

# THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXXI.—No. 8

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1911

PRICE TWOPENCE

*He who does a good deed is instantly ennobled. He who does a mean deed is by the action itself contracted.*  
—EMERSON.

## The Black Army.

AFTER a lecture of mine one Sunday evening a young gentleman rose to offer some opposition. While not wearing clerical attire, he had a very decided clerical accent, and I concluded that he had caught the twang in addressing Sunday-school children or in debating at Young Men's Christian Associations. Perhaps he had aspirations to the ministry, for one of his objections to my lecture was urged with much feeling. I had said that the ministers of all denominations were, for the most part, actuated by commonplace motives; that they went into pulpits as others go into law, or physic, or the army—for a living; and that their being called by the Holy Ghost was only the cant of their profession. My critic declared that I was wrong. He asserted that hundreds of them, perhaps thousands, entered their Churches, and engaged in the service of Christ, for purely disinterested reasons; that their great object was to save souls and fill heaven; that many of them were very poor, the average income of curates, for instance, being only £120 a year; and that some of them went abroad as missionaries to convert the heathen, facing all sorts of hardships, and carrying their lives in their hands. I cannot say that my critic put his case so tersely, but this is the substance of his objection; and I think it well to give an answer, once for all, to what I daresay is a very common argument.

Now at the outset I wish to make my own position clear, and to guard against misunderstanding. In the first place, I have nothing to do at present with the truth or falsity of Christianity; yet, at the same time, I am entitled to expect of its ministers a decent conformity to its teachings. In the next place, I do not assert that there are no ministers or missionaries who are earnest and sincere. Some of them, I have no doubt, would preach Christianity if it were poor, despised, and oppressed. These are men of principle and conviction; men with a passion for their calling; men who really believe that they are under God's orders to exhort and reprove a fallen, sinful world, and to point out the only way of eternal salvation. There are also some lawyers with a passion for law, some doctors with a passion for medicine, and some soldiers with a passion for military affairs; as I daresay there are men with a passion for almost every one of what are called the "humblest" employments. But these are the exceptions, and may be eliminated from a general survey. When we talk of any profession, as such, we have to go by the average; and I say that the average minister, like the average lawyer, doctor, soldier, tinker, tailor, or ploughman, is simply earning a subsistence for himself and his family—in short, that he preaches for a living. Simply this, and nothing more.

Let us look at the number of these clerical gentlemen. There are some fifty thousand of them in England alone. Will any man in his senses affirm that the law of averages does not apply to this huge Black Army? Are they all heroes and enthusiasts? The very idea is an absurdity. Try them by any

other test, and what is the result? They are average in stature, average in shape, average in looks, average in strength, average in intelligence. Why, then, even on the most favorable estimate, should they not be average in character? Has not the Catholic Church always recognised this fact, and made its priests sink their little individualities in the greatness and splendor of the Church? Has it not found a compensation for the pettiness of its myriad agents in the magnificence of its organisation? Are not all its orders, wheel within wheel, from the Pope down to the poor bog-trotting Irish priest, a practical recognition of the hard truth that the men of God, like the masses of other men, are actuated by the fundamental motives of human nature?

Look next at the *unfailing supply* of these clerical gentlemen. Exceptional motives are liable to fluctuation, and are therefore unaccountable. Any one of twenty men who saw a sovereign lying at his feet would pick it up, but it would be hard to tell which of them would risk his life to save a fellow being's. The British Army is filled by enlistment, and well filled, because poverty and misadventure drive thousands into taking "the Queen's shilling." But how full would it be if it depended upon the accession of men who yearn to fight and die for their country, turning from all other attractions to follow that stern ideal? And how full would the Black Army be if it were not recruited like the Red Army, under the forceful pressure of the necessities of existence? Year by year every vacancy is filled, and a waiting crowd is clamoring for admission. The supply always equals the demand, and goes beyond it, as it does in every other trade and profession. This phenomenon can only be explained by the ordinary laws of human action. Were the Churches manned by persons of exceptional—that is, incalculable—motive and character, there would be variations in the supply. Sometimes there would be a lull, and sometimes a feverish activity. But nothing of this sort ever occurs; the supply of ministers is as regular as the supply of carpenters or tailors, and must be subject to laws of the same generality.

This is quite consistent with the fact that *aptitude*, as well as accident, plays a part in determining a minister's career; but it also operates in the case of other professions, without implying any ethical consideration. A young man at one of the universities may have a taste for theology, as another has a taste for science or art or history or poetry. He may have a bent for public speaking, without the active, enterprising character which is requisite for successful oratory in politics; he may be fond of the social attentions which are paid to clergymen, especially by the female members of their congregations; or his temperament may be suited to the comparatively easy, unharassed life which is led by the general run of Christian ministers, who go to bed when they like, rise when they like, and adapt their duties to their convenience.

We will now consider the financial aspect of the question. It may be true that the average income of Church of England curates is only £120 a year. But before I recognise any hardship in this I must be assured that they would earn more (I mean on the average) in the general labor market. I am not at all satisfied that the ordinary curate is gifted with more brains than the ordinary skilled artisan.



He may talk better English, but that is an accident, and we all know that great nonsense may be couched in very elegant language. Being able to speak grammatically is no criterion of a man's ability to do anything serviceable to his fellow-men, for which he may reasonably expect a fair remuneration. One's own experience, of course, is not everything; but I have met both curates and artisans, and I cannot say that the former showed any distinct superiority over the latter. Perhaps I shall be told that their superiority is ethical and spiritual; to which I reply that I am not discussing their character, but their capacity.

It must also be remembered that income is not the sole factor in determining employments, or we should not see so many clerks keeping up a respectable appearance on meagre salaries while they might earn more in a rougher or more active occupation. A minister's life has certain advantages of personal comfort and social respectability. Nor is this all. His position is not precarious; he is not affected by commercial disasters and aberrations; his income is generally as certain, and as regular, as the succession of the seasons.

There is also the *prospect* to be considered. A curate's position is humble, and his income is "sadly limited," but a long vista of possibilities is before him—temporal as well as spiritual. He may become a vicar, a rector, a dean, an archdeacon, a canon, a bishop, even an archbishop. Who knows? Every one of Napoleon's soldiers fought with "a marshal's baton in his knapsack." Few of them *could* become marshals, but there was at least the chance, and the hope lured them to a hundred battlefields. And is not the "poor curate" under a similar inspiration? He also may climb the ladder of preferment, at the top of which shines resplendent, in the sunlight of glory, the golden prize of the great Archbishopric.

G. W. FOOTE.

(To be continued.)

#### Mind and Purpose in Nature.—IV.

(Concluded from p. 99.)

THE last chapter but one of Dr. Wallace's book is in the nature of an aside, although plainly intended to meet a very obvious criticism of the writer's position. The chapter bears the title, "Is Nature Cruel? The Purpose and Limitations of Pain," and, as is only to be expected, the reply is that Nature is not cruel, that all pain serves a useful, and, therefore, beneficent purpose. Looking at the existence of pain from a general point of view—and from that point of view only—it is true enough that the development of the capacity to feel pain serves some "purpose" in the evolution of life. Most noxious things are to a healthy organism unpleasant things, and it is easy for the evolutionist to realise that the establishment of a reaction of the organism against noxious forces has been one of the conditions of the development of a higher type of life. In the absence of this reaction life would soon disappear.

Again—still only in a general way—it is true that the development of pain has been "strictly subordinated to the law of utility, and, therefore, never developed beyond what was actually needed for the preservation of life." The statement is only true in a very general way, and the particular instances to which it does not apply effectually wrecks Dr. Wallace's apology. Still, as Natural Selection governs the development of animal life in this as in other directions, it may be granted that given the inability to feel pain, animal life could not have developed to what it is. But this only brings us back again to our previous position that, given the nature of organic life and all the conditions bearing upon it, the present result could not have been reached by any other course than the one actually followed. The existence of a nervous system capable of experiencing pleasant sensations involves the liability to painful ones. The two things develop

hand in hand. A nervous system cannot react in one direction without the ability to react in the other. This may be granted; but it clearly does not meet the criticism that is directed against the conditions themselves as the deliberate expression of creative purpose. It is not so much the end realised as the deliberate creation of the means to reach that end, against which the Freethinker directs his criticism. He admits that, given the present constitution of the universe, pain is inevitable, and also that the struggle for existence being inevitable, the balance of forces must be, on the whole, in favor of an agreeable and healthy life. But this does not dispose of the question why so much evil should be involved in the evolution of goodness, or why "creative purpose" should have made pain so often the raw material of pleasure. And it is really time that Theistic apologists left off assuring Freethinkers that the universe could not be other than it is without things being different to what they are. The truth of the statement is self-evident, but I do not know that it offers information of a very illuminating character.

It will be noted, too, that Dr. Wallace only claims for pain that it is needed for the "preservation" of life. Preservation against what? Clearly against forces which, because they are part of a purposive creation, must be seeking to destroy life. And whence came these forces? There is no source save that which, on Dr. Wallace's hypothesis, created the life which was to be preserved. The same mind that creates life creates forces that will destroy it, and so is driven to create capacities in living organisms that will check the efficiency of forces it has called into existence. One really needs to exercise some care in stating intelligently a position so inherently unreasonable. To offer even a plausible justification for pain one should be able to show that it aids *development*, not that it merely protects the organism against destructive forces. This only aims at giving the "Directive Mind" credit for trying to remedy a blunder without in the least absolving it from the responsibility of making it.

This was seen clearly enough by so orthodox a writer as Mosheim. He points out that if the operations of Nature are performed under the inspiration of God, they are properly the performance of God himself:—

"Whose faults, then, are those which we sometimes see in the universe?.....Do they not properly belong to the Deity?.....What difference is there between supposing that God himself, without the intervention of any other cause, brings to pass all results and events, and imagining that the Deity acts through a certain intelligent and insensate instrumentality which he constantly guides and governs? Only as much exists between penning a letter with one's own, and making use of another person's pen, though the words and diction be exactly prescribed.....God cannot have the excuse, sometimes made use of by man, that the amanuensis was not sufficiently careful, since nothing would be easier for him than to take care that this productive nature makes no mistake."\*

There is really no escape from this dilemma. Theists are as far from meeting the objection to-day as they were in the days of ancient Athens. Dr. Wallace fails as signally as any. Thus, to meet the objection raised on the score of immense destruction of life, we are told that variation and selection were necessary from the first, "in order to avoid the necessary available space being occupied by some low form to the exclusion of all others." But if they had been created less productive, or more perfect, the danger would have been non-existent and the slaughter unnecessary. Or, again, "the whole system of life development is that of the lower providing food for the higher in ever expanding circles of organic existence." An admirable arrangement for the higher, but not quite so admirable for the lower. The man sees wisdom and purpose in the creation of mutton; the sheep might conceivably question both the wisdom and the benevolence of

\* Note to Cudworth's *True Intellectual System*, p. 667, vol. ii.



the arrangement. It is entirely a question of point of view.

The justification of the process Dr. Wallace finds in its final outcome—Man. But this is not so much a question of the end justifying the means, as it is a question of the means justifying the end. The process must here justify itself at every step of its development. Was there any necessity that man should have been created? Would there have been any injustice to anybody or anything if he never had been created? Cessation of existence might involve moral injury. But can non-existence inflict injury? Was it an injustice to me that I was not a contemporary of Socrates? Is there any injustice to the unborn myriads of the future in the fact that they are not already here, or would there be any injustice to them if they never came into existence? Dr. Wallace, as is usual with Theists, writes as though there were some imperative necessity that man should exist, and that the choice of the best means to hand therefore becomes a justification of all that occurs. But no one can even conceive a necessity for the creation of man; and perhaps the crowning proof of the absence of purpose in the universe lies in this fact. Where a difficulty is to be overcome, or a greater good realised, one can see occasion for the play of purpose. But, in this case, nothing could be done for the sake of man; he did not exist. Life itself was absent. The "Divine Mind" was, on the hypothesis, self contained. It lacked nothing; it could acquire nothing. The universe is without any conceivable purpose for its creation, as it is without any observable purpose in its working.

Dr. Wallace finds a beneficent purpose in the existence of microbes and parasites, inasmuch as they kill off the less adapted and less healthy individuals. "Less adapted" is here used as the equivalent of weakly, inefficient, and undesirable. But this is a quite inadequate view of the case. The only reason, for example, why a particular person can be called weak or inefficient in relation to malaria or tuberculosis, is his or her inability to resist the attack of the germs of these diseases. Destroy these germs and the inefficiency disappears. Want of adaptation is, consequently, not something already existing and which these particular germs weed out, it is a want of adaptation created by the existence of the germs themselves. A tribe or a nation may be perfectly healthy, yet a new disease, small-pox, consumption, etc., will decimate them. They become suddenly ill-adapted to their environment only because the environment has been changed to the extent of the introduction of a new disease. By a process of elimination a type is developed that is immune to a special disease, but the race would have been none the worse had that disease never been introduced and the immune type never developed. Ineffectiveness, in relation to disease, is, therefore, not something which microbes serve to destroy, but something created by their existence. Dr. Wallace reads the process upside down.

It is also argued that the teeth and claws of the cat tribe, the beak and talons of birds of prey, etc., etc., are not created for the purpose "of shedding blood or giving pain." "Their actual purpose is always to prevent the escape of captured prey." Are we, then, to imagine that the food-living creatures—enjoy being captured, and that teeth and claws and beak and talons are so many providers of animal happiness? Dr. Wallace is unquestionably correct in saying that there is a great gap between man and animals in regard to sensitiveness to pain. But the question is not whether man and the lower animals are capable of feeling the same degree of pain, but whether the lower animals feel pain at all. Dr. Wallace does not deny that they do; he simply urges that their susceptibility is not so great as many imagine, and that it is never greater than the circumstances warrant. Which only amounts to saying that, as some animals must live on other animals, a certain amount of pain under existing conditions is unavoidable. This may be admitted, but it does not really affect the statement that the

"directive mind" has deliberately made the infliction of suffering a condition of animated existence. Even though it were proven that Nature is not gratuitously cruel, the fact of cruelty remains.

It is also said that pain is proportionate to the needs of each species, but "not beyond those needs." Dr. Wallace would find it very difficult indeed to prove the truth of this statement. In relation to many diseases—at least, in their inception—pain is hardly present at all. In relation to others, the pain is out of all proportion to their gravity. The pain and discomfort felt in the early stages of consumption, and that caused by toothache, well illustrates both points. In other directions, instead of painful feelings being excited by the presence of life-destroying conditions, the state of things is quite the reverse. Some dangerous gases give rise to a pleasing drowsiness that is the precursor of death. Extreme cold induces drowsiness at the very point where wakefulness is of vital importance. A badly fitting dress may cause a woman much more acute suffering than cancer in its early stages. Indeed, the actual relation between pain and diseases, or circumstances that are inimical to the organism, is extremely casual, and out of proportion. The situation is what one might expect from a knowledge of the evolutionary process, but it accords badly with Dr. Wallace's belief in a directive mind in Nature.

I conclude, as I began, with a regret that Dr. Wallace ever issued this book. Not merely because I disagree with the opinions expressed, but because the scientific data afford no ground whatever for the conclusions reached. The outstanding feature of Dr. Wallace's life has been his single-hearted and disinterested devotion to whatever he believed to be the truth, and it will not be pleasant to those who admire his character and scientific attainments to find him claimed as a supporter by those who will care little for the former and quite lack appreciation of the latter. Dr. Wallace has failed in his case, as all such argumentation must fail. And while it may be urged in defence that no one deserves blame for failing to achieve the impossible, the retort is apt that some degree of folly is shown in making the attempt.

C. COHEN.

### Christianity and the East.

RELIGIOUS leaders are in a state of great consternation and anger because Lord Curzon, in his recent Rectorial address at Glasgow, expressed his conviction "that the East is unlikely to accept Christianity." The fear, of course, is that such an utterance from so prominent and influential a gentleman will prove damaging to the funds of the various Missionary Societies. The *Methodist Times* for February 9 has a leading article on the subject, in which the alarm is expressed thus:—

"Such a forecast of the future, coming from a man of Lord Curzon's position, experience, and ability, is certain to influence the judgment of many who are not convinced supporters of foreign missionary enterprise. It therefore demands careful examination and criticism."

The article is presumably from the pen of the editor, the Rev. Dr. Scott Lidgett, and it is but fair to admit that the case for Christianity is put as ably as it is possible to put it. In order to understand the criticism offered it is necessary to quote the passage in the address on which it is based. Lord Curzon gave two reasons for coming to his conclusion:—

"First, the religions of Asia give to it what the Pagan mythologies did not give to Europe—namely, a definite and intelligible theory of the relations of God to man, which satisfies the spiritual aspirations as well as the day-to-day requirements of the Oriental; and, secondly, the latter sees in the teachings of Christianity something hostile to that revived self-consciousness of which I have spoken, and to which he clings as his dearest possession. Even if he had no objection to the dogmatic teaching of Christianity, he would not consent to become a Christian at the cost of ceasing to be an Asiatic."



Naturally Dr. Lidgett totally disagrees with Lord Curzon; he could not be a Methodist minister if he did not. Whether his lordship's view as to the suitability and sufficiency of its own religions for the East is correct or not, it is beyond all doubt that the Asiatics are passionately attached to them. Dr. Lidgett is quite sure that Lord Curzon is mistaken; but the criticism he makes upon the passage quoted is radically unfair. He charges his lordship with treating "not only the East itself, but its religions, as a unity," and then asserts that "such a view is totally incorrect and seriously misleading." In point of fact, the Rectorial address—at least, so far as the passage under discussion is concerned—does not treat either the East itself or its religions as a unity. All it claims is that the Orientals are satisfied with their own religions. Speaking of India, is it not because "its population is composed of perhaps the most heterogeneous association and mixture of races to be found anywhere upon the earth" that it has such a multiplicity of cults? The tendency of religion everywhere is to create and perpetuate divisions. The caste-system in India is of religious origin, and it is on the authority of religion that its continuance is justified. The four Indian castes were created by the Supreme Being—the *Brahmins* from his mouth, the *Kshatriya* from his arms, the *Vaisya* from his thigh, and the *Sudra* from his feet; and, being thus created of Divine material taken from different parts of the Divine person, they must not be interfered with in any way. It is true that what we find in India is "not unity, but unreconciled contradiction," and this is largely due to the influence of religion.

Now, Dr. Lidgett imagines that Christianity would abolish caste and all other evils from which the East is suffering. This is how he writes:—

"Directly the spirit of the East awakes to demand rational and moral consistency of thought and purpose the inner contradiction must pass into actual conflict, unless a higher religion step in to supersede all the rest while giving effect to whatever truth is contained in them."

The "higher religion," of course, is Christianity; Christianity being, in the reverend gentleman's estimation, the only true and perfect religion. Which is the best religion is a matter of opinion, for the priests of every religion under the sun loudly declare that all other religions are either wholly false or immeasurably inferior to their own. One thing, however, is indisputable, namely, that there is a practical and infallible test which we can apply to Christianity. Dr. Lidgett maintains that this religion is calculated to regenerate the East and solve its racial and other problems; but is he prepared to affirm that it has regenerated and solved the problems of the West? Has it abolished racial differences and caste divisions in Europe? Are there no class distinctions among us? Have we no higher and lower orders between whom there is little in common? Do our masters and servants eat and drink at the same table? No, Christianity has not equalised and unified the West, where it has had the field all to itself for fully fourteen hundred years. Even Dr. Lidgett would not have the hardihood to take a Hindu to Bermondsey or Whitechapel and say to him, "See what Christianity has done here, how well-fed, well-clothed, well-housed, well-behaved, and profoundly happy all the people are in a Christian city." Great Britain spends some sixty million pounds annually to protect itself against possible, if not probable, attacks from its Christian neighbors. The East is steadily appropriating the science and the arts of the West, but it declines to take its religion on any terms. Orientals come and attend our colleges and universities, but the majority of them return to their homes active haters of Christianity. This we know from the confession of foreign missionaries, as well as from the testimony of several educated Asiatics.

Lord Curzon is certainly in error when he states that Christianity "has taught the East philanthropy." Why, it would be difficult to name one Eastern

religion in which philanthropy is not strongly insisted upon. The ethical code of Hinduism is of the noblest order. Its emphasis is on—

"Fearlessness, singleness of soul, the will  
Always to strive for wisdom; opened hand  
And governed appetites; and piety  
And love of lonely study; humbleness,  
Uprightness, heed to injure nought which lives,  
Truthfulness, slowness unto wrath, a mind  
That lightly letteth go what others prize;  
And equanimity and charity  
Which spieth no man's fault; and tenderness  
Towards all that suffer."—*The Song Celestial*, book xvi.

Hinduism, Confucianism, Buddhism, Taoism, and Mohammedanism have nothing to learn about philanthropy and pity from Christianity; and these are the religions which predominate throughout the Orient. Philanthropy is, however, an evolutionary product, and no religion has the power to impart it to its devotees. The most religious people have often been the least philanthropic. The most philanthropic period in the history of the East was during the reign of Buddhism in India under King Azoka some three hundred years before Christ; and it is well known that early Buddhism was practical Atheism. Dr. Lidgett is of opinion that the reawakening we are witnessing in Japan and China, and to some extent even in India, "will lead to a great spiritual revolution"; but the probability is, judging by the change that is taking place in Japan, that it will lead to an intellectual revolution against supernatural religion of every form, a revolution which will eventuate in the emergence and triumph of rational humanitarianism. "It is quite true," Dr. Lidgett admits, "that such a revolution may lead to the transformation of the non-Christian religions," and that such a transformation may be "attended temporarily by a violent reaction against Christianity"; but the reverend gentleman is confident that "if all this comes to pass the new religions can only live by competing with Christianity on its own ground, and they must become assimilated to Christianity," and that "when this stage is reached the ultimate issue will no longer be in doubt." We are equally confident that the "ultimate issue" will be the establishment of Reason as the supreme arbiter and guide of both East and West.

The West went to the East for material gains. Finding it an extremely fruitful field it resolved to stay there to rule and to reap a still richer harvest of wealth. The East is now visiting the West in search of intellectual profit. It is here for the purpose of acquiring knowledge, and the knowledge it garners is already pushing many dreams and fancies out of its head. Let us boldly face the facts. He who runs can see at a glance that science is silently and inevitably killing Christianity in the West. Despite all the exceptionally vigorous activity of the Churches, Europe is blithely bidding good-bye to the religion which ruled it with a rod of iron for so many centuries; and who can doubt but that the same knowledge, when it becomes dominant there, will as inevitably destroy the religions of the East, and become the sole guide of life? Such, we verily believe, will be the "ultimate issue."

J. T. LLOYD.

### Judicial Aspect of the Ferrer Case.

EXAMINED BY DR. LUIS SIMARRO, PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY AT MADRID UNIVERSITY.

(From the New York "Truthseeker.")

[We have much pleasure in publishing an article by Dr. Simarro, on whose epoch-making book, *The Ferrer Case and European Opinion*, Mr. Heaford's article was based. Dr. Simarro's article is a summary by him of the conditions cited on pp. 621 *et seq.* of his great book. Our readers will be glad of this opportunity to read this trenchant piece of writing by the learned Spanish scientist, whose erudition and authority on the Ferrer case are unequalled. The selection is translated for the *Truthseeker* by Mr. Heaford.]

It has been said that it would be imprudent to form an opinion as to Ferrer's guilt without knowing all



the facts of the case. As this view seems to imply a censure upon those who, as private individuals, have ventured to hold a view contrary to the finding of the Court, it may clear the ground if we lay down the following propositions:—

1. That if in the Record of the Trial anything could be discovered against Ferrer which had not been scrutinised and threshed out by the Fiscal, the Assessor, and the Auditor in their three several accusations, any such item would have been published by the privileged violators of the official Sumario and archives who have been pursuing their campaign in favor of the excesses of the Conservatives.

2. That the known documents which sufficed, apparently, to enable Maura's government to convince itself of the righteousness of the sentence, as well as the various documents which the government shamefully allowed to be published in violation of the judicial decency required by the law, show clearly enough that there was no conclusive proof that Ferrer, absent from Barcelona during the days of the sedition, was the chief of the rebels. There was, in fact, no proof that he "directed others, or spoke on their behalf, or signed receipts or other writings sent out in his name, or exercised similar acts in a representative capacity"—according to the interpretation of chieftainship under Article 247 of the Penal Code.

3. That all the allegations of the accusers reduce themselves to (a) anonymous and undated documents, self-evidently long ante-dating the sedition and having no relation to the events at Barcelona; and (b) other documents, signed and dated many years before, which are certainly not "signed receipts or other writings sent in the name of the accused," as the law prescribes. The only witness who, on the Assessor's own showing, came forward to prove that Ferrer had actual participation in the revolt would not suffice (apart from the many inconsistencies and defects of his testimony) to demonstrate that Ferrer directed the rebels as their chief. Moreover, neither Ardid, nor Domenech, the barber, nor Paig Ventura, nor Casas, the Mayor of Premia—taking their deductions literally as they stand as uncontested verities—makes any statement of insinuation that Ferrer spoke as representative of the rebels, nor that he spoke on their behalf—according to the description of chief as defined in the Code—in the conversations and confidential communications in respect of which he was incriminated.

4. That it is not necessary to consult the Sumario (the production of which was so often called for, but in vain, during the last assembly of the Cortes in June and July, 1910), in order to form a fair and impartial judgment of the empty character of the "proofs" alleged against the accused; for if any element in the case is hidden away in the Record, the facts withheld will certainly not be of a character unfavorable to Ferrer. On the contrary, it is only conceivable that they are distinctly in his favor when the fact be confessed that a solid resistance has already been made to the demand that a full account of the Trial should be communicated to the Cortes. The publication *in extenso* of the Trial is due to public opinion, which in Spain and over the whole world has not ceased its untiring demands for its production.

Concerning the Sumario, let it suffice for us to reiterate that it has not been produced in Parliament nor presented to the Cortes, which, whether rightly or wrongly, represents the Spanish nation. It behoves us, therefore, to fix our minds on the methods of procedure at the trial, the archaic and inquisitive system of secret and written documentation which is maintained in terrible vigor in the Code of military justice after having been abandoned in every other country, including Spain itself. We must remember that when the odious system was expelled from the ordinary Penal Code, the Minister of Grace and Justice declared that "the foreigner who studies our criminal justice, and observes that we are in the grip of a system which has become decrepit and

discredited in Europe and America, necessarily forms a false and unjust idea of Spanish civilisation and culture." The fact that in ordinary cases, arising out of barrack life or in ordinary campaigning, Spanish military justice often rises superior to the pitfalls of the inquisitive and secret procedure of our military justice is due, no doubt, to the judgment and noble generosity inherent in the profession of arms; it certainly does not emanate from the provisions of the Code, which in all its bearings is exposed to the manipulations of superior authority and the arbitrariness of the government. It is precisely for this reason that in the conduct of complicated and passionate political trials recourse should not be had to such a perilous weapon of justice. The liberal-minded press of Europe in every land cried out with one voice, thundering forth its claim in every conceivable tone from friendly counsel to bitter diatribe, in favor of the submission of Ferrer's case to the ordinary prosecution of the law. With the same unanimity the clericalist journals, and all the different varieties of the reactionary press in Spain, implored and entreated Maura to allow the director of the execrated Escuela Moderna to be tried by Court Martial. As in France with Dreyfus, so in Spain with Ferrer, the Clericals put their whole trust in the military tribunals and had a holy horror of the civil judges administering the ordinary law.

How was the trial conducted?

Whilst the Juge d'Instruction "investigated" the matter during a month of research for proofs of the culpability of the accused; whilst the Auditor revised the case in the various stages of its evolution; whilst the Auditor studied the case at his leisure, and the Fiscal had the documents under his perusal—and the accused's counsel enjoyed this privilege only once, and then merely during a period of *twenty four hours*—the judges were under obligation to decide the case in a sitting of five hours, and this, too, after deliberating five and a half hours upon a voluminous Sumario of 1,200 pages, drawn up in secret, without the opportunity of seeing a single witness and without hearing the disproofs and explanations of the accused. The trial thus conducted was accelerated without giving time for passion to calm down or for prejudices to disappear, and after depriving the accused of his legal means of defence the opportunity was denied to the defender of producing the counter-proofs which he had ready. Such was the indecent haste of the "trial" that between half-past six of the evening of October 9 and the following day, the 10th, we find the portentous document of 1,200 pages passes from the Juge d'Instruction to the judicial authority, from thence to the Auditor, who therefrom wrote and presented a long opinion for the guidance of the Captain-General for whom it was prepared, and then the latter, after having "mastered" its contents, finally promulgated the decree approving the sentence. And it is in face of these posthaste proceedings that all the world is expected to recognise that the law in Ferrer's case was applied with equity and that Justice was administered in a serene and intelligent and impartial manner!

The sentence was passed; seven officers had been convinced that Ferrer was "the chief of the rebellion"—the rebellion which the ex-Governor of Barcelona, Senor Ossorio Gallardo, declared later on had no chiefs!

But who to-day will convince the 7,000 rebels who took up arms or assumed any part in the insurrection that their chief was Ferrer whom not one of them had seen; from whom no one had received orders or commands either directly or issued in his name; whose directions, proclamations or manifestoes no one had ever read, and whom no one had heard of during those insurrectionary days? Who will convince the 70,000 inhabitants of Barcelona and Catalonia who have been eye-witnesses of these events—maintaining during their happening immediate relations with the insurrectionaries, hearing their stories, and participating in their confidences—that the "chief of the rebels" was Ferrer, of



whom no one had any intimation that he had in any way participated in the commotions or even that he had been in Barcelona during the several days which saw the prevalence of the sedition? The living opinion of the whole world to-day and of history in the near to-morrow will certainly execrate the condemnation of Ferrer, obtained in absolute violation of justice and in disregard of the facts, in a moment of panic created by the process of governmental terrorism.

### Acid Drops.

We ought to have dealt before with Mr. G. R. Sims's latest tid-bit of nonsense in the *Referee*, in which, as most of our readers are probably aware, he writes weekly over the signature of "Dagonet." Mr. Sims was a bit of a Radical, and something of a Freethinker, in his younger days as a journalist. It is on record—and we daresay he wishes it wasn't—that he lectured for the North London Branch of the National Secular Society at Claremont Hall. But he soon forsook the "masses" for the "classes." He liked to be petted by "society" people, and to talk of "my friend Lord This or Lady That." Besides, reformers were such vulgar persons; some of them actually blew their noses in colored handkerchiefs. How could one of the "elect" like Mr. Sims be expected to tolerate such company? So he began to give himself airs, and exercise what he deemed his wit on Radicals and Republicans; and thus he passed on by regular stages to the parasitical position he holds to-day. For a time he wrote rubbish about his "mother-in-law," and then about his "liver," then he went in for Unionism and Protection, then he wrote doggerel about the Empire, then he fell back upon Morality, and finally he took up the cause of Religion. And that is about as far as he can sink. Not that we wish to dogmatise on the point; for in the lowest deep there may be a lower deep still threatening to devour him opening wide. Which, by the way, is a quotation from Milton, and we must apologise for it in this connection, for (Milton again) we had to compare small things with great—Sims with Satan.

In the *Referee* of January 22 the great Mr. Sims reached what must surely be his apotheosis. We defy him ever to be sillier. He had heard of a prize fool in the United States, and he seems to have been anxious not to be eclipsed. Accordingly he wrote as follows:—

"Senator Robinson, of Kansas, has, I read, given notice that he will introduce a Bill to make it a punishable offence for any parent to destroy the belief of a child in the actuality of Santa Klaus. There is a good deal to be said for the idea which underlies the Senatorial suggestion. It is a matter of history that the first elements of religious doubt were implanted in the mind of Georges Sand when she found out that Father Christmas was a myth. She woke up one Christmas eve and discovered her mother in the act of putting a present into the shoe which in France takes the place of the stocking. The authoress of *Consuelo* has left it on record that from that moment she lost her faith in more saints than Santa Klaus. I would go beyond Senator Robinson. Not only would I make it a punishable offence to destroy the faith of childhood, but I would visit with pains and penalties all who sought to destroy the illusions of youth or to unsettle the convictions of manhood. The man who does the best service in the great human cause is he who retains his faith, his illusions, and his convictions to the end."

This cutting might be framed and hung up as the last word of pious folly—even in the twentieth century.

Here we have Mr. Sims as the champion of Illusions. Of course he must *know* them to be illusions, or he couldn't champion them *as* illusions. And perhaps this explains, still more clearly, some of "Dagonet's" latter-day performances. When he argues that we shall all be better off for paying more for everything we buy, he does not really mean it; he is fighting for an Illusion. Free Trade is true, but who is going to fight for such a vulgar, commonplace thing as that? The highest heroism is to fight for Illusions,—so three cheers for Protection! We begin to understand it now. "Dagonet," after all, is not as deep as a well or as wide as a church door. He is quite simple when you see him in the right light.

Mr. Sims really proposes to punish everyone who disturbs another person's mind on any subject whatever. We dare say this would lead to a considerable increase in the circulation of the *Referee*. But what a world it would be for people of some originality! And think of some of the past victims of "Dagonet's" jurisprudence if it had existed two thousand

years ago. Jesus Christ would have been one of the first. The twelve apostles were active destroyers of "the faith of childhood," and they would have had to swallow their gruel. Men like Luther, who was one of the great "unsettlers," would have had to undergo the Sims treatment. Nobody could possibly have escaped it except the incurably indolent and the incorrigibly foolish. *They* don't disturb the faith of childhood; *they* don't unsettle the convictions of manhood. The world would be the same—as far as they are concerned—yesterday, to-day, and for ever. A perfect G. R. Sims paradise!

We do not despair of seeing Mr. Sims at the head of a "Bib and Tucker Brigade." Men have sought out many inventions. Let us return to the mental peace of our childhood. Let us eschew knives and forks, and use only spoons, and have all our food soft—as soft as "Dagonet's" intellectuals. There is hope for the world at last. Sims and the Bib and Tucker Brigade will inaugurate the millennium.

Harold-road Church, Upton Park, has been broken into and £10 worth of property stolen. The church was not insured against burglary. They left it to Christ.

After performing a religious ceremony at the launching of the *Thunderer*, which his wife christened, the Archbishop of Canterbury had the cool cheek to tell the Queen's Hall meeting, a few days afterwards, that "the peace movement is distinctly a Church movement." That takes the biscuit.

Many years ago, at one of Bradlaugh's meetings in St. James's Hall, during his great parliamentary struggle, we heard the late Sir R. Cremer (he was plain *Mr.* Cremer then) state that his Society had invited every minister of the gospel in Greater London to protest against England's breaking the peace in Egypt. Only seven replies, if we recollect aright, had been received, and of these only two were favorable. That must have been nearly thirty years ago. The peace movement wasn't distinctly a Church movement then! It is better worth patronising now. And the Church has found out the fact,—for it never overlooks anything that tends to its own interest.

The British Council of Peace, of which the Archbishop of Canterbury is president, is one of "The Associated Councils of Churches in the British and German Empires for Fostering Friendly Relations between the Two Peoples." This object, of course, is a good one, and we wish it success. But there are some amusing things in the printed report of the British Council, particularly in the speeches of representatives of the German Churches when they were visited last year by representatives of the British Churches. "This morning," one of them said, "we visited the Mausoleum at Charlottenburg together, and we were reminded that our beloved old King, William I., before he went to war against France, knelt down there at the tombs of his parents, to pray for help and blessing." A comical figure, indeed, as a symbol of Christian peace! "No sovereign," the speaker said, "who lays his decisions in prayer before the altar of God, will begin a rash war." We wonder if this pious speaker never heard of the falsification by Bismarck of the Ems telegram in 1870, by which he pushed the pious old Hohenzollern King over the borders of peace into the bloody arena of war. William I. trusted in God, but Bismarck took the matter into his own hands, and God did not get a look in.

The *Methodist Recorder* says it is a "common remark" that the opening devotional exercises of the Annual Conference are "deplorably ill attended." We are not surprised. It is too much to expect ministers to get up early in order to hear somebody pray at them. The business of a doctor is administer medicine, not swallow it.

Rev. C. Ensor Walters says the falling off in the habit of worshiping is due to a "strange shyness concerning the deeper things of religion." "Shyness" is a good word. Perhaps, however, the compositor has done Mr. Walters an injustice, and what he really said was there existed a deal of shie-ness in matters of religion. And this would be much nearer the truth. For people are shieing at religion all over the civilised world. Hence Mr. Walters' complaint.

Mr. R. J. Campbell was one of the speakers at a gathering of Theosophists the other evening. He told his audience that having given some attention recently to the question of Christ's second coming, he thought it possible that Jesus might be reincarnated in order to aid in the production of a world civilisation. Very considerate, indeed. But we wonder how Mr. Campbell knows? For ourselves, we



cheerfully admit that the evidence in favor of a second coming is quite as good as that offered to prove a first appearance.

Dr. Harnack, who came over from Germany on a week-end visit, told a *Christian World* interviewer that "the most valuable elements of our common civilisation are based on our Protestantism." Well, so far as Protestantism serves to keep Christianity out of State affairs, there is some truth in the remark. In any other sense it is wholly untrue. Protestant Christianity intruding in secular matters is no less evil than Roman Catholicism. The fortunate thing is that the conditions that give rise to Protestantism almost invariably prevent Protestant Christianity tyrannising to the same extent as Catholicism. But this is a mere accident so far as Protestantism is concerned. And Dr. Harnack need not go outside the history of his own country to find ample proof of what has been said.

In the course of a biographical sketch of the late Sir Francis Galton, a writer in *Nature* attributes Galton's evenness of temper and acceptance of criticism to his Quaker ancestry—to the "Galton and Barclay blood." It is a curious way of putting the matter, in the columns of a scientific journal, too. We wonder whether it was the "Galton and Barclay blood" that was responsible for Sir Francis Galton's Freethought? And was it the general Christian "blood" that caused the obituary notice writers in the papers to ignore this aspect of his character?

The writer of "Local Topics" in the *Eastern Daily Press* understands his business from a religious point of view. He has been telling the godly, in effect, that their number is certainly decreasing, but, on the other hand, that the fewer they become the more powerful they are. We were glad to see this writer replied to by our old friend, Mr. J. W. de Caux, in a brief but pregnant letter, which a good many of our readers will thank us for reproducing:—

"Dwindling Congregations.

To the Editor.

Sir—"Local Topics" was never more instructive, and at the same time entertaining, than on Friday last, when he strove to console the professing Christians who are so greatly depressed because nowadays sermons have so frequently to be preached to a 'beggarly array of empty benches.'

We are told that the 'declining membership of the churches' is due to the absence of those who, in the not long ago, attended church or chapel 'for mere social reasons,' that 'the result is that membership is a much more real and living thing than formerly,' and that consequently 'the churches were never more powerful than now in their influence upon the national life.' Rather poor comfort that for believers in the Holy Ghost!

The facts which the occupant of the Coward's Castle care-fully ignores are that, during the last half-century, free thought has spread widely, and that of the hundreds of thousands of free thinkers now inhabiting this 'tight little island,' but few were not inoculated in their childhood with the dogmas of the Christian religion, the great bulk having released themselves from the trammels of superstition by studying for themselves, aided by reason and common sense, the Biblical fables and the blood-stained pages of historic Christianity.—Yours truly,

J. W. DE CAUX.

Great Yarmouth, February 5th."

Mr. de Caux gets older, of course, but his strong head holds out all right, and his pen has lost none of its cunning.

At an inquest at Kilburn, on February 6, on the five-months' old son of a plumber, named Bermint, living in Hiley-road, Kensal-rise, it was stated that the child had six fingers on each hand and seven toes on each foot. Such phenomena do occur. But it is seldom that one turns up like the giant in the twentieth verse of the twenty-first chapter of the second book of Samuel, who "had on every hand six fingers, and on every foot six toes."

The English church at Versailles has been burnt down. We suppose "Providence" failed to recognise it.

Rev. Charles Frederic Aked, who left a 80-80 church at Liverpool for the Fifth-Avenue Baptist Church ("the millionaires' church") at New York, has just had his salary raised by 2,000 dollars a year, making 12,000 dollars in all. At this rate, Nonconformists will soon have to give over talking about Bishops.

Rev. Dr. Jowett recognised the offer of a famous New York pulpit as a call from God. That did not prevent him, however, from suffering a nervous breakdown soon after making up his mind. Perhaps he would reply, with the poet Cowper, that "God moves in a mysterious way his

wonders to perform." Very mysterious, in this case; if the reverend gentleman was right about the call.

Joseph Harding, of Bilton Hill, near Rugby, the ex-soldier who ran amok with a razor and wounded several people badly, besides cutting his own throat, though not fatally, is evidently of a religious turn of mind. A prayer-book, opened at the burial service, was found upon his bed.

It is a pity that public speakers will not make certain of their facts before airing their views. Of course, this might lead to a sensible diminution in the number of speeches, but the public would, we daresay, survive the loss. For example, Mr. George Lansbury, M.P., informed a gathering of the Old Ford Mission Brotherhood that "Bradlaugh, Huxley, and Spencer had taught that by the spread of knowledge our social evils would be done away with." Now we beg to assure Mr. Lansbury—and all else whom it may concern—that, as put, Bradlaugh, Huxley, and Spencer taught nothing of the kind. If Mr. Lansbury will consult one of Spencer's most popular books, the *Study of Sociology*, he will find a special chapter devoted to repel the teaching that mere acquisition of knowledge will bring about a better type of character and better social conditions. And with Bradlaugh and Huxley, their teaching, not so definitely conveyed as Spencer's, was not that knowledge alone would bring about better conditions, but that accurate knowledge, and the consequent destruction of erroneous views, were the essential conditions of social improvement.

The fact is, said Mr. Lansbury, that knowledge without religion is a failure. As religion is used as the opposite of knowledge, we presume that, in Mr. Lansbury's opinion, it stands for feeling or emotion. And if Mr. Lansbury means that sound progress implies a fusion of knowledge and emotion, no one who understands affairs will quarrel with him. But if he means that emotion is to be given first place, or that the particular kind of emotion called religious is to be given first place, then we beg to differ. And we would remind Mr. Lansbury that the man who is ruled by emotion, and who is chock full of good intentions, but who lacks adequate knowledge, is about the most dangerous kind of an asset that Society can hold. A large part of the trouble in the world may be traced to this class of people—people who can't sit still but who don't know how to move. And as to religious emotion, well, really, the world has never been lacking in that article, but has never been much the better for possessing it. We remind Mr. Lansbury that the industrial and commercial conditions about which he, rightly or wrongly, complains, grew up side by side with the growth of evangelical Christianity. The rise of Wesleyan Methodism and similar movements did not prevent the growth of the factory system, or of the employment of women and children in mines, or of long hours and short wages. And these conditions of life were not improved by religious feeling. Human sympathy cried for reform and informed intelligence indicated the road to improvement. And they who showed the way were, in the main, they who had the least to do with the religion of their time.

The Southport District Free Church Council has issued a printed blast—signed by J. T. Barkby, president, and F. P. Argall, secretary—against the Mormons and Anti-Christian Literature. These gentlemen assume that the Bible is an anti-polygamous book. But it is nothing of the kind. We defy them to discover a single sentence against polygamy from Genesis to Revelation. Polygamy still obtained amongst the Jews at the time of Christ. It has indeed been argued that the brothers and sisters of Jesus were the children of Joseph, not by Mary, but by other wives. Yet at that very time monogamy had long been legal amongst the Greeks and Romans. Christianity, in its triumph, simply took on the institution of monogamy as it existed in the Roman Empire. And there was no difficulty in that respect when the Empire was broken up by the Northern Barbarians, for they were monogamous too. It was, of course, by reading the Bible that Joseph Smith learnt the polygamy which he taught, and which he and his followers practised until their territory was included within the United States. We advise these Free Churchmen to read what the great Martin Luther said about polygamy before they print any more blasts against Monism. We don't suppose, however, that our advice will be followed. Christians wallow in ignorance—even of their own faith and history. They appear to love it. And some think that is why they are Christians.

"Beware of Anti-Christian Literature!" the Southport District Free Church Council exclaim. And they especially appeal to "Young Women," whom they have the effrontery



to inform that "In the Old Testament woman is placed in a position of equality with man." The first instance they give of woman's equality with man is positively amusing. It was "in the work of preparing the tabernacle." Yes, woman swept out the tabernacle then, and she sweeps out the tabernacle now. She also does a bit of mending when there is anything in that line to be done. This is her share in the "preparing." Man did, and does, all the rest—including the "thus saith the Lord" business and every other sort of work that commands a salary. So much for female equality in the "preparing of the tabernacle." And quite in keeping with it is what these Free Churchmen say about woman's position in the New Testament. They point out that "husbands are commanded to love their wives"—as if human beings could love each other to order! But they say nothing about wives being commanded to "obey" their husbands; or about the teaching that the husband is the head of the wife as Christ is the head of the Church. The official Free Churchmen of the Southport District are both silly and dishonest. We quite understand why they want to keep "young women" especially from "Anti-Christian Literature."

Ecclesiastic property includes public-houses, brothels, and slums—all yielding a welcome rent to the uniformed soldiers of Christ. Some very bad cases have been reported in London, and here is a very bad case at Nottingham. The local *Daily Express* reports an address delivered by Councillor W. Hobson, at a meeting of the Bridge-Ward Liberal Association, on "The Housing Question." In the course of that address, Mr. Hobson "related an incident that occurred about three weeks ago":—

"The medical officer of health inspected some houses near Poplar-square, and, finding the conditions very bad, he at once informed the city engineer, who pronounced them to be dangerous structures. Notices were served upon the tenants to come out, and it was found that the two rows of buildings, one on either side of the street, were let to a shop woman, who sub-let them at 4s. 6d. a week on one side and 4s. on the other. The rent had been paid regularly for 20 years, and nothing had been done in the way of repairs during that time.

Wooden partitions had been erected so as to divide the rooms into two compartments. In the whole of the houses there were living 248 people. There were nine houses on one row, and one water-tap between them!

Proceedings were taken in connection with these houses last Friday, and it transpired that it was an agent who let the houses to the shopkeeper, and that the real owner was the Dean of Norwich!"

Rents from the vilest slum property flowing into the pockets of the priests of God! Yet the religion of these men is said to be the only one on earth that is worth

From an interview with the Dean of Norwich, printed in more than one Monday newspaper, it appears that the property in question does not belong to any ecclesiastical body, but to the Dean personally. "This is a very old property," he says, "and has been in my family a very long time." Its general management had been in the hands of "an agent of high repute." Which is not a very noble confession. Church dignitaries ought not to preach severe morality to other people, and then own property without recognising its responsibilities themselves. The Dean of Norwich had better have held his tongue than offer such a miserable excuse.

The Bishop of London, preaching at Glasgow, hoped that the Holy Spirit might "combine them together into a solemn league and covenant to work for the bringing of the Kingdom of God into the slums of London and Glasgow." Well-to-do Christians are always anxious about the morality of the poor Christians. They trust God will help them to save the souls of their needy fellow sinners. That they are in any danger themselves is inconceivable. They are strongly in sympathy with the French lady who said that God would think twice before damning a person of quality. General Booth never asks for money to save dukes and duchesses, or big manufacturers, or generals and admirals, or cabinet ministers. It is the souls of the "residuum" that have to be rescued. So the Bishop of London wants to bring the Kingdom of God into the slums—as if it were everywhere else already! The slums! Why, the only thing to be done with the slums is to annihilate them. Bishop Ingram's method is to let the devils of social evil work in them, and put in his "God" now and then like a ferret at a rat-hunt.

One of the co-respondents in the recent Welsh divorce case was Mr. William Powell, a grocer, who denied misconduct but admitted he had been willing to pay £100 to the petitioner to avoid the scandal of proceedings. The

jury found that Mr. William Powell had been guilty of misconduct. This co-respondent was a member of the Maenofferen Church, Blaenau Festiniog. What church the other co-respondent belonged to does not appear. But we daresay he is duly attached to some place of Christian worship.

Certain offences seem more common amongst men of God than amongst other sections of the community. William Alexander Willis, fifty-six years of age, a Baptist minister, who had conducted a mission in Peckham and Forest Hill, after serving for many years as a missionary in China, pleaded guilty at the Old Bailey to offences under the Criminal Law Amendment Act. For two years and a half he had been corrupting the lads he was supposed to be leading to Christ. The judge read extracts from letters written by this dirty scoundrel, speaking of the good work that was being done, and expressing the hope that the boys would grow up workers for Jesus. Mr. Justice Avory, while wishing to be lenient on account of the prisoner's age and state of health, said he could not pass a sentence of less than five years' penal servitude.

Men's lives are still poisoned by religious bigotry. Baron Albert von Rothschild, the head of the Austrian branch of the great financial family, who died at Vienna quite recently, was in many ways disappointed and unhappy. His beloved wife died early of an incurable and painful disease, his eldest son is a lunatic, his youngest committed suicide, and his only daughter is weak-minded. He might have derived some comfort from political distinction, but that was denied him. He aspired to become a Privy Councillor with the title of Excellency, but his Jewish creed, which he would not abandon, proved an insurmountable barrier. Religion assailed him on the top of all his other misfortunes.

An attempt was made at Dartford on Sunday to get a young lady to leave her companions from a local Catholic convent while they were out for a walk. A large crowd assembled, and there was considerable excitement. Eventually the police arranged that the young lady should remain at the convent until the arrival of her brother, a well-known landowner in the north of Ireland. "The young lady," the *Daily News* says, "who is 26 or 27 years of age, is said to have inherited a considerable fortune." Ay, there's the rub! What a keen eye Churches have, especially the Catholic Church, for such god-sends.

"Is it not a shame," the famous Russian actress, Lydia Yvorska (privately the Princess Bariatinsky) exclaims, "that there is not one really serious theatre in London?" What else could she expect in our rotting Christian civilisation? It was different when the Stage was banned by the Church. Then the Stage was self-respecting, and took a serious view of its own position and objects. Now it is in a friendly competition with the Church for the favors of "Society," and actors and actresses who should be studying the art of their profession are handing round buns at converted-thieves' suppers, or selling things at bazaars, or begging money for High Church parsons, or chattering to interviewers about their matrimonial prospects or the next twopenny-halfpenny piece they are going to appear in. The Stage honored Shakespeare by playing him with heart and brain in the old days. Now it plays anything that will bring in the mob of pleasure-seekers with their money, and thinks to atone by unlimited talk about a Shakespeare Memorial Theatre—in the dim and distant future.

Mr. S. Jones, the Deputy Town Clerk, told some plain truth to a deputation of Sabbatarians who appeared before the licensing magistrates to protest against any license for Sunday music being granted in Scarborough. He applied on behalf of the Corporation for licenses for the St. Nicholas Hall, the Floral Hall, and the marine drive and promenade, and he took the opportunity of replying to the Sabbatarians. "If they really objected to music of any kind," he said, "there must be no music in churches or chapels, or at the open-air religious services in the castle dykes.....Were they going to stop Sunday music and not stop cabmen from driving persons to church on the Lord's Day?.....It was a piece of impudence to ask their worships to deprive the great majority of the people of the town and the visitors of their usual Sunday high-toned musical entertainment because a very small proportion of people were opposed to it." The chief constable said he had no objection whatever to the applications—so they were granted. But the worthy licensing magistrates gratified the bigots by refusing to allow cinematograph shows on Sunday. The less fashionable entertainment was, as usual, the one prohibited. Poor people are so easily demoralised by recreation!



### Mr. Foote's Engagements.

Sunday, February 19, Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, Manchester: at 3, "The Bible"; at 6.30, "God."

February 26, Birmingham.

March 5, Liverpool; 19 and 26, Queen's Hall, London.

April 2, Stratford Town Hall; April 9, Glasgow.

### To Correspondents.

C. COHEN'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—February 19, Queen's Hall, London; 26, Glasgow. March 5, Manchester; 12, Queen's Hall; 19, Stratford Town Hall.

J. T. LLOYD'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—February 19, Failsworth; 26, Queen's Hall. March 5, Queen's Hall; 12, West Ham; 19, Glasgow; 26, Stratford Town Hall. April 2, Manchester; 23, Liverpool.

W. P. BALL.—Many thanks for useful cuttings.

F. J. VIOSRY.—Sad news indeed.

SYDNEY A. GIMSON, President of the Leicester Secular Society, subscribing to the President's Honorarium Fund, says: "I am glad to note that the whole £300 was raised last year. To be glad that record it would be good if it were raised a few months earlier this year." We should be very glad if it could be so. The Fund ought to have a rest after September, at least.

L. H. W. MANN.—(1) Archbishop Temple, and Bishop Fraser, of Manchester, for instance, left lots of money that they had saved, and invested, out of their Church incomes. It is nonsense to pretend that the big fortunes left by clericals are all private fortunes. They are not. The editor forgets that the incomes of fat incumbencies and bishoprics are before the public eye. (2) Sunday was not invented by Constantine. It was ancient. The Christians met and held their Sunday meetings then, just as Freethinkers hold their meetings on Sunday now, because it was the only day open to them as the Pagan day of general rest from labor.

J. D. (Leicester).—See paragraph. Thanks.

A. FAGO.—Your remarks are sensible enough, but the matter is rather off our beat. Isn't it?

G. MANCO.—See paragraph. Thanks. Glad you endorse our report of Mrs. Bonner's lecture.

J. A. BATES.—Thanks for cuttings.

G. BRADFIELD.—Glad you have acquired a large and good portrait of Ingersoll. We have often thought that a portrait of Ingersoll, with portraits of his calumniators, would be the best possible answer to their slanders. The paper you mention is not published now. Mr. Foote has no objection to visiting Cheltenham.

THOMAS.—The extracts will be useful. Knowing what Christian "charity" is, and that it isn't at all "rare," we understand your fear of publicity.

G. F. H. McCLUSKEY.—Pleased to hear from yourself and friend Tucker. Your good wishes for 1911 are appreciated—and reciprocated. We note your hope "that the amount asked for will not only be made up, but that the thirty odd pounds deficiency on the previous two years will be wiped out as well." We wish something could be done in the West of England in the way of propaganda. Is any hall available in Plymouth now?

A. D. CORRICK.—Your letter is full of pleasant things, but the best thing in it (if we may say so) is the passage that "The wife joins me in wishing you the best of health and happiness, and increased influence in your noble work." One woman counts as ten men in this matter. Woman's influence, through the family, is illimitable. And it is great in other ways too. Shakespeare, in all probability, got his beautiful and noble conceptions of woman from his mother. For our own part, we think it is certain, and we believe we could prove it. He wrote his works, and she produced and moulded him—and it was the biggest thing ever done on this planet. We want the woman's influence for Froethought, and the brightest star of hope in the dark unknown beyond the dawning light is the fact that we are getting it,—slowly, yes, but very surely. Thanks, in conclusion, for the Holyoake reference.

E. B.—No doubt all will prove useful.

C. MILLMAN.—Certainly, if a British soldier is called upon to fire upon the crowd, after the Riot Act is read, it makes no difference whether his relatives are in the crowd or not. His duty is to fire. Any clergyman will tell you that.

T. HIBBOTT.—We wanted a copy of the pamphlet rather to keep than to read.

J. PARTRIDGE.—Glad to hear Mr. Moss's lecture and dramatic recital were both applauded by a good audience at Birmingham.

A. B. H.—We believe the verse is Lowell's, but we have not time to look it up now. The Bradlaugh story is sheer invention—in other words, a calculated lie. By trying to live on such garbage, Christians show that they have little else to live on.

ENNSON.—You don't reply to the paragraph at all, but start a fresh discussion.

W. MANN.—Thanks for new address. Many of our readers will be very glad when your pen is active again.

SANCTA.—The Church of England does not receive an annual grant from the Government, nevertheless it is a State Church,

established, held together, and controlled by the State. Tithes, for instance, are not voluntary subscriptions, but legally exacted contributions, and if the parson were not paid them he would call upon the State to levy them for him.

VIVIAN PHELIP.—Much pleased to hear you say that "The Freethinker is excellent at hitting the right nail on the head."

MESSRS. A. AND F. PEARS point out to us that the edition of their *Encyclopaedia* referred to in our columns last week is an old one, and send us a copy of the new (and really valuable) edition, which gives Bradlaugh his proper credit under the heading of "Oaths."

W. HASSELL.—Glad to have helped you in the matter. Pay no heed to the "authority" of commentators; read your Shakespeare, and think for yourself.

A good deal of correspondence stands over for want of space this week.

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

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

ORDERS for literature should be sent to the 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.

### Sugar Plums.

Mr. Foote's second visit to Manchester this winter was postponed, as local readers are aware, from Feb. 12 to Feb. 19. He is to lecture twice, afternoon and evening, in the Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, South Lancashire "saints" will no doubt rally around the President as usual.

Mr. Foote delivers two lectures, afternoon and evening, next Sunday (Feb. 26) in the great Birmingham Town Hall. The N. S. S. Branch desires him to take the two subjects he was billed for on Oct. 28, when he was unable to lecture in consequence of an attack of influenza—his place being taken by Mr. Lloyd, who, of course, lectured on subjects of his own. The local "saints" are looking forward eagerly to the evening "Bradlaugh" lecture, and some of them are prophesying record meetings on this occasion.

Mr. Cohen occupies the Queen's Hall platform again this evening (Feb. 19) and will, we hope, have a really good audience. The London "saints" should see to that.

Miss Kathleen B. Kough pays Birmingham another visit to-day (Feb. 19), lecturing in the evening at the King's Hall, Corporation-street, on "Immortality." We hope to hear of a capital audience.

Mr. Lloyd lectures this evening (Feb. 19) at the Secular Sunday School, Failsworth. It is odd that Mr. Foote and Mr. Lloyd should have struck the district on the same date two or three years' running, but it is a big, populous district, and there should be audiences for both.

Mrs. H. Bradlaugh Bonner lectures for the Liverpool Branch to-day (Feb. 19) at the Alexandra Hall, Islington-square. Reserved seats for each lecture (not both) are 1s. and 6d., and can be obtained of Mr. W. McKelvie, secretary, 49 Penrose-street, Everton, Liverpool. Admission to non-reserved seats is by silver collection at the door.

Tickets for the Liverpool Branch Dinner (Saturday, March 4, at the Bee Hotel, St. John's-lane), at 3s. each, can also be obtained at the same address. Mr. Foote is to attend this Dinner as the guest of the evening.

"It is remarkable," Mr. T. Hibbott writes, "what a fascination our paper has for all its readers. I have been a subscriber from the first number, and anxiously look for it every Thursday morning still, and would not miss it if its price were doubled. And I am now verging on three score and ten."

### President's Honorarium Fund, 1911.

#### Sixth List of Subscriptions.

Previously acknowledged, £121 5s. 2d. W. Stevens, £2 2s.; J. Roeckel, £1 1s.; Sydney A. Gimson, £2 2s.; G. F. H. McCluskey, £1; Henry Tucker, £1; A. D. Corrick, £1; W. H. Morrish, £1 1s.; T. Hibbott, 5s.; Robert Stirton and Friends—Dundee (quarterly), £1 10s.; Vivian Phelip, 10s. 6d.



## The Church in Politics—Americans, Beware!—III.

BY M. M. MANGASARIAN.

(Concluded from p. 109.)

IN this connection I must make an explanation. I respect the right of my neighbor to be a Catholic. I am ready to fight for the protection of his liberties as I am for my own. It gives me real pleasure to admit also that there are sincere, brave, noble, and pure-minded men and women in all the Churches. What I am trying to do is to prove, by citing history, that a supernatural order and a merely human State cannot pull together. The attempt has always resulted disastrously. The Church is supernatural, the State is human. Either the one or the other must rule. If the Church submits to the State, it ceases to be divine, for how can a divine institution be subject to a man-made State? It would be like asking God to obey man. Besides, a State is made up of Jews, unbelievers, heretics, Turks, and Pagans, as well as of Christians. How can such a State make laws for Christians?

If, on the other hand, the State would be subject to the Church, there will only be the Church. We will in that event have no further use for freedom, for instance, as we would not know what to do with it, since we cannot use it to criticise or disagree with the Church, or help to build up a new Church. When we have God for a teacher, or his Vicar on earth to rule us, what would liberty be good for? It follows, then, that the Catholic Church cannot consistently be subject to any secular power, being a "divine" institution. This statement cannot be successfully controverted, and if so, we call the attention of the President of the United States to it, as well as of all those who believe that it is possible to have Rome in the White House and be a Republic at the same time.

Nor should people complain because I am so earnest about this matter. If it is a virtue in the Catholics to labor night and day to convert this country to their faith, as they say they are doing, why is it improper in me to try to protect the free institutions of the country? I have not said anything against Catholicism which Cardinal Gibbons has not said against what he calls the infidels. In one of his recent letters he declared that no Agnostic or Atheist should be given office in this country. Why may a cardinal stand up for his Church and not I for the Secular State? If the framers of the Constitution desired only Christians or believers in a Church of some kind as office holders, they would not have left the name of the Deity out of the nation's charter. According to the Constitution, the only persons really eligible to office are the infidels, or at any rate those only who are willing to place the interests of the country above even those of God or Church. Are Catholics willing to do that? We ask once more, are Catholics willing to do that?

And we do not have to ask the future to answer that question. The past has answered it in unmistakable fashion. What to-day is the difference between Austria, for instance, and America? In Catholic or religious Austria the interest of the Church is above the rights of man. It is well for religion to be free, but it is not free in Austria; it is well for thought and speech to be free, but they are not free in Austria. Why? Because the interests of the Church come first. In secular America religion is free, thought and speech are free. Why? The rights of man come first in a secular State. The Church has the power to make an America out of Austria. But will she do it? Yet if she had the power to make an Austria out of America would she hesitate to do it? Americans, beware!

But let us return to Napoleon III. and Pius IX. Encouraged and emboldened by his successes and his increasing power over the Emperor, as well as by his command of the resources of France for his own throne, Pius IX. about this time promulgated the

famous dogma of the infallibility of the Pope. Until then the Church, or ecclesiastical councils, shared infallibility with the Pope, but henceforth the Pope alone shall be infallible, and councils and conclaves would no longer be needed to decide religious questions. Thus to the principle of absolutism was given a new endorsement. As soon as he became infallible, the Pope announced a new dogma—the immaculate conception of the Virgin. The Church had never held that Mary herself, like her divine Son, was born of the Holy Ghost, but Pope Pius declared she was, and his word became the belief of the Church Universal. About this time Mary began to appear to shepherds and young girls in the fields, confirming the word of the Pope that she was born of the Holy Ghost.

At the commencement of 1854 there appeared a pamphlet by an abbot who was not yet ready to accept the virgin birth of Mary. The writer charged that a certain woman of Grenoble was personating the Virgin Mother of God in these reputed appearances to shepherds and young people. Mlle. de Lamerliere, the accused woman, sued the abbot for defamation of character. To the profound regret of the Church, the young lady lost her suit. From that time her name became "The Apparition!" The Church gave her a famous advocate, Berryer, to appeal the case; the abbot was defended by Jules Favre. The higher court of Grenoble confirmed the decision of the lower court, which under ordinary circumstances would have put an end to the new dogma. But it did not. The Church was in politics, and had therefore many ways of getting over a little embarrassment like that.

But the Church did more than promulgate new dogmas. About this time, in Bologna, the little child of a Jew, Martara, suddenly disappeared from home. Careful search by the distracted father proved that the priests had carried him off to bring him up as a Roman Catholic. The anti-clerical party poured forth hot shot at a Church that would steal, not only the goods, but also the children, whenever it had the power to break into people's homes. Even the Emperor pleaded with the Pope for the return of the child to its outraged parents. But it was all in vain. The Church, the Holy Catholic Church, was in the saddle, and she would ride the nation to please herself. The Pope replied that as this was a matter pertaining to the salvation of the child's soul it was a spiritual question, and therefore beyond the jurisdiction of the State. Shortly after another boy disappeared precisely in the same manner, and was discovered in the Catholic seminary. The French Ambassador pleaded with the Pope as before, but the Church was a divine institution, and the secular authorities were guilty of impertinence in attempting to criticise her conduct or to give her advice. It was impossible to live next door to such a power peaceably. In every Catholic country there were two kingdoms, the one within the other; two sovereigns, the one the rival of the other. And the result was, as we said it would be a moment ago, the "divine" Church swallowed up the secular State whenever it could.

In 1864 Pius IX. issued his famous encyclical, in which he boldly condemned the "pernicious" doctrine of the rights of man. For the edification of Americans who hope some day to see a Catholic in the White House at Washington, let us quote one or two passages from this Papal Bull:

"We [the Pope] cannot pass over in silence the audacity of those who teach that except in matters pertaining to the Church, the decrees of the Apostolic See are not binding upon the conscience." Which means that the Pope must be obeyed in secular as well as in religious matters. Americans, beware!

"There are also those who have the audacity to declare that the supreme authority given by Jesus Christ to the Apostolic See is subject to the secular authorities." Which means that the Pope is the real head of the nation as well as of the Church, and that she will not obey any man-made constitutions.



"Our predecessor of blessed memory, Gregory XVI., described as a madness the doctrine of liberty of conscience and of worship." Which means that with the Catholic Church in power there will be only one Church. Then the encyclical proceeds to enumerate the errors which all Catholics condemn :

Error XVIII. To say that Protestantism is a branch of the true Christian Church, and that a Protestant could be as pleasing to God as a Catholic.

Error XXI. That the Catholic Church has no right to call itself the only true Church.

Error XXIV. That the Church has no right to resort to force.

Error XXVII. That the holy ministers of the Church have no right to interfere in matters temporal (this proves the charge that the Catholic Church is in politics).

Error XXXVI. That there can be State Churches in any country other than the Catholic Church.

Error XLVII. That the schools should be independent of the authority of the Church.

Error LV. That the State ought to be separated from the Church.

There is much in the passages quoted to make every lover of free institutions to ponder over seriously and long.

But let us hasten to the concluding chapter of that period in history reaching from 1848 to 1870, with which we have been dealing. The Third Napoleon began to realise that after all he was a mere figure-head in the empire which he had created by violating his own oath and abrogating the Constitution. The real sovereign of the French was Pope Pius IX. In other words, the relation between Pope and Emperor was that which the Bible suggests should exist between husband and wife. The Pope was the husband, the Emperor was the wife, and, as commanded in the Bible, a wife must obey her husband. Napoleon more than once made attempts to free himself from the ever-tightening grip of the Pope, but only to find that he was helpless. For instance, he had written to the Pope about reforms in the Papal States, urging the Holy Father to curb the abuses of the clergy and to introduce modern methods in the government of his territory. But he was compelled to apologise for presuming to give advice to the Vicar of Christ. On another occasion the Emperor was foolish enough to suggest that Frenchmen must obey the laws of their own country before those of a foreign power. Did he mean Rome by "a foreign power"? He was clearly made to understand that the Catholics in France were first the subjects of the Pope, and then the subjects of the Emperor. Despite these failures to free himself from the authority of the Church, the signs of insubordination on the part of the Emperor increased. Napoleon's principal weakness was vacillation. He never finished an undertaking. His resolutions were like fire-rockets; they fell to the ground as soon as they shot up in the air. Vacillation means weakness. Napoleon, after all, was like clay in the hands of the Pope. The Pope had made him, and the Pope could unmake him.

To be just to the Emperor, we must also make allowances for the influence which the queen, Empress Eugenie, exerted over him. She was a Spaniard, very worldly, and yet very pious. She was one of those women to whom the priest was God in miniature.

Strange as it may seem, Napoleon's son, on the other hand, the prince and presumptive heir to the throne, at whose birth the Pope had sent Eugenie the Golden Rose, was an avowed Freethinker. Napoleon now sided with his queen, and now with his son. He had no mind of his own. It was in one of his independent moods that he decided to make a final effort to shake off Rome from his shoulders. He entered into a secret arrangement with Victor Emmanuel of Italy, who was then seeking to seize Rome as the capital of United Italy, to help humiliate Pius IX. Napoleon promised to let Garibaldi march upon Rome. From the moment that the Catholics

discovered this plot to rob the Pope of the city of Rome, Napoleon was doomed. The Church not only showed its displeasure plainly, but it made it also evident that it would not accept any apologies this time. Napoleon's resolution sickened again. He became alarmed for his throne. He saw the sword of Damocles hanging over his head by a single hair. He hastened to explain, but the priests who had called him a Constantine and a Charlemagne now called him a Nero and a Pontius Pilate. Like Judas, he had betrayed his master. It was in the vain hope of once more swinging around the Catholic world to his support that the Emperor tapped the resources of his country to advance the Catholic faith. Bent upon this errand, he sent an expedition to Syria, another to China, another to Mexico. Everywhere France must become the defender of the Catholic Church. It was not to the interest of France to waste its substance in a sort of Catholic crusade, tramping from east to west for the glory of the Church; but it was only by sacrificing France to the Vatican that Napoleon hoped to change the frown of the Pope into a smile. Finally it occurred to the Emperor that a war with Germany, the rising Protestant power of the north, would restore his popularity with the Church. He would humiliate Germany, overthrow the Iron Chancellor, and convert Berlin into a Catholic capital.

Such a conquest would give Catholicism an immense prestige, and it would make of Napoleon really another Charlemagne. The war was declared. It was an act of sheer madness. The whole nation was going to be thrown into the mouth of the cannon to please Rome and to regain her favor for France. But it was survive or perish with Napoleon.

He did not have the shadow of a foundation for a quarrel with Germany. That country was willing to withdraw the candidacy of a Hohenzollern for the Spanish throne. But Napoleon demanded more. France had been injured, he declared, and Germany must be punished for it. It must be stated that Napoleon counted on the co-operation of the King of Italy in the attack upon Germany. But when the war was declared Victor Emmanuel demanded that before he can send an Italian army to the aid of the French, Napoleon must recall his soldiers from Rome. The French were still keeping an army in Rome to maintain the Pope upon his throne. Victor Emmanuel asked the French to vacate Rome. This Napoleon was willing enough to do, but the Catholics in France threatened to "boycott" the Emperor if he left the Pope to his fate. It was a critical situation. The Italians would not budge unless the French soldiers were recalled from Rome, and the French would not support the Emperor if they were. In the meantime, the victorious Germans were before the walls of Sedan. Anon, the cannon's roar was heard in the streets of Paris. A wave of blood, red and palpitating, was sweeping onward upon the fair land of France. The nation was upon her knees, mangled, bleeding, torn, ruined. The "faithful" were marching the streets with "God save Rome and France." It was too late. The Church in politics cost France the slaughter of her armies, the criminal waste of her savings, the destruction of her cities, the loss of two of her provinces—Alsace and Lorraine—and imposed upon her a blood tax, the enormity of which was appalling. Americans, beware!

And if France did not go the way of Spain it was because, when she returned to the republican form of government once more, she put no faith in the professions of loyalty to the Republic by the priests, and refused to consider their candidate to the presidency. By ousting the Church from politics in France, that unhappy country has recovered her health, has entered the path of peace and progress, and is to-day one of the freest and foremost nations of the world.

What can the Church do for a people? Look at Spain.

What can a country do without the church? Look at regenerated France.



## Nature's Curious Contrivances.

TRAVELLERS in desert regions have constantly commented upon the striking uniformity of color which characterises the scaled, furred, and feathered dwellers of these arid wastes. In the Great Desert of Northern Africa, not only the lion, camel, and smaller mammals, but even the birds and reptiles present one uniform sand color—a peculiarity shared with their domesticated neighbor, the Egyptian cat. An interpretation of this resemblance of the desert fauna to its sandy surroundings immediately suggests itself. In a flat, open country, destitute of brush-wood or trees, and lacking those surface undulations which furnish a lurking-place, any modifications of pattern or color which serve to render an animal inconspicuous must greatly enhance its prospects of survival in the struggle for existence. Such adaptations are obviously of great value to their possessors, and the powerful agency of Natural Selection will ensure their preservation.

These phenomena of color adaptation are prevalent in all parts of the world. Speaking of the tropics, Dr. A. R. Wallace, says:—

“It is among their evergreen forests alone that we find whole groups of birds whose ground color is green. Parrots are very generally green, and in the East we have an extensive group of fruit-eating pigeons; while the barbets, bee-eaters, turacos, leaf-thrushes, and many other groups, have so much green in their plumage as to tend greatly to their concealment among the dense foliage.”\*

Turning from the Equator to the Poles, we find that northern animals—the polar bear, Greenland falcon, snowy owl, and arctic fox—present an appearance of uniform whiteness. Many of these species, however, inhabit regions which are free from snow during the transient arctic summer. In these circumstances, a snow-like covering, instead of affording concealment, would render its owner conspicuous amid the ephemeral summer vegetation. As a result, these animals present the phenomena of variable coloration—appearing in white during the winter months, while displaying through the summer the normal coloration of their relatives in more temperate climes. In his interesting and valuable work on *The Colors of Animals*, Professor E. B. Poulton mentions a curious experiment, through which the Hudson Bay lemming was enabled to retain its summer dress in the depth of winter, owing to the shelter afforded it in the cabin of a vessel. On February 1, however, it was exposed on deck, and, after a week's exposure to a temperature of 30° below zero, “it was entirely white, with the exception of a dark band across the shoulders, prolonged posteriorly down the middle of the back.”

Instances of such variation are not absent in our own country. Anglers are aware that trout display color adaptation, varying in accordance with the shade of the sandy or muddy bed of the stream they inhabit.

The most remarkable and best-known case of variable coloration is furnished by the chameleon, which possesses the power of changing its color from dirty white to a variety of tints harmonising with the foliage of the trees it frequents. This phenomenon is traced to the stimulating effects caused by the waves of light which enter the chameleon's eye. These waves stimulate the pigment cells which are arranged in layers of various colors, so that “very different effects may be produced by concentration in certain cells, leading to the appearance of those of another color, or to a combined effect due to the colors of two or more kinds of cells.”†

In the instances just cited—which anyone who takes an interest in nature may extend from personal observation—the animal becomes inconspicuous by

blending its hues with that of its environment. The following example furnishes an illustration of another form of protective resemblance, through which the organism adapts itself to its surroundings through the total loss of all color whatsoever. In many of the lower Medusæ (jelly fishes) the body consists of a transparent substance possessing the same refractive power as water; consequently, when in its aquatic medium, the animal is almost invisible. So perfect is the disguise that a number of these jelly-fishes may be placed in a small aquarium and still remain undetected even when the containing vessel is held against the light. Some species have so thoroughly adopted this protective method that it has exceeded the protective limit, for their very transparency causes the colored material upon which they subsist to clearly outline the digestive tract. But here, again, mimicry of surrounding objects is utilised as a means of defence, and the brown food particles outlining the digestive cavity appears to the untrained eye as a fragment of floating seaweed.

The foregoing phenomena supply examples of what may be called general adaptation; the organisms thus secure a measure of protective concealment in merging their individuality in the general color scheme of their surroundings.

More astounding still are the devices which enable animals to assume a color and form closely resembling special objects which are of little interest to their enemies. A case in point is presented by the larvæ of the Geometer moth. Although these caterpillars are so numerous—over two hundred species being native to our own island—they are seldom detected owing to their extraordinary resemblance to the twigs of the plants upon which they feed. The larvæ of the Swallow-tail moth furnishes another striking example of these protected Lepidoptera. Its long, irregularly cylindrical body, standing out at an acute angle to the stem, closely resembles in color and form the bark of its food plant, and the illusion is greatly intensified by the little humps on the caterpillar's skin which simulate the buds and irregularities of the bark. The posterior end of the insect's body is provided with a pair of appendages which firmly clasp the plant, while the free end is supported in its deathlike position by an invisible thread attached to the stem. The larva will remain in this stationary position for hours; so perfect is its resemblance to the twigs of a currant-bush, that to the casual, or even to the careful, observer it appears to be part of the plant.

The Mexican thorn-bugs have evolved a similar method of concealment. Their favorite food plants are prickly shrubs; and the thorns which project from the branches provide the model for imitation.

So marked is the correspondence between the “stick” insects and the stalks of their resting plants that the most experienced naturalists have frequently been deceived. Jenner Weir relates how, after twenty years' experience as an entomologist, he on one occasion took out his pruning-scissors for the purpose of removing a spur from a plum-tree, which he thought he had overlooked. This spur, much to his surprise, proved to be a caterpillar of the Geometer moth, some two inches in length; and so perfect was the resemblance that none of his family, even when a space of four inches in which it was enclosed was defined, could detect the fraud.

Such objects as twigs and spurs, however admirably they may lend themselves to the adaptive needs of the larval caterpillar, are obviously quite useless as protective instruments to the developed butterflies or moths. But although the large and conspicuous wings of the mature Lepidoptera preclude all possibility of resemblance to the dark integuments of plants, the structural outlines of these butterflies readily lend themselves to close imitation of the shape and color of the leaf.

This mode of protection attains its greatest perfection in the Indian Kallima butterflies. Wallace describes these as “rather large and showy butterflies, orange and bluish on the upper side,” and they habitually settle among dead or dying foliage. When

\* *Darwinism*, p. 192.

† Poulton, *Colors of Animals*, pp. 84, 85.



the wings are folded in rest, the gorgeous coloration of the upper surface is completely hidden from view, and the appearance now presented by the exposed side is that of a dead and decaying leaf with all the customary characteristics of leaf-stalk, midrib, and lateral veins.

Another object which supplies a model for insect imitation is a fragment of rotten wood. One of the "shark" moths (*Xylina obsoleta*), in virtue of its mingled brown, whitish, black, and yellow coloration, traced with dark angles and curves, has acquired an amazing resemblance to this model. Professor Weismann relates a personal experience of this marvellous mimicry in these words:—

"I thought I saw a *Xylina* sitting on the ground, and picked it up to examine it. I thought it was a bit of wood, and, disappointed, I threw it down again on the grass; but then I felt uncertain, and picked it up once more—to find that it was a moth after all."\*

Passing from these examples of protective resemblance, we may now survey an order of coloration which fulfils an entirely different function. In these cases, the animal colors are gorgeous and brilliant, and the insects are thereby rendered markedly conspicuous in contrast with their natural surroundings. Kirby and Spence, in their celebrated *Introduction to Entomology*, noted several instances of this order of coloration and expressed doubts concerning its purely adventitious character. They surmised that the showy robes of certain insects were utilised for the purpose of dazzling their enemies. No scientific explanation, however, was vouchsafed until Bates, Wallace, and others pointed out that these gaily painted insects were usually inedible, owing to their nauseous flavor. Owing to their unpalatability, these biologists contended that the showy insects to a large extent escape the pitiless persecution to which their more palatable relatives are subjected by insectivorous birds and lizards. But without their "outward and visible sign of this inward and sickening taste," their enemies would be unable to distinguish them from their edible relatives. To be first killed and then rejected would be of no benefit to the insect species. Consequently, these highly decorated species gain similar advantages from their conspicuousness which their protectively adapted relations derive from their simulation of surrounding objects.

(To be continued.)

T. F. P.

## Correspondence.

### THE WORST SUPERSTITION IN THE WORLD.

[We quoted a few lines last week from the following letter. On second thoughts, we decide to give our readers the benefit of the whole letter. The first part of it is really amusing.—EDITOR.]

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

MY DEAR FOOTE,—I am sending you herewith £5 for your Honorarium Fund.

Many years ago, while living at a hotel in Paris much frequented by English and Americans, I first heard of your arrest and persecution because you were brave enough to tell the truth about the most debasing form of superstition that ever cursed this planet. I remember that this subject was discussed at the hotel, and it appeared to be very strange to everyone that one could still be persecuted for a religious belief in England. I came to England while you were being tried for Blasphemy at the Law Courts, and an English friend wished to show me the new Palace of Justice, now very appropriately called "The Law Courts," because it is said that one finds there a great deal more of Law than of Justice. As we were coming out of the building, we met what appeared to be a well-to-do country farmer—a typical John Bull in appearance. He stopped us and inquired: "There is a man being tried here to-day because he don't believe in God?" "Yes, that is so; the gentleman's name is Foote. It is a very bad case. He does not believe either in God, the Devil, or the Bible. But you are too late, my friend; the case was finished an hour ago. And it was such a bad one that the Judge sentenced the culprit to be hanged

at once, so they took him out into the yard and hanged him. It is finished, and so we are going home." He said "Good; they served him b — well right." "Then you think a man should be hanged if he does not believe in the Bible?" "Certainly."

Recently I have been very much surprised to find what a very important factor falsehood is in religion. Torrey certainly was a boss liar. He could not tell the truth even if he tried. But, as a whole, Protestants are not in it with the Catholics. They deny all of their historical iniquities absolutely.

It is certainly a fact that Darwin's theory, so-called, is very well established to-day. It is accepted throughout the whole civilised world by every thinking man, and I should say that even in Japan ninety-five per cent of the men would be Darwinians. Protestants, as a rule, do not pretend to deny it. And still, if you ask a Roman Catholic about it he will always say: "Oh, Darwinism; yes, that caused some excitement in the 'seventies, but it has proved to be false and nobody believes it to-day." This glaring falsehood is being taught in every Catholic school throughout the whole world. How is this for lying?

When I was in Constantinople, I had a very clever and highly educated Turkish secretary who wrote with a reed, and I used to discuss religious subjects with him. He seemed much more intelligent than any Christian I had ever met, and he insisted that there was no country in the world where there was greater religious liberty than in Turkey, especially in Constantinople. "No one is persecuted for religious opinions here, which is not the case in either England or the United States. Then, again, if one goes to England he is forced to close up his factory or place of business on Sunday in order to conform to English superstitions; but in Turkey, although we have three Sabbaths every week, anyone is allowed to do business seven days in a week if they like."

As I am a business man I do not wish my name to be published, because I am told that if I offend the bigots they will retaliate not only by attempts to injure my business, but also to lie about me and defame my character when I am dead. You can put me down as "Anti-Devil-Dodger" unless you can find a better signature.

## FREETHOUGHT IN SOUTH AFRICA.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—I feel certain you will be interested to know that a Society—to be called the National Freethought Society of South Africa—was recently inaugurated at the Old Town House, Cape Town. The Principles and Objects are on the lines of your National Secular Society, and we are indebted to your *Freethinker* for this information—a paper which is not only valued by its readers here, but which pains are taken to see that it is passed on to be read and re-read amongst outsiders. Of course the Society is yet in its initial stage, but we have some of the finest debaters in Cape Town to call on to champion Freethought when our Committee can unearth a believer who has the manliness to appeal to men's reason. It is hoped to commence monthly lectures in one of our Halls at an early date. Pamphlets describing the objects of the Society are being distributed broadcast and at an open-air Freethought propaganda meeting, which is held weekly by pioneer Mr. Martin on Sunday evening, close to a spot where two Christian preachers wrangle as to meaning of the Bible, and as to which version—1600 or 1900—is the true rendering. If you know all the local conditions you would agree that this Society is none too early in the field. Signs are not wanting that the Church is ardently courting the State.

J. H. DEAN, *Hon. Sec.*

### "OUR FATHER, WHICH ART IN HEAVEN."

Oh, Thou art pitiless! They call Thee Light,  
Law, Justice, Love! but Thou art pitiless.  
What thing of earth is precious in thy sight,  
But weary waiting on and soul's distress?  
When dost Thou come with glorious hands to bless  
The good man that dies cold for lack of Thee?  
When bringest Thou garlands for our happiness?  
Whom dost Thou send but Death to set us free?  
Blood runs like wine—foul spirits sit and rule—  
The weak are crushed in every street and lane—  
He who is generous becomes the fool  
Of all the world, and gives his life in vain.  
Wert Thou as good as Thou art beautiful,  
Thou couldst not bear to look upon such pain.

—Robert Buchanan.



**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.****INDOOR.**

QUEEN'S (MINOR) HALL (Langham-place, W.): 7.30, C. Cohen, "Christianity in Decay."

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Public (Minor) Hall, Canning Town): 7.30, W. J. Ramsey, "Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise."

**OUTDOOR.**

EDMONTON BRANCH N. S. S. (The Green): 7, J. Hecht, a Lecture.

**COUNTRY.****INDOOR.**

BIRMINGHAM BRANCH N. S. S. (King's Hall, Corporation-street): 7, Miss K. B. Kough, "Immortality."

FAILSWORTH (Secular School, Pole-lane): J. T. Lloyd, 2.30, Address to Scholars; 6.30, "The Law of Liberty in Morals."

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (Hall, 110 Brunswick-street): 12 noon, Class; 6.30, C. R. Clemens, "Evolution of Prehistoric Man." With lantern illustrations.

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate): 6.30, F. J. Gould, "Three Modern Prophets" (Tolstoy, Ruskin, Nietzsche).

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N. S. S. (Alexandra Hall, Islington-square): Mrs. H. Bradlaugh-Bonner, 3, "Christianity, Rationalism, and Peace"; 7, "The Fourth Centenary of Michael Servetus, the Victim of John Calvin."

MAESTEG BRANCH N. S. S. (Coegnant Library, Caerau): 6, Jack Williams, "The Philosophy of the Soul."

MANCHESTER BRANCH N. S. S. (Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, All Saints): G. W. Foote, 3, "The Bible"; 6.30, "God." Tea at 5.

RHONDDA BRANCH N. S. S. (Parry's Temperance Bar, Tony-pandy): 3, Discussion, "Secular Education."

**FLOWERS OF FREETHOUGHT**

By G. W. FOOTE.

First Series, cloth : : : : 2s. 6d.  
Second Series cloth : : : : 2s. 6d.

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

**BUSINESS CARDS.**

Short advertisements are inserted under this heading at the rate of 2s. per half inch and 3s. 6d. per inch. No advertisement under this heading can be less than 2s. or extend beyond one inch. Special terms for several continuous insertions.

APARTMENTS.—Any Commercial or other Friends visiting our district will find Cheap and Comfortable Accommodation at HIBBOTT'S Boarding House, Crow-lane, Ramebottom.

**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.**

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.

**THE SECULAR SOCIETY**

(LIMITED)

Company Limited by Guarantee.

Registered Office—2 NEWCASTLE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Chairman of Board of Directors—MR. G. W. FOOTE.

Secretary—Miss E. M. VANCE.

THIS Society was formed in 1898 to afford legal security to the acquisition and application of funds for Secular purposes.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Society's solicitors are Messrs. Harper and Battcock, 28 Rood-lane, Fenchurch-street, London, E.C.

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

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



### NATIONAL SECULAR SOCIETY.

President: G. W. FOOTE.

Secretary: MISS E. M. VANCE, 2 Newcastle-st., London, E.C.

#### Principles and Objects.

SECULARISM teaches that conduct should be based on reason and knowledge. It knows nothing of divine guidance or interference; it excludes supernatural hopes and fears; it regards happiness as man's proper aim, and utility as his moral guide.

Secularism affirms that Progress is only possible through Liberty, which is at once a right and a duty; and therefore seeks to remove every barrier to the fullest equal freedom of thought, action, and speech.

Secularism declares that theology is condemned by reason as superstitious, and by experience as mischievous, and assails it as the historic enemy of Progress.

Secularism accordingly seeks to dispel superstition; to spread education; to disestablish religion; to rationalise morality; to promote peace; to dignify labor; to extend material well-being; and to realise the self-government of the people.

#### Membership.

Any person is eligible as a member on signing the following declaration:—

"I desire to join the National Secular Society, and I pledge myself, if admitted as a member, to co-operate in promoting its objects."

Name.....

Address.....

Occupation .....

Dated this ..... day of ..... 190.....

This Declaration should be transmitted to the Secretary with a subscription.

P.S.—Beyond a minimum of Two Shillings per year, every member is left to fix his own subscription according to his means and interest in the cause.

#### Immediate Practical Objects.

The Legitimation of Bequests to Secular or other Free-thought Societies, for the maintenance and propagation of heterodox opinions on matters of religion, on the same conditions as apply to Christian or Theistic churches or organisations.

The Abolition of the Blasphemy Laws, in order that Religion may be canvassed as freely as other subjects, without fear of fine or imprisonment.

The Disestablishment and Disendowment of the State Churches in England, Scotland, and Wales.

The Abolition of all Religious Teaching and Bible Reading in Schools, or other educational establishments supported by the State.

The Opening of all endowed educational institutions to the children and youth of all classes alike.

The Abrogation of all laws interfering with the free use of Sunday for the purpose of culture and recreation; and the Sunday opening of State and Municipal Museums, Libraries, and Art Galleries.

A Reform of the Marriage Laws, especially to secure equal justice for husband and wife, and a reasonable liberty and facility of divorce.

The Equalisation of the legal status of men and women, so that all rights may be independent of sexual distinctions.

The Protection of children from all forms of violence, and from the greed of those who would make a profit out of their premature labor.

The Abolition of all hereditary distinctions and privileges, fostering a spirit antagonistic to justice and human brotherhood.

The Improvement by all just and wise means of the conditions of daily life for the masses of the people, especially in towns and cities, where insanitary and incommensurable dwellings, and the want of open spaces, cause physical weakness and disease, and the deterioration of family life.

The Promotion of the right and duty of Labor to organise itself for its moral and economical advancement, and of its claim to legal protection in such combinations.

The Substitution of the idea of Reform for that of Punishment in the treatment of criminals, so that gaols may no longer be places of brutalisation, or even of mere detention, but places of physical, intellectual, and moral elevation for those who are afflicted with anti-social tendencies.

An Extension of the moral law to animals, so as to secure them humane treatment and legal protection against cruelty.

The Promotion of Peace between nations, and the substitution of Arbitration for War in the settlement of international disputes.

America's Freethought Newspaper.

### THE TRUTH SEEKER.

FOUNDED BY D. M. BINNETT, 1873.  
CONTINUED BY E. M. MACDONALD, 1883-1909.

G. E. MACDONALD ... .. EDITOR.  
L. K. WASHBURN ... .. EDITORIAL CONTRIBUTOR.

#### SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

Single subscription in advance	...	\$3.00
Two new subscribers	...	5.00
One subscription two years in advance	...	5.00

To all foreign countries, except Mexico, 50 cents per annum extra  
Subscriptions for any length of time under a year, at the rate of 25 cents per month, may be begun at any time.

Freethinkers everywhere are invited to send for specimen copies, which are free.

THE TRUTH SEEKER COMPANY,  
Publishers, Dealers in Freethought Books,  
62 VESRY STREET, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

### TRUE MORALITY:

Or, The Theory and Practice of Neo-Malthusianism.

IS, 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.

### 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.

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 or 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.



## SUNDAY EVENING FREETHOUGHT LECTURES

AT

Queen's (Minor) Hall,  
 LANGHAM PLACE, LONDON, W.

(Under the auspices of the Secular Society, Ltd.)

FEBRUARY 19.—

Mr. C. COHEN,  
 "Christianity in Decay."

FEBRUARY 26.—

Mr. J. T. LLOYD,  
 "History Cooked to Christian Order."

Vocal and Instrumental Music Before each Lecture.

Questions and Discussion Invited.

Front Seats 1s. Back Seats 6d. A Few Seats Free.

Music from 7 to 7.30. Lecture at 7.30.

## A LIBERAL OFFER NOTHING LIKE IT.

Greatest Popular Family Reference Book and Sexology—Almost Given Away. A Million sold at 3 and 4 dollars—Now Try it Yourself.

Insure Your Life—You Die to Win; Buy this Book, You Learn to Live.



Ignorance kills—knowledge saves—be wise in time. Men weaken, sicken, die—no knowing how to live. "Habits that enslave" wreck thousands—young and old Fathers fail, mothers are "bed-ridden," babies die. Family feuds, marital miseries, divorces—even murders—All can be avoided by self-knowledge, self-control.

You can discount heaven—dodge hell—here and now, by reading and applying the wisdom of this one book of 1,200 pages, 400 illustrations, 80 lithographs on 18 anatomical color plates, and over 250 prescriptions.

OF COURSE YOU WANT TO KNOW WHAT EVERYONE OUGHT TO KNOW.

THE YOUNG—How to choose the best to marry.  
 THE MARRIED—How to be happy in marriage.  
 THE FOND PARENT—How to have prize babies.  
 THE MOTHER—How to have them without pain.  
 THE CHILDLESS—How to be fruitful and multiply.  
 THE CURIOUS—How they "grew" from germ-cell.  
 THE HEALTHY—How to enjoy life and keep well.  
 THE INVALID—How to brace up and keep well.

Whatever you'd ask a doctor you find herein, or (if not, Dr. F. will answer your inquiry FREE, any time)

Dr. Foote's books have been the popular instructors of the masses in America for fifty years (often re-written, enlarged, and always kept up-to-date). For twenty years they have sold largely (from London) to all countries where English is spoken, and everywhere highly praised. Last editions are best, largest, and most for the price. You may save the price by not buying, and you may lose your life (or your wife or child) by not knowing some of the vitally important truths it tells.

## Most Grateful Testimonials From Everywhere.

Gudivoda, India: "It is a store of medical knowledge in plainest language, and every reader of English would be benefited by it."—W. L. N.

Triplicane, India: "I have gone through the book many times, and not only benefited myself but many friends also."—G. W. T.

Panderma, Turkey: "I can avow frankly there is rarely to be found such an interesting book as yours."—K. H. (Chemist).  
 Calgary, Can.: "The information therein has changed my whole idea of life—to be nobler and happier."—D. N. M.  
 Laverton, W. Aust.: "I consider it worth ten times the price. I have benefited much by it."—R. M.

Somewhat Abridged Editions (800 pp. each) can be had in German, Swedish, Finnish, or Spanish.

Price EIGHT SHILLINGS by Mail to any Address.

ORDER OF THE PIONEER PRESS,  
 2 NEWCASTLE STREET, LONDON, E.C.