1  | p. ½  |    |    |    |
| HALL OF SCIENCE LIBEL CASE... ..  | 0  | 6  | 2  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| GRAND OLD BOOK ... ..   | 1  | 0  | 8  | p. 1½ |    |    |    |
| Reply to Gladstone.   |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| SIGN OF THE CROSS ... ..  | 0  | 6  | 2  | p. 1½ |    |    |    |
| Contains important examination of<br>the famous Tacitus passage.                        |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| WHAT IS AGNOSTICISM? ... ..   | 0  | 8  | 1  | p. ½  |    |    |    |
| With a Defence of Atheism.  |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| <b>FOOTE, G. W.—Continued.</b>  |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| WILL CHRIST SAVE US? ... ..   | 0  | 6  | 2  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| DARWIN ON GOD ... ..  | 0  | 6  | 2  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| An important work.  |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| <b>INGERSOLL, R. G.</b>   |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| THE DEVIL ... ..  | 0  | 6  | 2  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| CHRISTIAN CATECHISM ... ..  | 0  | 6  | 2  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| A brilliant work.   |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| DEFENCE OF FREETHOUGHT ... ..   | 0  | 4  | 1  | p. ½  |    |    |    |
| Speech at a "blasphemy" trial.  |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| ORATION ON THE GODS ... ..  | 0  | 6  | 1  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| SUPERSTITION ... ..   | 0  | 6  | 1  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| ORATION ON VOLTAIRE... ..   | 0  | 8  | 1  | p. ½  |    |    |    |
| ROME OR REASON? ... ..  | 0  | 8  | 1  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| COMING CIVILISATION ... ..  | 0  | 8  | 1  | p. ½  |    |    |    |
| ORATION ON WALT WHITMAN ... ..  | 0  | 8  | 1  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| WHAT IS RELIGION? ... ..  | 0  | 2  | ½  | p. ½  |    |    |    |
| Ingersoll's Last Lecture.   |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| <b>LLOYD, JOHN T.</b>   |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| FROM CHRISTIAN PULPIT TO SECU-<br>LAR PLATFORM ... ..                                   | 0  | 6  | 1  | p. ½  |    |    |    |
| <b>NEWMAN, CHARLES</b><br>(Cardinal Newman's Brother.)                                  |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| ESSAYS IN RATIONALISM ... ..  | 1  | 6  | 4  | p. 2  |    |    |    |
| <b>SHELLEY, P. B.</b>   |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| REFUTATION OF DEISM ... ..  | 0  | 4  | 1  | p. ½  |    |    |    |
| LIFE, DEATH, AND IMMORTALITY ... ..   | 0  | 2  | ½  | p. ½  |    |    |    |
| LETTER TO LORD ELLENBOROUGH ... ..  | 0  | 2  | ½  | p. ½  |    |    |    |
| <b>STRAUSS, D. F.</b>   |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| THE BIRTH OF CHRIST... ..   | 0  | 6  | 1  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| <b>WATTS, CHARLES</b>   |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| IS IMMORTALITY A FACT? ... ..   | 0  | 4  | 1  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| RATIONALIST'S CATECHISM ... ..  | 0  | 8  | 1  | p. 1  |    |    |    |
| <b>WHEELER, J. M.</b>   |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |
| LIFE OF VOLTAIRE ... ..   | 1  | 0  | 2  | p. 2  |    |    |    |
| FOOTSTEPS OF THE PAST ... ..  | 2  | 6  | 6  | p. 3  |    |    |    |

### FURTHER REDUCTION.

Half-a-Crown's worth from above list for Two Shillings.

IS THE BOOK OF THE HOUR. 21

**THE SALVATION ARMY**

---

AND

**THE PUBLIC.**

BY  
**JOHN MANSON.**

**Second Edition (Augmented).**

**OVER TWO HUNDRED PAGES—HANDSOMELY GOT-UP.  
 PRICE SIXPENCE.**

Freethinkers should buy, read, and circulate this searching criticism of the Salvation Army. It is one of the most thorough pieces of work done in our day. The author calls it "a religious, social, and financial study." He leaves no section of "the Army's" territory unexplored. He turns his powerful searchlight on every department of William Booth's gigantic undertaking. And the result is a startling exposure of the extraordinary methods of the greatest religious enterprise the world has seen since the establishment of Mormonism. Mr. Manson has earned the gratitude of all sane and honest reformers. His book cannot be neglected by anyone who is interested in human freedom and progress.

**Single Copies, Post Free, Eightpence.**

**Special Terms to N. S. S. Branches on Application.**

**Order Direct from**

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

**The Churches & Modern Thought.**

By **PHILIP VIVIAN.**

**One of the Most Remarkable Books Recently Published  
 can now be obtained at the "Freethinker" office.**

**Price 3s. 6d. net, by post 4d. extra.**

**Cheap Edition, 1s. net - same postage.**

Mr. A. W. BENN, author of *The History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century*, says:—"Happening to dip into the first page, I found myself insensibly drawn along, and so continued, devoting to it the few half-hours at my disposal for recreative reading, without missing a word, until I had reached, with regret, the last page."

*A précis of the contents and a selection of over 100 Press opinions will be supplied on receipt of a half-penny stamp to cover postage.*