

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXXI.—No. 37

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1911

PRICE TWOPENCE

Nature is only to be commanded by obeying her.
—BACON.

Canon Horsley on Infidelity.

CANON HORSLEY is going to leave "crowded South London" for "a beautiful Kentish parish wherein 800 people are scattered over 1,576 acres." No doubt the salary is as much higher as the work is less, and we suppose the reverend gentleman is to be congratulated on his "call."

Before going off into clover Mr. Horsley delivered himself of a variety of opinions on "London's Social Problems," through the medium of a *Daily News* interviewer, and some of them will be more or less interesting to our readers.

We cannot congratulate Mr. Horsley on his self-consistency. His opinions differ from each other, and some of his statements contradict each other most flagrantly. At one moment he thinks the world is growing better; at another moment he thinks it is growing worse; and he is pretty cocksure in both cases. This appears to be one of his natural characteristics. A good many years ago, at a public meeting in St. Martin's Town Hall, we had occasion to correct this reverend gentleman. He was speaking on the subject of prison reform, and he claimed to be perfectly familiar with prison life. We told him that in our opinion he knew next to nothing about it. "Why," he said sarcastically, "I've been for many years a prison chaplain." We told him that this was no qualification; prison life was only understood by the man on the wrong side of the cell door; and as we had been in that position we were better able to speak on prison life than he was.

Mr. Horsley opened his part of this interview with the following utterance:—

"London is being tremendously improved structurally, and especially with regard to open spaces and conditions of life. The level of morality is much better than it was, and one finds better behavior and better language used in the streets."

Afterwards he said that gambling had spread downwards to boys, and drinking to women. A terrible feature of the drink curse was "the number of quite young women you will find in the public-houses." Opportunities for drinking should be restricted, and the bookmakers should be rooted out. "I want to put an end," Mr. Horsley said, "to the advertising bookmaker." We suppose he means the bookmaker who does business with the poor. Those who do business with the wealthy need not be interfered with. Now this is one of the grossest hypocricies of modern society. Betting is a crime or it is not. If it be not a crime, it should not be interfered with at all; if it be a crime, it should be stopped altogether. The bookmaker who deals in shillings is hunted and worried; the bookmaker who deals in pounds is treated as a highly respectable citizen; newspapers publish the betting odds, and report how much Lord This and Lord That won or lost at the last fashionable races; and the working man is expected, in the face of all this, to regard betting as a most shocking wickedness.

Mr. Horsley, like other Christian censors, concerns himself with the morals of the poor. The morals of

the rich are a much more sacred matter. It is always the poor who are to be reformed. Preaching is for *them*, religious missions are for *them*. The Salvation Army and the Church Army never start operations in a wealthy neighborhood. And did not John Ruskin, some thirty years ago, ask the then Bishop of Peterborough, what man's sins he had publicly rebuked if the man was known to have more than £400 a year?

On the religious side Mr. Horsley admits "the steady decline in church worship." But the people who don't go to church "have not abandoned religion." Oh dear no! It is the fashion amongst the clergy to interpret non-attendance at church in a subtly romantic manner. There was an old joke as to the absence of cleanliness in some of the early temperance hotels; namely, that they thought water too holy a thing to be put to profane uses; and the clergy are apt to represent the people who *don't* go to church as reverencing religion rather more than the people who *do*. Mr. Horsley does not go quite to that length, but he goes a good part of the way. He declares that emptying churches do not "imply a growth of infidelity." "Why," he says, "when I think of the publications one saw displayed in news-agents' shops during my Shoreditch days, and consider how difficult it would be to obtain them now, the change for the better is striking."

We wonder what "publications" the reverend gentlemen refers to. We know something of Free-thought literature, and we do not recollect them. The suggestion is that those publications were too abominable for words,—and we defy Mr. Horsley to prove that any such publications were ever issued in association with Free-thought. It appears to us that he confuses "infidelity" with "immorality,"—which is one of the meanest tricks of his profession. While denying that people have abandoned religion he declares that "they seem to have lost the instinct of worship and the idea of duty." As if these two things exist or are lost together! whereas they have no connection whatever. People who do not attend "divine worship" on principle, because they do not believe in it—thus acting to their personal detriment rather than their personal advantage—have at least as much "sense of duty" as those who do attend for legitimate and all sorts of illegitimate reasons—such as making acquaintances, finding customers, and meeting with possible suitors for marriageable daughters.

Mr. Horsley may be allowed to derive what consolation he can from the reflection that "these things go in waves." "We are getting," he says, "through a sort of ebb-tide, and presently the tide will flow again. It is something that the blatant infidelity of other years has gone." The image is rather misleading. Time is more like a river than an ocean. It flows on like a river and never flows back. Every now and then a powerful personality—such as Newman, Carlyle, or Morris—cries out "Back to the Church" or "Back to Feudalism" or "Back to the Middle Ages." There is great agitation and great expectation. But the world never does go back. It proceeds along a regular course of evolution. And just as vain as all other such cries is the prevailing one at present of "Back to Christ." And as for "blatant infidelity," it is merely a sample of clerical manners.

G. W. FOOTE.

The Churches and Modern Thought.

TAKING the translation—I think that is the correct word—of Bishop Gore from Birmingham to Oxford as a text, the *Times* in its issue of Wednesday, August 30, indulges in some reflections on "The Churches and Modern Thought." Like many of the leading articles in the *Times*, it is written with a very superior air, and in a spirit of cocksureness that would lead the unwary to conclude that no other view of the matter than the one expressed is rationally possible. Above all, some of the leading terms used are so elusive in their character, and susceptible to such opposed meanings, that two persons of widely opposed views might find themselves agreeing over particular passages, owing to the simple fact that each would place a different construction upon them. But that, I suppose, is the art of newspaper writing. To excel, one must learn to skim the surface of a subject as though one could dive deeply if one would, and make use of a number of vague terms that will please all and offend none. The writing of newspaper leading articles nowadays seems one long elaborate exercise in the art of saying much and meaning little.

Here are some instances in point:—

"Spiritual influences are often thought to have lost their hold on mankind in these days and to have no longer any place among us.....The age of reason is more obsolete than the age of faith, and the impossibility of solving our problems on a purely materialistic basis is becoming clearer as we understand them better.....But the right motives are moral motives, which spring from spiritual sources."

Now, used in an article written in defence of the Church, "spiritual" and "materialistic" should each have only one, and that a very obvious, meaning. "Spiritual" should be the equivalent of supernatural, of some power that does not come within the categories signified by such terms as matter, force, or energy. "Materialistic" should stand for the theory that reduces all phenomena to mechanical and theoretically calculable processes, whether we are or are not able to effect such a reduction in our present state of knowledge. But if that is what is meant by the words, then it is demonstrably untrue to argue that spiritual influences are stronger to-day than ever. On the contrary, there was never a time when their influence was less. Even the Churches are dropping the supernatural overboard, and trying to avoid a splash, so that the lightening of the vessel's load will pass unnoticed.

On the other hand, using Materialism in its scientific and philosophic sense, the impossibility of solving our problems on any other than a materialistic basis is rapidly becoming patent. That a given organism in a given environment will act in a particular manner is a truth that is being taken over from biology to sociology, and is being accepted by all serious reformers. The demand for better education, better houses, better sanitation, better conditions of labor, are all illustrations of this. The study of disease, of heredity—with all its vast implications—the growth of the new science of eugenics, are all so many applications of the principles of Materialism to life. These are all so many confessions that social phenomena, like phenomena in general, are the products of definitely ascertainable forces, and that if improvement is to be effected at all, it is by the method of studying their nature and controlling their operations. The whole of the modern science of biology, of the new psychology, and of all modern theories of sociology, are so many distinct attempts to solve the great problems of life on a materialistic basis, and so many confessions that attempts in other directions are sheer waste of time.

But if by "spiritual" is meant the finer mental and moral qualities of mankind, and by "materialistic" the sacrifice of these qualities to the lower sensual appetites, then the words are used in a way that Materialists themselves might use them, although they would naturally prefer a less misleading termi-

nology. The evil is that in articles like the one under examination the words are used in one sense and applied in another. Of course, right motives are moral motives—sometimes, for there are motives that are simply non-moral. The motive that leads me to sit down to dinner, or to open the window, for instance, need be neither moral nor immoral. And one may agree that moral motives spring from a spiritual source, if by this is meant the imperceptible relations that binds a man to his fellows, and the bonds of affection that weld groups into a whole. But if it is meant that morality springs from a belief in God, or a future life, or faith in Jesus, or from any other cluster of religious doctrines, then the reply is that this is simply false, and the man who nowadays bases morality upon any such foundation proves himself incapable of dealing with the subject—except in a newspaper article or in a religious journal.

There is an echo of an ill-informed Christian psychology, and one that marks its inability to deal aright with social problems in the remark, "The actions of human beings.....must be inspired by right motives, which are individual." In the first place, a right motive is no guarantee whatever of a useful social action. It is right knowledge that is the essential, and half the troubles of the world may be traced to the presence of good intentions combined with inadequate information. Next, it is true that motives must be individual in so far as they are expressed by an individual, but it is none the less certain that our desires, and consequently our motives, ultimately originate in society. It is the play of social forces that are the ultimate source of individual desires, and the individual can only be permanently affected by some modification of the social structure. Part of the failure of Christianity to affect social life for good has been due to dealing with society as though it were a mere accidental association of human beings to be saved piecemeal.

But the high-water mark of extravagance is reached in the statement that "To-day the Church more than any other institution brings men together in goodwill, dissolves the barriers of class and caste, and teaches the spirit in which the social problems that mark our time must be approached." Why, it is among the plainest of facts that the thing least likely to bring men together in goodwill is religion. It is religion that keeps the current education difficultly alive. It is religion that forms one of the greatest obstacles to the settlement of the Irish question. It breeds so much goodwill that in numberless clubs, literary societies, and other institutions it is a standing rule that religion be tabooed. And this, not because it binds men together in goodwill, for that is one of the purposes for which such institutions exist, but because the disruptive influence of religion is recognised. Moreover, it is a standing complaint that precisely because in church and chapel class and caste still maintain their aggressive attitudes so many people stay away from church altogether.

I do not know what is meant by the Church teaching the people the way in which social problems are to be approached; I only know that if organised Christianity has shown its incapacity in any direction, it has done so in this. Does it mean that self-sacrifice and charity, the two things about which the Churches have talked most, offer a solution for our problems? No one but a Christian preacher could take this seriously. Charity, obviously, can only do, at most, something to minimise evil consequences, and often enough brings a fresh crop of evils in its wake. And self-sacrifice is, too, the symptom of a diseased state of society, not the condition of betterment. It is the mutual profit derived from mutual helpfulness that we need in social life, not the one-sided benefit that is derived from sacrifice. Is it the putting into practice of the Sermon on the Mount? Well, it was one of the Church's own dignitaries who declared that a society which ventured on that trial could not exist for a month. No society has ever yet tried the experiment, and if it were

suggested it is certain that Christians would be the first to raise an objection. And one may remind the *Times* leader writer that responsible Christians openly expressed their sadness that during the recent labor trouble no one bothered with the Churches, and some frankly confessed that the Churches did not interfere because they were not wanted, and they were not wanted because they were not trusted.

To expect any of the Churches to either initiate a social reform or to help a movement that is struggling for existence is to expect them to run counter to their immediate interests. If Nonconformists twit Churchmen with being servants of the landed and ruling classes, Churchmen may retort that they are equally in the clutch of the successful commercial man. And the result is that from neither source can any drastic reform emanate. There will be no frothy denunciation of evils no one defends, flatulent eulogies of virtues no one decries, whole-hearted denunciation of evils in Africa or Turkey, but a careful and interested silence concerning evils at home.

It has, indeed, been the great social function of the Churches to guard vested interests by a diversion of attention into other channels. Whether they have always done this consciously or not is immaterial to the fact; they have done it. For the energy that is spent on religious subjects is energy diverted from social service. The young men and women studying in Bible classes *might* be studying social or political science. The people studying how the Jews lived 2,000 years ago, or speculating as to how they themselves will live in the New Jerusalem, *might* be paying a keener attention to the way people are living in our own towns and cities. Even the charities of church and chapel are so many bribes to remain content under conditions that would be absolutely intolerable to people whose minds were not subdued to theological influence.

If anyone doubts the part played in social life by religion, let them ask themselves why it is that those who are so solicitous for the celestial salvation of the people are so often utterly careless about their terrestrial damnation? How comes it that the man who will not spend five pounds to make the houses of his tenants more habitable will subscribe liberally towards getting them into mansions on the other side of the grave? How is it that they who screw their workpeople down to the last halfpenny in wages are yet so solicitous concerning their immortal welfare? They will then find the only answer to be that these subscriptions to church and chapel are so many profitable investments by shrewd speculators. It is not regard for the people's souls, but concern for their own pockets and positions, that leads them to regard religion as so indispensable a social asset. In some directions this is being realised, but it must be more clearly and more generally recognised if social improvement is to go forward smoothly and rapidly. True, the removal of theology from the social arena will not establish the millennium; but it will bring men face to face with facts. It will cleanse their minds of superstition, and their mouths of a deal of cant; and that done, all things are possible.

C. COHEN.

The Paternoster.

As everybody knows, *pater noster* are the first two words in the Latin version of what is generally called the Lord's Prayer. Into the origin and history of this interesting prayer it is not the purpose of this article to enter. It is wholly immaterial whether it is a combination of Jewish prayers in use in pre-Christian times, or whether it is an original Christian formula. This is a point on which first-class scholars are widely divided. Two hundred years ago the Rev. John Gregorie compiled practically the whole of the Lord's Prayer from the Jewish *Euchologues*, and Basnage went further still, and affirmed that there was an

ancient Jewish prayer called *Kadish*, "precisely like Jesus's prayer." But over against Gregorie and Basnage we must put a greater scholar than either, namely, Dr. M. Margoliouth, who in 1876 published a book entitled *The Lord's Prayer no Apaptation of existing Jewish Prayers*. Others maintain that Jesus gathered the Lord's Prayer, not from the Jewish Liturgy, but out of the *Zendavesta*. In reality, however, the question of origin is of no importance, because, however it came to assume its present form, the Lord's Prayer, like most other prayers, is theologically a series of contradictions in terms, and ethically an offence against conscience.

According to Professor Archibald Duff, of Bradford, the Lord's Prayer is a creed, "the Great Creed of Jesus." Professor Duff is an advanced Higher Critic, while in theology he seems to be a Ritschlian. Ritschl had said that "the Lord's Prayer is really a creed." "When you pray," he had continued, "you know that you have that for which you ask. The prayer is a declaration of confidence in God." Adopting his Master's view, Professor Duff asserted that "this creed of Jesus is the Gospel that is going to draw all the peoples to the feet of Christ in the worship of God." Then, according to a report in the *British Congregationalist* for August 31, he added:—

"This prayer is in common use in the churches of Christendom—Roman Catholic, Greek, Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist, Congregational. I declare to be a complete Christian everyone who has attained to this perfect state of faith in God."

Now, if the Lord's Prayer is "the Gospel that is going to draw all the peoples to the feet of Christ," will the Professor explain to us why it has not done so already? On what grounds does he believe that it will do in the future what it has signally failed to do in the past? On what does he base his confident prediction? There is no risk whatsoever in dealing in rhetorical prophecies. If no specific dates are given, the future is a bottomless pit into which the wildest prognostications may be flung with perfect impunity. Prophets get into trouble only when they so far forget themselves as to enter into particulars. But Professor Duff's character as a prophet is vitiated by his misrepresentation of the actual. Quoting Ritschl, he says: "When you pray, you know that you have that for which you ask"; and on examining the petitions one by one he claimed to find in each "the honest expression of our gladness that we have already received all these things." This "honest expression of gladness" is read into the petitions by the preacher in the interest of a theory; there is no trace of it in the prayer itself. Furthermore, if the things asked for are already in the possession of the asker, why ask at all? If that is the case the prayer should be transformed into a hymn of joyous thanksgiving. But the thesis is false, the things prayed for being either unrealised or naturally obtained. "Hallowed be thy name," "thy kingdom come," "thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth," these petitions have never been granted, and are less likely to be granted now than ever. They are offered up at the throne of grace every day by upward of four hundred million people; but not the slightest response has ever been made. "Give us this day our daily bread" is the silliest petition ever made. Bread is a product of human intelligence. But if the petition itself is silly, Professor Duff's comment on it is sillier still. The reporter makes him talk thus:—

"'Give us this day our daily bread' was really an expression of gratitude. The children knew that all had been secured beforehand, and that the daily bread was in the house. If anyone in London was not that morning going home to a comfortable meal it was the fault of some fellow-man. God had made ample provision."

That is pious nonsense. God has not made ample provision. What about the hundreds of thousands that die of starvation in India and Russia, and other countries, as the result of long-continued drought? Is not the weather under God's control? As a matter of fact it is man alone who provides the

daily food, and sometimes he fails because Nature takes to thwarting his noble efforts.

Prayer originated in the fear that the powers inherent in the elements of Nature were hostile to the human race, and took delight in torturing it in several cruel ways. To strengthen the appeal of the prayer costly gifts were laid on the altar, in the hope that thereby the unknown powers would be propitiated and become friendly. In every prayer there is a conscious or unconscious suggestion that God has to be coaxed into doing what the petitioners imagine would be of benefit to them. Apart from such a suggestion prayer is meaningless. A man would be a fool to ask for things he already had, and a bigger fool still to call the asking an expression of gladness that he had already received them. In that case praying would be worse than child's play; and in any case, prayer is a reflection that sheds its poisonous venom on God's character. The Lord's Prayer in particular is essentially dishonoring to the Supreme Being. It implies that he has produced a Universe in which his name is not hallowed, his kingdom not realised, and his will not done; and this implication is equivalent to a charge of imperfection against him both as Maker and as Ruler of the world. Has Professor Duff the courage to deny this? Whenever he repeats this prayer does he for a moment imagine that God's name is hallowed, his kingdom come, and his will done throughout Nature? He knows better, though in his sermon he talked nonsense in support of a Ritschlian theory. And who can fancy the unfortunate starvelings on the Thames Embankment thoughtfully and honestly saying, on a cold, winter's night, "Our Father, which art in heaven." Professor Duff is quite right when he says that, when anybody lacks daily bread, it is somebody's fault, but is he audacious enough even to hint that in a world governed by a Supreme Being any could suffer hunger?

The God addressed in the Lord's Prayer is clearly non-existent. Not only is he represented as winking at the imperfections and iniquities of the Universe, he is also addressed as one who encourages evil. "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil," is a petition which tacitly lays all that is wicked and hurtful at God's door. He is held responsible for it all. If we go astray and perish it is God's fault, not ours. It is he who leads us into temptation, and the evil from which we need to be delivered exists by his consent. These are implications which makes the belief in an infinitely good and loving God the greatest of all absurdities. Mr. Campbell feels the force of this when in a recent sermon he says:—

"I admit that when one reflects upon the enormous wickedness of human nature in some of its developments it seems almost impossible to take such a high view of its origin and destiny as I have just done. There is nothing much more saddening than the study of the cruelties and beastialities of human history.....It seems almost blasphemy even to think of such things in the same breath with Jesus, let alone declare that there is a way from such filthy depths of degradation to the sublime height on which he dwells, or that the souls which thus wallow in the mire of sensuality are from the same Divine source as he. But there is no help for it; I must say it; to say any other is to bring an accusation against God from which there is no defence. For, do what you will, the ultimate responsibility for all that is most dreadful in human experience, as well as for all that is most beautiful, must rest with him."

What Mr. Campbell does not see, however, is that the admission that evil as well as good is of Divine origin, in no way acquits the Divine Being of the charge "from which there is no defence." To hold God responsible for evil is to undeify him, or, in plain words, to treat him as a nonentity, which history proves him to be.

Professor Duff expatiated on the doctrine of Divine forgiveness. Omar Khayyam believed in a double forgiveness, God's forgiveness of man and man's of God.

"Oh Thou, who didst with pitfall and with gin
Beset the road I was to wander in,
Thou wilt not with Predestined Evil round
Enmesh, and then impute my Fall to sin!

Oh, Thou, who Man of baser Earth didst make,
And ev'n with Paradise devise the Snake:
For all the Sin wherewith the Face of Man
Is blacken'd—Man's forgiveness give—and take!"

But Professor Duff represents "Our Father which art in heaven" as offering to forgive us for being and doing what he himself caused us to be and to do. As Mr. Campbell puts it, "all the instincts of our nature, the perverse gratification of which is sin, are of his implanting." And yet both Dr. Duff and Mr. Campbell teach the immanence of a perfect God in the Universe, and, particularly, in man. The former portrays him as whispering "Don't," to the last moment before our fall. After our sin which, with the nature we had received from him, we were bound to fall into, he is waiting to forgive us. If such a God exists, it is he who needs forgiveness, not we.

We conclude, therefore, that prayer impugns the Divine character, and that the modern neglect of it is a sign of progress. The less a man prays the more he believes in himself; and the more he believes in himself the less becomes his confidence in God. It is only when he throws off all supernatural allegiance that he realises his self-sufficiency. All he needs is harmony with his environment, and this he must acquire through practice. The goal to be ever kept in view is his own perfection as a social animal.

J. T. LLOYD.

The Utility of Praise and Blame.—II.

(Concluded from p. 565.)

ONE need never travel very far in order to witness the melancholy spectacle of vice in triumph and virtue in distress. The cynical author of *Dorian Gray* sardonically tells us that the easiest way to overcome temptations is to give way to them. Needless to say, this has seldom been the opinion of the men who have conferred lasting benefits on the human race. The accommodating spirit which prompts acquiescence in evil is fatalism in its most sinister form. Those fatalistic races whose cry is "kismet" are stationary or retrograde. The unacknowledged legislators of mankind, as Shelley so finely called the poets, are almost invariably to be found in the van of social progress. The greatest of all poet-sages was the playwright who most successfully held the mirror up to nature, and the lesser songsters and poetic dramatists follow in Shakespeare's train. Another great Elizabethan has said that "By discrediting falsehood truth grows in request." It is obviously impossible to make plain and clear the superiority of truth to error without exalting the one and depressing the other. No social cancer can be removed unless we realise the evils and injustices of the social or economic disease we desire to abolish or reform. The amelioration of social anomalies is usually forced upon the Legislature by the growth of an educated and enlightened corporate conscience. The germinating thoughts of the social and religious pioneers, which have culminated in the enduring reforms recorded in human history, usually date their beginnings in the daring imaginings of some one far-seeing man. The brave reforming men of letters who prepared the way for the great French Revolution made men grasp the fact that the misgovernment of a privileged aristocracy and Church were mainly responsible for the appalling miseries of the people.

There exists a very general human fondness for casting the blame upon others for the troubles that may at any moment overtake the most honest and upright among us. That this tendency does not require any further encouragement is freely granted. But this very different to admitting that blame is altogether futile. The only practical justification

for blame is its utility. So far as discontent may be made a vehicle for improvement, it is a blessing. Clumsily executed work deserves, and should receive, condemnation or criticism. Where even ordinary capacity is lying latent, judicious criticism may do much to direct the artist, craftsman, or any other renderer of social service, along lines of greater efficiency. Human nature being what it is, there exists an almost universal tendency to regard criticism as essentially derogatory to the exclusion of every other consideration. But there is, happily, a growing recognition that one's best and most trustworthy friends are those who are prepared—should the occasion warrant it—to withstand one to one's face. The candid friend is far more reliable than any fawning, lying, smooth-faced mask of insincerity.

The earlier efforts of distinguished writers are seldom their supreme achievements. In the case of Shakespeare we find that his 'prentice hand produced comparatively inferior works, such as the tragedy of *Titus Andronicus* and the comedy of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*. He subsequently gave the world his wonderful *As You Like It* and *Much Ado About Nothing*. But the ripened sheaves of his autumnal glory include *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Lear*, *Macbeth*, *Measure for Measure*, and the sunnier *Tempest*. All these later mournful masterpieces proclaim the philosopher-poet who had suffered the buffetings of fate; even the Master had been blamed by his experiences, and had grown greater and wiser in consequence.

Another noteworthy instance is furnished by Charles Dickens. The crudities of *Oliver Twist* and *Nicholas Nickleby* are scarcely to be detected in *David Copperfield* or in that splendid book, *Great Expectations*. On the other hand, George Eliot's first great performance, *Adam Bede*, is, in many respects, equal, if not superior, to her later productions. But when we remember that this gifted woman was secluded from outside criticism, we may easily understand that, like the even greater George Meredith, the authoress of *Romola* suffered from the sound of her own voice. Robert Browning, throughout his career, and Meredith, in his ripar years, displayed a tendency to obscurity. As the ordinary reading public knew little, and cared less, for their contributions to the highest prose and verse, in company with Charles Lamb, these men of genius damned the public and wrote to please themselves and a choice circle of literary and scientific men.

These considerations are not confined to literature alone. Musical and art criticism has been of immense service to sculptors, painters, etchers, engravers, composers, and musicians. The various workers in the arts and crafts, inasmuch as they imitate or ignore the productions of their contemporaries or predecessors, in that manner display their admiration, envy, or dislike for the style, ideal, or execution of other artists' achievements. And when one turns to the less ideal, though more practical, sciences, one immediately discovers the immense influence excited by the critical faculty in this department of nature. No man on the face of the earth is more vigorous and exacting than the cultivator in the vineyard of science. Whenever a scientific discovery is proclaimed, it is immediately subjected to the most exacting tests that the critical faculty has thus far evolved. When any hitherto unknown natural phenomenon is admitted as proven by the world of science as a whole, it becomes a fact for all time. Scientific theories concerning such a phenomenon may come and go, but the fact itself goes on for ever. The purest treasure mortal time affords is spotless reputation, and this Shakespearean declaration is almost invariably borne in mind by the leading workers in the fields of science. The praise and gratitude of the living, with the additional prospect of a posthumous fame, have doubtless buoyed up many patient searchers into Nature's secrets in the darkest hours of their lives.

If blame assumes the form of penance or chastisement, praise appears in more kindly and genial shapes. The demeanor of our domestic animal-

friends and servants towards those who treat them with consideration and kindness is vastly different to the attitude they adopt towards those who maltreat them. The affection, hatred, or terror which human kindness or cruelty inspire in lower animal breasts signify the presence of emotions similar to those of mankind deep down in the zoological scale.

Even a cynic must concede that every generous human heart beats faster in the presence of some kindly deed performed. An act of mercy graciously done has been known to raise the spirits of the palest of pessimists; in a person of more sanguine temperament such an act may even evoke some unexpected physical display. The applause of the thoughtful and intelligent is tantamount to considered encouragement and approval. It may even outwardly express the deeper feelings of love. An actor or orator wields a potent influence over his audience, but he is in turn moulded by the demeanor of the listeners and spectators. Henry Irving's greatest impersonation was probably that of Mathias in *The Bells*. But notwithstanding his very numerous performances of this part, he was never in his highest form unless he was well received by the house. Human creatures are not stocks or stones, but complex bundles of highly integrated living and feeling organic substance. The toughest of men wince under mental scorn or physical chastisement. The most hardened cynic cannot conceal his satisfaction if he happen to be praised; a knowledge that the praise is unmerited detracts little from his gratification.

No discussion of the problem of praise and blame is complete without some consideration of the question of crime and punishment. The recent Crippen murder trial produced abundant illustrations of the spirit of revenge which still animates a large section of the community. One frequently heard the view expressed that the accused man deserved nothing short of burning or boiling alive. Such revengeful sentiments were by no means confined to the more uncivilised sections of the population. As a matter of fact, these inhumane opinions and desires were cherished by numerous highly emotional and refined, if thoughtless and inconsiderate, people. Comparatively few ever pause to consider the causes and conditions of criminal acts. The larger number of orthodox and conventional citizens regard the penal system exclusively from the primitive point of view. The restraint imposed by the system is usually lost sight of; while the possibility of reforming the prisoner is scarcely ever considered. The criminal is simply regarded as a wanton disturber of that happy sense of security which all normal citizens are anxious to safeguard.

That those who inflict injuries upon society should be punished through their loss of liberty, for some definite period, is at once granted. The restraints and denials imposed by incarceration act as a deterrent to the prisoner or his would-be imitators. But the main motive of the penal reformer is to create a prison atmosphere that is calculated to do something to humanise the prisoner. No prisoner should be detained one instant after he is fit to be set at liberty. No delinquent was ever yet reformed through the employment of harsh or brutal methods. At the commencement of the nineteenth century over one hundred crimes and misdemeanors were punishable with death. But notwithstanding the barbarous condition of the penal code, the amount of crime then prevalent was much greater per thousand of the population than it is to-day in the presence of a far milder system. Harsh and cruel prison methods render the brutal more brutal still; they crush the spirits of those who have wandered, more by accident than design, from the paths of rectitude, and make callous and stolid almost every official who participates in their administration.

The philosophical Determinist who realises that natural causation extends throughout the entire

domain of nature cannot make any exception even when dealing with the activities of the human race. Physicists, geologists, and astronomers never observe any natural occurrence the causes of which have hitherto baffled inquiry without redoubling their energies in order to trace the effect back to its origin. The existence of a cause or causes of ascertained effects is always taken for granted. In the natural history sciences the same processes obtain. No plant or animal has yet manifested any form or function not necessitated by the purely natural causes which determined its existence. In the presence of two eternities, one past and the other to come, all who have pondered the problem of existence from the scientific standpoint are compelled to picture the universe as an unending chain, or series of chains, made up of an infinite series of links, conceived as causes and effects.

Man's will power, as manifested by his acts, must in the last resort be admitted as simply the resultant of the countless causes which have so arranged themselves that their effects are rendered tangible and visible in his deeds. The human will is simply the feeling, or set of feelings, which happen to be in the ascendant when circumstances impel man to exercise his capacity to respond to forces resident in the external world. And when man's actions or responses are conducive to the health and happiness of society, the onlookers are filled with pleasurable emotions. But when they prove detrimental to the State, they call into being feelings of pain and resentment.

Praise and blame are as logical and rational to the Determinist as to the Libertarian; they constitute most powerful factors in moulding men's character and conduct, and consequently constitute two tremendous forces making for a fuller and fitter adjustment of the human family to the complex conditions of its terrestrial home. T. F. PALMER.

Acid Drops.

"Are Scientific Men Unbelievers?" is the title of a short article in Miss Agnes Weston's *Ashore and Afloat*. The lady either knows very little herself or she feels she can presume to any extent on the ignorance and credulity of her readers. "Where are the infidel astronomers?" she asks. Evidently she has never heard of Laplace. That one name will do for a beginning. More can be supplied when necessary. Biologists the "sailor's friend" seems to know nothing about. She does not include the mighty name of Darwin (to say nothing of Tyndall, Spencer, etc.) in her fancy list of "scientists." "Where are the infidel orators?" she asks. "Not Patrick Henry," she answers, "not Webster, not Gough, not Spurgeon, not Durbin, not Milburn, not Bright—these men believed in God." Evidently she never heard of Mirabeau, Gambetta, Ingersoll, or Bradlaugh. Then the lady asks "Where are the great infidel poets?" "Not Chaucer," she answers, "not Milton, not Shakespeare, not Byron, not Burns, not Lowell, not Longfellow, not Tennyson, not Holmes, not Watts, not Wesley, not David." Angels and ministers of grace, what a comical list of *great* poets! Lowell, Holmes, Watts, and Wesley were no more "great poets" than Miss Weston herself is. And she takes the names of Shakespeare, Byron, and Burns in vain. All three of them were "infidels" in the sense that they despised and laughed at the religion which has the honor of Miss Weston's support. All the lady has got left is Longfellow and David. She actually fancies that David wrote the Psalms! A country curate could have set her right on that point.

Miss Weston finally classes Edison with the anti-infidel inventors! It is a pity she cannot keep up to date. Edison has been proclaiming his "infidelity" (if the lady *must* use that offensive term) from the housetops lately. By her using the past tense in Edison's case, as well as in the other cases in her list, we conclude that she doesn't even know that Edison is still living.

Miss Weston should "stick to her last." She may be "the sailors' friend," though some dispute it, but she should not pose as "the parsons' friend" too. They know enough—or most of them do—to be aware that her ignorant help is

a serious disadvantage. They have trouble enough to hold their own without such an encumbrance.

Let a theologian alone for discovering an impossible reason for a simple occurrence. Most people are under the impression that the recent railway strike was due to dissatisfaction with hours of work, rates of pay, and general conditions of labor. Canon Rawnsley says no; the real reason lay in the belief that "God meant men to act as brethren towards one another in the effort to make life really tolerable and human to all sorts and conditions of men." It was an expression of "the spirit and mind of Christ." Probably the strike leaders had been reading that it was a Christian's duty to take no thought for the morrow, to turn one cheek when the other is smitten, and that the poor and meek and hungry are among the blessed of the earth; and the strike was their method of putting such teaching into practice.

Rev. Dr. Hanson, of Belfast, expresses his intense surprise at "the patience of God." When he looks round at the world, and notes its vice and misery, Dr. Hanson quite fails to understand how God can bear it, and wonders that he does not "take the evil-doer by the throat," or "open the floodgates of divine retribution and sweep the streets clean." This is all very well in its way, and probably expresses no more than Dr. Hanson's own feelings on the matter. That is what *he* would do if he had the power. He would take the evil-doer, or evil, by the throat and throttle it. Well, why does not God do the same? Surely he could if he would. As a matter of fact every decent man and woman in the country is doing what he or she can do to make evil less powerful than it is; and Dr. Hanson's God meanwhile sits up aloft looking on, doing nothing.

One might meet Dr. Hanson's surprise with a question: Why should God be impatient with the evil in the world? According to the popular theology, it is part of his plan that it should exist. It is here for our good, to develop our nature and train our spiritual powers. The theology which represented evil as from the Devil, with God fighting the Devil—and generally getting the worst of it—is out of fashion. There is really no sense in God getting impatient with his own design, or throttling the evil-doer because he is as his Creator left him. Really we do not wonder at God's patience with man; what surprises us is man's patience with God. He made the world, he made man, he afflicts him with disease and pestilence and disaster, he endows him with a faulty mental, moral, or physical nature, and then Dr. Hanson says, "I wonder how God can tolerate it all." What we wonder is how man can tolerate it all. Winwood Reade well said that if there is a day of judgment it will not be man's place to kneel suing for mercy. His place will be rather that of an accuser charging his Creator with either gross bungling, deliberate cruelty, or criminal neglect.

No pie is worth anything unless the Rev. F. B. Meyer has had a finger in it. His one fear just now is that the industrial revolution which has already commenced may be carried through "apart from the influence of religion." He is convinced that "every religious man and woman ought to take part in it." We are equally convinced that all parsons, at least, should be rigidly forbidden to have anything to do with it. If they get into it at all it will be *their* movement, and they will spoil it. The problems involved are purely economical, and can be satisfactorily settled only by those who understand economic principles.

As a matter of fact, Christian ministers *do* claim the present unrest in the labor world as the fruit of their teaching. The Rev. E. Roberts, of Manchester, in the *Baptist Times and Freeman* for September 1, actually puts the following question: "May not all this social unrest be the stir caused by the leaven of Christianity?" Christianity must be an extremely strange sort of leaven to have lain quiescent in the social meal for eighteen hundred years and to be now at last beginning to work! As he proceeds, Mr. Roberts waxes bolder, and positively affirms that "this ferment is caused by the leaven of Christ's teaching." "This labor strife," he adds, "is the spirit of our own teaching." This is a fair sample of pious lying. There is not a word of truth in the reverend gentleman's assertion. The Christian Church has never been on the side of the workers, and in consequence the workers have deserted it. A minister here and there realises this, and is eager to make up for it by nobbling and seeking to control all the social movements of the age, forgetting that honesty and truthfulness are virtues without which no cause can truly prosper.

Bishop Weldon occupied the position of President in the Educational Section of the British Association, and in the

course of his address dealt with the question of religious education. He said:—

"Religion is in the long run the most potent support of morality; religious teaching is, therefore, a necessary element in every sound educational system; and any religious teaching, if it be but the belief in an Almighty Power, is far better than Secularism or Paganism. But it is the State alone—not any Church or religious body, but the State alone—which can ensure the attendance of all children at religious teaching—subject of course to exemption on conscientious grounds."

It is to be observed that the Bishop is like a drowning man clutching at a straw. Any religious teaching—even though it be the bare belief in an Almighty something or the other—is better than Secularism or Paganism. By this Bishop Welldon really means, better for him and his class, and with this we quite agree. For a secular system of education in elementary schools is a frank admission by the State that it has no connection with religion, and that good citizens may be developed without calling in the Bishop's "most potent support of morality." France has a secular system of education; so has Japan, and the two may stand as representing "Secularism and Paganism." We invite the Bishop to say what France and Japan lose by not having religious instruction in their schools.

We quite agree that it is the State alone that can ensure the attendance of all children at religious teaching, although if there is exemption under a Conscience Clause, all children will not attend. But if there was any real desire on the parents' part that their children should have religious instruction, it would not be necessary for the State to enforce their attendance. What the Bishop feels is that unless the State does force religion upon children they will not get it, and that the power of the State must be utilised to compel them to come in, as it was once used to compel religious conformity. And this is dead against the drift of the best thought of the time, not only in this country but in others. For the State to dragoon adults into church is bad enough; to dragoon children is infinitely worse. The introduction of a Conscience Clause, as a protection for those who will not have religious instruction, not only fails in practice to give protection, but breaks down the case in favor of the State giving religious instruction. For if the State is justified in giving religious instruction on the ground that it is the most potent support of morality, it is justified in insisting that all shall receive it. It is clearly to the interest of the State to see that all is done to cause children to grow up useful citizens; and it is simply absurd to say, Here is a teaching, the most effective we know of to create a good character, nevertheless if you do not want your children to have it, they may go without it. They must learn reading, writing, arithmetic, etc., but the "most potent" of all forces in the formation of character they may either take or leave. No position could be more absurd than this. On the other hand, if the State does permit abstention, it is a round assumption that the teaching is not essential to the formation of character. In brief, the State must teach religion to all or none. It cannot teach it to all, because all will not have it; one day we shall see the other alternative established, and without detriment to the nation's mind or morals.

The *Christian Commonwealth* is longing for a time "when there will be a truly Catholic Church that will welcome all earnest aspiring souls, irrespective of mere intellectual belief." The *C. C.* is a journal that lives on pretty sentiments that mean nothing, and this is not a bad sample of its kind. We wonder what kind of welcome it would give in its Church to a man who treated the existence of a God and a future life as pure myth. Yet there are many such who are earnest enough and aspiring enough. We imagine they would soon be made to feel that their absence would be much more welcome than their presence. We remember Mr. R. J. Campbell captivating a number of Socialists by a somewhat similar rigmorole. And we remember that he afterwards informed them that no matter how earnest and aspiring they were, if they did not believe in certain religious doctrines they had better clear out.

Westminster Abbey is once more open to the public after being closed for months owing to the Coronation. The "grand stands" used for that ridiculous performance have been removed by the carpenters, who left the temple of the "carpenter-god" to its usual congregation of ladies.

The Rev. Dr. Dixon, the present occupier of Spurgeon's pulpit, is a whole-hogger with a vengeance. People had told him "that he was wrong in preaching the principle that salvation could be dependent on this mere belief"—that is, that God sent his Son into the world to die in order that

believers should not perish. "But," he is reported to have exclaimed, "if that is a wrong principle, I shall still go on preaching it right down to the grave." We no longer wonder at his so callously slandering the late Colonel Ingersoll. A man who is resolved to continue preaching a lie till he dies can do anything!

"Stories learnt at mother's knee," the clergy say, "are never wholly forgotten." Quite so. But some things learnt at father's knee make a still more vivid impression.

The Welsh Calvinistic Methodist Church has been taking a review of its position in 1910 as compared with 1900. It finds a decrease in the number of ministers, probationers, Sunday-school teachers, members, and scholars. There is also a falling off in contributions and pew rents, a decrease in the liquidation of chapel debts, with a general increase of debt to the extent of £54,000. More evidence of the conquering power of Christianity!

In his Pastoral Address the Wesleyan President perpetrates three palpable blunders. He asserts that, in spite of the distressing shrinkage from which all the Churches have suffered, "the existence of God is more widely accepted, there is a growing disposition to judge theories by their practical value and utility, which should result in the justification of the Christian faith, and a high appreciation of the person and teaching of Jesus Christ is increasing." We challenge Mr. Haigh to furnish practical proofs of the truth of those assertions. We readily admit that the second assertion is a half truth. There is a growing tendency to judge theories by what they can do, and the result is not "the justification of the Christian faith," but the gradual alienation of the people from all connection with it. The churches and chapels are emptying because believers in God and followers of Christ are becoming fewer and fewer. All this was frankly admitted by several speakers when the subject was under discussion at the recent Conference. After all, the President is only adhering to the Christian rule, never to acknowledge defeat.

Mr. Reuben Websdale, agricultural laborer, of Tivetshall St. Margaret, Norfolk, appears to have challenged the Rev. Augustine Mackie, of St. Margaret's Church, to "swop jobs" for a day. The reverend gentleman accepted the challenge, but the agricultural laborer backed out at the eleventh hour. Probably he was frightened by the list of his Saturday labors which the reverend gentleman drew up—and Saturday was "a slack day"! Here is the "Time Table for Saturday, August 26, 1911," as presented by the Rev. Augustine Mackie to Mr. Reuben Websdale:—

- 9.30-10.0.—Retranslation of English into Greek.
- 10.0-11.30.—(Ecumenical documents of the faith. Revise the "definition", of the Council of Chalcedon.
- 11.30-12.30.—The Homo-owsion and the Constantinopolitan symbol.
- 12.30-1.0.—The "hapax legomena" of the Apocalypse.
- 3.0-5.0.—House-to-house visiting in St. Mary's.
- 6.0-6.30.—Write out notices for church porches and choose hymns for Sunday.
- 6.30-9.0.—Prepare two sermons and a children's address."

It is obvious that the reverend gentleman's real business did not begin till 3 o'clock in the afternoon. Work is what one must do—and the reverend gentleman was not obliged to do any of the first four items in his Time Table; neither would he or anyone else be a jot worse off if he did not do them. It was not work, therefore, but sport or pleasure, whichever he likes to call it. House-to-house visiting might mean a few prayers and a little cake and sherry. Evidently it was not fair to throw all the labor of preparing two sermons and an address to "kids" upon Saturday. Thursday and Friday, at least, ought to bear some share of it. The reverend gentleman seems to be a procrastinator. He tackles his sermons and addresses at the last possible moment. And if he prepares three such efforts in two hours and a half, all we can say is "God help his congregation." For assuredly they will want help from somebody. The one lesson of this jest, perhaps, is the peculiarity of the clerical view of what constitutes work. On the whole, Mr. Reuben Websdale was too easily frightened.

Birthday books are sometimes absurd. *The Chamberlain Birthday Book* is made up of potted political paragraphs, which ought to whiten the hair of that gentleman's present supporters. Listen to a sample: "I am an English Nonconformist, born and bred in dissent, and I am opposed, from honest conviction, to anything in the nature of State interference with, or State aid to, religion." It will make a beautiful gift book to Primrose League buds under the age

of eleven years—or even to adult members of the Education Settlement Committee.

The French have a laudable habit of naming their streets after distinguished men and women. Here in England we name them mostly after the landlord, and the effect is sometimes humorous. For example, "Christian-street, London, E., is inhabited entirely by Jews."

Christianity, like the chameleon, always adapts herself to her immediate surroundings. When she sees an enemy approaching, her first impulse and effort are to strangle it. If she fails to give it its quietus, she instantly pretends that it is a friend in disguise, and comes to terms with it at whatever cost. When Darwin's *Origin of Species* appeared, the Church made a fierce attack upon it, pelting it with the most indignant and opprobrious terms at her command, but as soon as she perceived that Darwinism had triumphed over all opposition she said: "After all, Darwinism, when properly understood, is in no sense antagonistic to the fundamental truths of the Christian religion. Indeed, the theory of evolution has thrown a flood of new light on God's Book, enabling us to translate its dull prose into resplendent poetry. Yes, science is my most valuable ally; it has rendered me incalculable service by relieving me of 'a mass of abnormal growths, that have not nourished but have sapped my vitality.' Why, it has given me a new Bible and a new Christianity." The consequence is that if Paul were to come back to life he would not be able to recognise the religion he did so much to set on its feet in the world.

Such is the contention of the Rev. Professor David Smith in his Correspondence Column in the *British Weekly* for August 31. He pronounces the Mosaic Cosmogony a mere bit of harmless Orientalism, to be interpreted spiritually, not literally. Evolution—Creation and Providence—means God's "normal operation," while Christianity signifies his abnormal operation—"his strange work." This may be ingenious; but it is not honest. It may satisfy the credulous; but it disgusts the thoughtful. It is the juggle of the worst form of sophistry.

One of its young ministers declares that Methodism "expects her young men to preach that against which reason and morality rebel." "An Astonished Methodist" empties a bottle of vitriol upon the head of his youthful brother, and tells him that he is as ignorant and vile as "a Hyde Park Atheist," or a writer in the *Clarion*, and deserves to be expelled from the denomination. But we beg to assure "An Astonished Methodist" that it is he, and not "A Young Minister," who is hopelessly ignorant and prejudiced. It is easy enough to sneer at the Hyde Park Atheist; but it is not so easy to refute his arguments. We do not hesitate to affirm that all the so-called fundamental doctrines of Methodism are opposed to reason and destructive of genuine morality, and that what is true of Methodism is equally true of every other form of supernatural religion. We heartily congratulate "A Young Minister" upon his brave utterance, and express the hope that he will have courage enough to vacate the house of bondage and let reason and moral sense have free course.

The Rev. J. Ossian Davies urges us to trust in our Divine Guide. The curious thing is that the exhortation is given as a comment on "Lead us not into temptation." Has it never dawned upon this pietistic man of God that prayer is essentially an expression of distrust in God? To plead with a guide not to lead us in this or that direction is to suggest that, unless so besought, he may do so. Absolute trust in God would absolutely exclude prayer. Amazing is the inconsistency of Christians. In their creed, God is all-knowing, all-wise, and all-good; but in their practice they pester him with passionate petitions to do certain things and to refrain from doing other certain things. He has not a moment he can call his own.

"In New York city a gang of Roman Catholic priests conceive themselves to be above the law, and privileged to assault and drive from a public park any persons whose conduct does not suit their particular notions. A few evenings since, several of these clerical thugs, armed with canes, proceeded to invade St. Nicholas Park, and to set up their arbitrary censorship there. In one instance, one of these ruffians struck a young girl who was smoking a cigarette a violent blow with his cane. Of course, the matter was absolutely none of his business; and the girl had a perfect legal right to smoke. It is a pity that the pious blackguard could not have been promptly arrested and severely dealt with. A number of couples who were 'spooning' on the benches, minding their own business

and doing no harm of any sort, were also assaulted by these impudent priests. The police, apparently taught to violate their duty and to allow any emissary of the Church to commit crime with impunity, did not in any way interfere with the lawless and infamous procedure. It remains to be seen whether the Roman Catholic Church owns the City of New York, and whether its agents have rights superior to those of ordinary citizens."—*Truthseeker* (New York).

A Japanese scholar has translated the Book of Job into his native language with the ironic title of *The Man Who Feared God for Nought*. Since Job went to the better land the clergy have done it for hard cash.

The British and Foreign Bible Society boasts of translating the Gospels into "cannibal dialects." "Angels and ministers of grace defend us!" Imagine a dusky convert finding the passage, "Except ye drink my blood and eat my flesh," etc., and then meeting a missionary.

Nothing can be more contemptible than the ignorant and mischievous manner in which men of God treat morality. Of course, morality is quite indispensable; but its inferiority to Christianity is patent to all. The Rev. F. A. Jackson, who is on the staff of the *Baptist Times and Freeman*, institutes a ludicrous contrast between the two, out of which morality issues battered and torn and bleeding. We are told that morality can be aloof and censorious, merciless, self-righteous, lonely and fearful, a code, only itself, and carry a man only to the grave, while Christianity always is the opposite, and does incalculably more for all who accept it. We holdly declare that such a contrast is fundamentally false, in that it totally misrepresents both Christianity and morality. Does not this holy man know that censoriousness, unmercifulness, haughtiness, and pride are forms of immorality, of which Christians are fully as guilty, to say the least, as other people?

And yet Mr. Jackson, after making such a contrast between Christianity and morality, goes on to say that a "divorce between the two is unthinkable." Why, if the latter can be and do what Mr. Jackson predicates of it, its union with Christianity ought to be, for the reverend gentleman, quite unthinkable. Christians have been and done what he attributes to morality, which proves that they were merely moral and not at all Christian people. But taking morality in its true sense, the divorce between it and Christianity is not only thinkable, but also deplorably actual. The history of the Church is very largely a history of immorality. The bulk of her proudest conquests were secured by immoral means, while her treatment of heretics and unbelievers has invariably been the quintessence of immorality.

Newspapers eulogised the late Rev. Dr. Guinness Rogers as the "idol of the working classes." The writers must have got muddled over his front name.

The American literary papers say that Hall Caine's face is partly like Shakespeare's and partly like Christ's. We should not go so far as that on this side of "the pond"; but we have no difficulty in classing his intellect as Christlike.

"Providence" doesn't care a copper for any of the Churches. Oxford Place Chapel, Leeds, known as a cathedral of Wesleyanism, has just been the scene of a disastrous fire. The gallery is a ruin and the magnificent organ utterly destroyed. Of course the building was insured. Not even Wesleyans trust "Providence" too much. There is financial safety in hedging.

Rev. E. Mortlock, vicar of St. Barnabas, Bexhill, is evidently feeling the draught. He deplors the increase of Sunday entertainments, and is shocked to find the Corporation one of the principal sinners in this direction. He hopes public opinion will be roused on the subject "before it is too late"—that is, before the clergy are hopelessly outrivalled in catering for the said public.

A young student, showing the museum at Oxford to a party, produced a rusty sword, which he assured them was the identical sword with which Balaam was about to kill his ass. One of the company observed that he thought Balaam had no sword, but only wished for one. "You are right," said the student, "and this is the sword that he wished for."

Mr. Foote's Engagements.

October 1, 8, 15, Queen's Hall, London; 22, Birmingham Town Hall; 29, Liverpool.
 November 5, Leicester; 12, Manchester; 19 and 26, Queen's Hall, London.

To Correspondents.

PRESIDENT'S HONORARIUM FUND, 1911.—Previously acknowledged £288 4s. 9d. Received since:—Mathematicus, 5s.; A. H. Walter, 10s. 6d.

THE VANCE TESTIMONIAL FUND.—Previously acknowledged, £130 15s. Received since:—H. T., £2 2s.; John Hayes, 2s.; L. E. S., 2s. 6d.; J. Wilmot, 10s.; A. H. Walter, 10s. 6d.

J. N. LENTZ (U.S.A.).—See "Acid Drop." Thanks. What you refer to is a distressing fact, as you say; but Freethought wins steadily in spite of weak sceptics who still bow the knee "in the house of Rimmon."

L. M. UDDINGTON.—Sorry you will have "no Mr. Foote at Glasgow" this side of the New Year, but pleased (in one way) to hear that all your family will miss him at the Secular Hall. He will try to pay Glasgow two visits in the second session.

G. W. PINNER.—Sorry we cannot fall in with your proposal. If you have settled the problem of the origin of life you can easily publish your solution in a less expensive manner.

HAROLD WEBB.—Glad you are "an Atheist and happy," and have derived so much profit and pleasure from reading the *Freethinker*.

MATHEMATICUS.—The matter shall be properly attended to. Thanks for writing us about it.

W. SCRIVENER.—We know nothing of the paper you mention, and we conceive its opinion of Charles Bradlaugh to be of no importance whatever.

JACK BARTON.—Is it worth while going back to a volume published in 1904, which was even then, we believe, a reprint of a book first published some twenty years earlier? Glad you are so pleased with the *Freethinker*. It is curious, as you say, how ignorant and foolish Christians speak of it as "a rag." Is there any Christian paper in which half as much brains is put every week?

MARY FLEMING.—When a Belfast rabbi shudders at the thought of what would happen to "my people" during the first few months of Home Rule in Ireland, and justifies his apprehension by the report of the recent riots in South Wales, he simply shows that his pious mind is in a frightful muddle. But he will probably recover.

G. E. DREWITT.—Passed over to shop manager. Pleased to hear of zeal for promoting our circulation even on the west coast of Africa.

R. NORTH.—We have often "patted on the back" the paper you refer to, but we never noticed the least return or acknowledgment, so we conclude that our attentions are not welcome.

H. SMALLWOOD.—Sending as desired. Mr. Foote is well at present.

H. T., sending cheque to the Vance Testimonial Fund, says: "I should have liked to send something larger, for I have never met a lady in business or out of it for whom I entertain greater respect."

A. E. S.—We regret we cannot give you the address of a news-vendor who sells the *Freethinker* in Dublin, although we know we have readers there. Perhaps one of them can oblige with the information.

JOHN VASEY.—Thanks; but General Booth is not a certified prophet.

POSTMAN.—We believe the Liverpool Branch's new lecture season does not begin till October.

J. W. MEE.—You have merely to give the head master or mistress of the school written notice that your child is to be withdrawn from religious instruction. Glad you take so much pleasure in reading this journal.

JOHN HAYES.—We have looked through it, but the reverend gentleman's thoughts on the great strike are rather ancient now. Things move so fast in these days. Thanks all the same.

G. BALLARD.—We know as well as you do that criminals did not make themselves, but that is no reason why they should be allowed to rob, assault, and even murder their fellow-citizens; and your instructing us in the value of "education" we prefer to take as a joke.

A. MILLAR.—We should have been glad to see you, on your first visit to London; but 2 Newcastle-street is purely a business place and is not, of course, open at 9 p.m., and our own residence is nearly forty miles away. Better luck next time.

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

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

WHEN the services of the National Secular Society in connection with Secular Burial Services are required, all communications should be addressed to the secretary, Miss E. M. Vance.

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

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

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

ORDERS for literature should be sent to the Manager of the Pioneer Press, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C., and not to the Editor.

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

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

Sugar Plums.

Mr. Foote has been spending a few days with his old friend, Mr. J. W. de Caux, of Great Yarmouth, between seeing last week's *Freethinker* and the present one through the press. Mr. de Caux bears his age wonderfully well, and would be quite brisk if it were not for the pain arising from the ankle he broke in an accident a good many years ago. He is a little deaf, but he is still able to sit with efficiency as a magistrate, in which capacity he is well-known for his common sense and humanity.

Tickets for the Bradlaugh Dinner, which takes place at the Holborn Restaurant on Wednesday evening, Sept. 27, can be obtained at the N. S. S. office, 2, Newcastle-street, London, E.C., as well as at the address in the advertisement on another page. Mr. Foote is the Chairman this year, and the *Freethinker* will contain a verbatim report of his speech on Charles Bradlaugh together with a descriptive report of the evening's proceedings.

The next "social" under the auspices of the N. S. S. Executive takes place at Anderton's Hotel, Fleet-street, on Thursday evening, October 8. Possibly the Testimonial to Miss Vance will be presented the same evening. There will be a few words from the President in any case, and the usual program of music and dancing.

The N. S. S. demonstration in Victoria Park on Sunday was eminently successful. The speakers were Messrs. Cohen, Davies, and Moss. Mr. Wilson found the "platform" in the shape of a brake with splendid horses as before. Miss Stanley and Mrs. Marshall helped with the collection and other arrangements. Another demonstration will be held this evening (Sept. 10) at 5 o'clock on Parliament Hill,—the speakers being Messrs. Cohen, Davies, Moss, and Heaford, and Miss Kough.

Mr. Will Thorne, M.P., speaking at a demonstration in the Palace Theatre, Newcastle-on-Tyne, in connection with the Trade Union Congress, spoke strongly in favor of Secular Education. He was thus reported in the *Daily News*:—

"In conclusion, the speaker urged the secular solution of the education question. It was time, he said, that within their own ranks they came together on this question and recognised that the spiritual side of education must be left to the parson and the priest and to the Sunday-school.

During next year he believed the Government would be forced to deal with the education problem. The Nonconformists and the Welsh people were kicking up their heels to have their demands met, and they were likely to see a renewal of the squabble between Nonconformists, Churchmen, and Catholics. Trade union members would do all they could to convince Parliament that the secular solution was the only sensible and practical course. (Cheers.)"

The Catholic members of the Trade Union Congress, instigated, of course, by their priests, have been trying to upset the Congress's reiterated resolution in support of Secular Education, but they are not likely to achieve much success in that direction. With a view, however, to expose the fallacy of the Catholics' plea, the Secular Education League prepared and printed a leaflet on "Education and Labor," which was placed in the hands of Congress delegates.

The Unseen Universe.

"Physical science goes on unconcernedly pursuing its own paths. Theology, the science whose object is the dealing of God with man as a moral being, maintains but a shivering existence, shouldered and jostled by the sturdy growths of modern thought, and bemoaning itself for the hostility which it encounters."—C. W. GOODWIN, "Mosaic Cosmogony," *Essays and Reviews*, p. 211.

"There are, indeed, always to be found some who are fond of dwelling on instances of the marvellous, as if opening a door to the supernatural; and others, who perhaps confusedly and inadvertently use language to the effect that we are surrounded by wonders and miracles, inscrutable to our faculties. But, as before observed, there are no real mysteries in nature; what is to-day a miracle may become a well-known phenomenon, subject to law, to-morrow; and assuredly will eventually be so, if inductive inquiry be steadily carried out. The supernatural continually recedes and disappears from our view, and the dominion of nature, order, and intelligence daily advances."—PROFESSOR BADEN-POWELL, *The Order of Nature*, pp. 269-70.

IN pursuing our researches into the religious beliefs of great men we have no desire to ridicule or belittle the men in question. For our part their foolish and futile books upon religion might moulder upon their shelves for all eternity without our disturbing the dust upon them, if it were not for the persistence with which believers continually use the names of these great men to countenance them in their own foolish beliefs. But it is a fact that no great man has ever written a book upon the subject of the existence of a God, a soul, or a future life that will carry conviction to any unprejudiced mind. If such a book were written by a great scientist, and if it were irrefutable in the same way that the multiplication table is irrefutable, the Christian Churches would circulate such a book by the million; they would give free copies to every Freethinker and Rationalist they could find.

Men construct their theories and systems by which to prove the existence, the wisdom, and benevolence of God, and, like the sand castles constructed by children on the seashore, the advancing tide of science sweeps them away, leaving not a trace behind. We have seen how quickly this happened to Dr. Wallace's theory of the central position of our earth in the universe. A similar fatality overtook the once famous "Bridgewater Treatises."

Lord Bridgewater, dying in 1829, placed eight thousand pounds at the disposal of the President of the Royal Society for writing and publishing works on the power, wisdom, and goodness of God. The money was divided between eight scientific writers, who duly supplied "what a sarcastic savant called 'power, wisdom, and goodness as per order.'"^{*}

But, as Professor Bain remarked, they were "special pleadings, backed by a fee of a thousand pounds to each writer for maintaining one side." To be satisfactorily sifted, a similar fee should have "been given to eight equally able writers to present the other side." If the same offer were made for proofs of the existence and power of a Devil, plenty of able writers would undertake the task, and, we may add, with a more plausible result.

However, it was unnecessary to subsidise the other side; for, with the advent of Darwinism, which explained the so-called design in nature as the outcome of Natural Selection acting through the Survival of the Fittest in the struggle for existence, the works became obsolete, and no one thinks of appealing to them now. In fact, the whole of the works so laboriously compiled by Paley and his school, who argued from the analogy of the watch and the watchmaker that the plant must have had a plant-maker, have been swept away. If anyone doubts it let them read Call's *Final Causes*.

With the destruction of the Design Argument went the last hope of establishing the existence of a God—good or evil, or a mixture of both—from the facts of nature.

Since then the enemy have given up frontal attacks, and have concentrated upon the rear; they

have endeavored to find in the unknown and undiscovered tracts beyond the bounds of science a place to again set up the throne of God which had been so unceremoniously hustled out from the realm of the known.

Accordingly, in 1873, Clerk-Maxwell, the great physicist, delivered his famous address at Bradford, in which, describing the atoms of which the material universe is composed as being all of the same size and indestructible, he declared that they bore upon them the stamp of the "manufactured article." So that, instead of God being called upon to produce the world, vegetable and animal life, and man by separate acts of creation, all that was required of him was to sit in his workshop and manufacture the atoms, and endow them with the laws and potentialities required to evolve them automatically.

Two years later two English scientists, Professor Tait and Balfour Stewart, after having devoted their lives to physical science, announced that their studies had led them to a demonstration of the existence of God, and published the result of their researches in a book entitled *The Unseen Universe*. The book had a phenomenal reception, and passed through seventeen editions between 1875 and 1890. There was much rejoicing among the pious. This God for which the philosophers had been for so many hundreds of years so anxiously searching was at last practically demonstrated. Professor Tait and Balfour Stewart had at last driven this elusive God into a corner from which there was no escape. Let us shortly examine their argument.

The authors do not begin by pleading for faith; they advance with confidence. They tell us that they are not writing for those who already believe, but for "honest inquirers—for honest doubters, it may be"; for those who desire to know what "science, when allowed perfect liberty of thought and loyally followed," has to say upon religion. And, furthermore, they intend "to view the universe from the physical standpoint" only. They hold the Nebular Hypothesis and accept the theory of Evolution. They even go so far as to say:—

"It may sound strange to some of our readers to be told that it is the duty of the man of science to push back the Great First Cause in time as far as possible; nevertheless this accurately represents the part in the universe which he is called upon to play."

No deception, gentlemen. Nothing up the sleeve. No theological thimble-rigging or fog-bound metaphysics made in Germany, from the factory of Hegel and Co., but the genuine scientific article, warranted to wear.

They incidentally adopt Clerk-Maxwell's description of the atom as bearing the marks of the "manufactured article," but they founded their own proof upon the "dissipation of energy" and "the principle of continuity." They argued that, at the rate the sun is pouring out energy, the time will arrive when it will become a cold and lifeless mass, encircled by planets in the same condition; and eventually the same fate will overtake the entire universe, through the dissipation of energy. Therefore, they argued, as the universe must eventually come to an end, it must have had a beginning; and as the "principle of continuity" recognises no acts of creation, or break in the uniformity of natural law, therefore it must have been evolved from a previously existing invisible or Unseen Universe.

As to this "infinitely mysterious" developing agency, they observe "we cannot do better than consult the Christian records."

It was cleverly done. Just as we were preparing to be ushered into the presence of this mysterious First Cause, hey presto! and by some act of legerdemain we suddenly find ourselves translated to the New Jerusalem and gazing upon the familiar features of the old Jehovah. The rest of the volume is devoted to quotations from the Bible, and has no further interest for us.

When the book first appeared Professor Clifford wrote an article upon it for the *Fortnightly Review* (June, 1875), in which he parodies the idea that

* A. W. Benn, *History of Rationalism*, vol. i., p. 372.

because atoms are exactly alike, and indestructible, they were manufactured, as follows:—

"Because the sea is salt and will put out a fire, there must at one time have been a large fire lighted at the bottom of it. This can only have been effected by the agency of the whale who lives in the middle of the Sahara."

In conclusion he denounces "these sickly dreams of hysterical women and half-starved men," and tells them that they keep in their hearts "the slender remnant of a system which has made its red mark on history, and still lives to threaten mankind"; and warns them to "Take heed lest you have given soil and shelter to the seed of that awful plague which has destroyed two civilisations, and but barely failed to slay such promise of good as is now struggling to live among men."* Would that Clifford had lived to give us more of the lightning flash of his indignation and scorn of these contemptible efforts to force science into conformity with Christian superstition. Clifford fell a victim to consumption at the early age of thirty-four.

We now know a great deal more about the atom than Clerk-Maxwell or the authors of *The Unseen Universe* knew. We know, from the researches carried out on radium, that atoms are not all of the same size; that they are not indestructible. We know that they are subject to the same law of evolution as everything else; that they grow and decay, and end in dissolution; and therefore they are not manufactured articles.

When this fact was first announced some good Christians saw in this dissolution of the atom the dissolution of the foundations of science and the overthrow of Materialism. Where's your Mighty Atom now? What about the indestructibility of matter now? they asked; forgetful that it is the pious dictum as to their divine origin which is overthrown. And it required the precise statement of Sir Oliver Lodge to convince them that the position of science was unchanged, before their "victorious trumpet-peal," as in the Tuscan army, "died fitfully away."

We prefer to quote Sir Oliver Lodge in preference to many other scientists available, because Sir Oliver is always ready to grasp at any chance of reconciling science with religion. Dealing with this very subject of the dissolution of the atoms of matter, which, as he observes, "have their day and cease to be," he says:—

"I want to make the distinct assertion that no really existing thing perishes, but only changes its form. Physical science teaches us this clearly enough concerning matter and energy, the two great entities with which it has to do. And there is no likelihood of any great modification in this teaching."†

Although the atom is dissolved, the substance of which it is composed is not annihilated; it still exists in a more rarefied form. Nothing is wasted, nothing lost.

Then, as to the law of the "dissipation of energy," upon which the authors of *The Unseen Universe* build their argument, Sir Oliver observes:—

"Yet does the human mind pine for something finite: it longs for a beginning, even if it could dispense with an end. It has tried of late to imagine that the law of dissipation of energy was a heaven-sent message, revealing the finite duration of the universe; so that before everything was, it could seek a Great First Cause; and after everything had been, could take refuge once more in Him. Seen more closely, these are childish notions. They would give no real help if they were true; they cannot be true, any more than other fairy tales suitable for children."‡

In the economy of nature, modern science finds no sign of a beginning, no prospect of an end.

"Worlds on worlds are rolling ever
From creation to decay,
Like the bubbles on a river,
Sparkling, bursting, borne away."§

* This remarkable essay, which filled eighteen pages of the *Fortnightly Review*, was composed at a single sitting that lasted from a quarter to ten in the evening till nine o'clock the following morning. It is reprinted in Clifford's *Lectures and Essays*.

† *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1908.

‡ *Man and the Universe*, 1908; pp. 30-31.

§ Shelley, *Hellas*.

After sampling a few more of these pseudo-scientific works, we will consider the philosophy of Materialism in the light of modern science, and see whether it is as dead as the pious assert.

W. MANN.

(To be continued.)

Shakespeare and the Devil.

BY THE LATE J. M. WHEELER,
Sub-Editor of the "Freethinker" and Author of the
"Biographical Dictionary of Freethinkers," etc.

SHAKESPEARE has been claimed as an endorser of the superstition of his time, on account of his introducing witches, ghosts, and fairies in his plays. If this were so, it would not be wonderful. King James, to whom the Bible was dedicated, wrote a work on demonology, in which he said that witches kissed the Devil in imitation of God's showing his back parts to Moses (Exodus xxxiii. 38). After his time some of the most eminent men in English literature endorsed the Bible-founded belief in witchcraft. Sir Thomas Browne gave evidence at Norwich which led to the hanging of two poor women by Sir Matthew Hale. Dr. Henry More, Joseph Glanvil, Richard Baxter, and Meric Casaubon, all wrote against the Sadduceeism which, denying the Devil and his angels, virtually challenged God and his. Addison believed "there is, and has been, such a thing as witchcraft," and John Wesley declared, "The giving up witchcraft is in effect giving up the Bible."

Shakespeare uses the supernatural, but his usage implies no belief, for he treats it as its master. We cannot prove he did not believe in fairies, ghosts, or witches, but we can show that he makes them subservise the purposes of his play. Mazzini observes:—

"The divine power has scarcely ever any direct intervention in the Shakespearean drama. The fantastic element, so frequently introduced, if closely examined, will be found never to depart from the individual sphere. His supernatural apparitions are all of them either simply personifications of popular superstition, or, like Caliban and Ariel, symbols of the duality of humanity; or, like the witches in *Macbeth*, the incarnations of human passions."

Note, however, that the weird sisters—

"So withered and so wild in their attire
That look not like the inhabitant o' the earth,
And yet are on't—"

are not emissaries of the Devil, but the visible promptings of criminal desires. They are more akin to the Scandinavian Norns, or the Greek Furies, than to the Christian agents of hell. They own allegiance, not to Satan, but to Hecate. Here Shakespeare has seized the essential fact about witchcraft, to which sufficient attention has never been given. The stamping out of witchcraft was the suppression of Pagan rites which remained in Christendom until the seventeenth century. The worship of Hecate, with its lunar dances, survived in the "antic round" of the witches' Sabbat.

In his treatment of the belief in possession by devils Shakespeare shows himself to have been emphatically a Freethinker, who ridiculed the credulity of his times. He would deserve to rank among the liberators of mankind if only for his playing the devil with the Devil. The Gospel-supported belief in possession by devils was the occasion of much insanity, misery, and ill-treatment of those under its baneful influence. Persons seized with epilepsy or madness were pinioned, confined in the dark, and frequently flagellated, to whip the offending devil out of them. The treatment is alluded to in *Romeo and Juliet* (i. 2):—

"Not mad, but bound more than a madman is,
Shut up in prison, kept without my food,
Whipp'd and tormented."

In the *Comedy of Errors* (iv. 4) is an amusing scene which further illustrates this. Dr. Pinch, as school-

master, is exhorted, "as a conjurer," to bring the alleged mad Antipholus of Ephesus back to his senses. Pinch says:—

"I charge thee, Satan, housed within this man,
To yield possession to my holy prayers,
And to thy state of darkness hie thee straight;
I conjure thee by all the saints in heaven."

But all the saints in heaven do not avail, and Pinch declares:—

"Mistress, both man and master is possessed;
I know it by their pale and deadly looks.
They must be bound, and laid in some dark room."

The scene between Malvolio and the Clown in *Twelfth Night* (iv. 2) further caricatures the New Testament-supported idea of demoniacal possession and exorcism. The clown, arrayed in gown and beard, pretends to be Sir Topas, the curate, and speaks to the devil within Malvolio; "Out, hyperbolic fiend! how vexest thou this man"; and when Malvolio pleads, "Good Sir Topas, do not think I am mad; they have laid me here in hideous darkness," replies: "Fie, thou dishonest Satan! I call thee by the most modest terms, for I am one of those gentle ones that will use the Devil himself with courtesy"; whereas the priestly exorcisers treated them contumeliously. In ridiculing possession by devils Shakespeare was virtually discarding the New Testament, which countenanced that belief, and in jeering at exorcisms he was flying in the face of the canons of the Church of England, which recognise the exorcism of demons, but prohibit it to any but priests.

Another satire on the belief in possession is found in *King Lear*, where Edgar pretends to be mad and possessed. He says (ii. 3):—

"My face I'll grime with filth,
Blanket my loins; elf all my hair in knots."

Lodge, in his *Wits Miserie*, describing a devil whom he names Brawling-Contention, says: "His ordinary apparell is a little low-crowned hat with a fether in it like a fore-horse; his haire is wild and full of elves locks, and withy for want of kumbing." Edgar says:—

"This is the foul fiend Flibbertigibbet; he begins at curfew, and walks till the first cock; he gives the web and the pin, squints the eye, and makes the hare-lip; mildews the white wheat, and hurts the poor creature of earth."

"St. Withold footed thrice the wold;
He met the night-mare, and her nine-fold;
Bid her alight,
And her troth plight,
And, aroint thee, witch, aroint thee."

Then he says:—

"Peace, Smolkin, peace, thou fiend.....
The Prince of Darkness is a gentleman;
Modo he's called and Mahu."

And later on:—

"Frateretto calls me; and tells me Nero is an angler in the lake of darkness. Pray, innocent, and beware the foul fiend."

The very names of the evil spirits which Edgar pretends beset him Archbishop Harsnet, in his *Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures* (1603) tells us were those of the demons alleged to have been exorcised by Popish priests. Among these were Smolkin, Modo, Mahu, Frateretto, and Flibbertigibbet. No way of ridding the mind of belief in these "foul fiends" could be more effective than putting them into the mouth of one whom the audience knows is only pretending to be mad. And yet some people pretend that Shakespeare was a Roman Catholic! When Edgar describes the Devil, he depicts an incredible monster:—

"Methought his eyes
Were two full moons; he had a thousand noses;
Horns welk'd and waved like the enridg'd sea."

The many stories of devils with awful names are again satirised when, in 1 *Henry IV.* (ii. 4) Falstaff alludes to Glendower as "he of Wales, that gave Amaimon the bastinado, and made Lucifer cuckold, and swore the Devil his true liegeman upon the cross of a Welsh hook." Ford, in *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (ii. 2) says: "Amaimon sounds well, Lucifer well, Barbason well; yet they are devils'

additions, the names of fiends." In *Henry V.* (ii. 1) Nym tells Pistol: "I am not Barbason; you cannot conjure me."

Shakespeare satirises, too, the belief that the Devil could transform himself into any shape—a belief countenanced by Paul, who says (2 Cor. xi. 14) that Satan transforms himself into an angel of light. Thus Prince Hal (1 *Henry IV.*, ii. 4) tells Falstaff, in the character of the King: "There is a devil haunts thee in the likeness of a fat old man. That villainous, abominable misleader of youth, Falstaff, that old white-bearded Satan." So in the *Merchant of Venice* (iii. 1), on the approach of Shylock, Salanio says: "Let me say amen betimes, lest the Devil cross my prayer; for here he comes in the likeness of a Jew." In *Othello*, Iago tells Brabantio to seek his daughter, "or else the Devil will make a grandsire of you," owing to the Devil being regarded as black, and as acting the part of an incubus.

In the *Comedy of Errors* (iv. 3) Antipholus of Syracuse says to a courtesan, "Satan! avoid! I charge thee, tempt me not." His servant Dromio says, "Master, is this Mistress Satan?" A.—"It is the Devil." D.—"Nay, she is worse; she is the devil's dam; and here she comes in the habit of a light wench; and therefore comes that the wenches say 'God damn me'; that's as much as to say, 'God make me a light wench.' It is written, 'they appear to me like angels of light: light is an effect of fire, and fire will burn; ergo, light wenches will burn.'" And when she asks him to "mend our dinner," Dromio says: "Master, if you do, expect spoon meat, or bespeak a long spoon." A.—"Why, Dromio?" D.—"Marry, he must have a long spoon, that must eat with the Devil." In *Love's Labor Lost* (iv. 3), too, we have: "Devils soonest tempt, resembling spirits of light." And Constance, in *King John* (iii. 1), tells the Dauphin, "The Devil tempts thee here in likeness of a new, untrimmed bride." Hamlet pauses lest

"The spirit that I have seen
May be the devil: and the devil hath power
To assume a pleasing shape; yea, and perhaps
Out of my weakness and my melancholy,
And he is very potent with such spirits,
Abuses me to damn me."

Here, giving the superstition of the time, our dramatist also shows its occasion, in weakness and melancholy. Further light on the Devil is given when Cassio, in remorse for his drunkenness, says (*Othello*, ii. 3): "O thou invisible spirit of wine, if thou hast no name to be known by, let me call thee—devil!" and, giving at once the rational, true, and poetic meaning of the word, he says: "It hath pleased the devil, drunkenness, to give place to the devil, wrath; one unperfectness shows me another, to make me frankly despise myself." And yet again: "Every inordinate cup is unblessed, and the ingredient is a devil." Thus does Shakespeare refine the old savage belief in a devil into the actuality which works evident woe among mankind. So in *Triolus and Cressida* we have the Devil as a metaphor. "How the devil, Luxury.....tickles these together." That the Devil is only evil spelled with a d—as god is good with one o—we may see from the exclamation, "I' the name of evil" (*Winter's Tale*, iv. 2), which is equivalent to "In the devil's name."

Mary and Jeany, two country lasses, were discussing their new minister. "D'ye ken what he puts me in mind o'?" said Mary; and then archly answered, "Just o' a kiss frae a body ye dinna like."

"Why is Professor — the greatest revival preacher of the ago?"

"Because at the end of every sermon there is a great awakening."

How did Jonah feel when the whale swallowed him? Down in the mouth.

A lady's description of her pastor: "Six days of the week he's invisible, and on the seventh he's incomprehensible."

Correspondence.

CHRISTIAN QUOTATIONS—AND EDITING.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—I have just been re-reading your articles on Warschauer, and desire to say that I have highly enjoyed the drubbing you have given him; he fully deserves what you have dealt out to him, and I sincerely hope you will see it good to put the whole of the business—the Debate itself and the extra criticism—into book form, so as to be handy, and more accessible than if left spread over the pages of the *Freethinker*.

I want to urge this on you for another reason also.

I have, with one of my daughters, been reading Darwin's *Origin* in two different editions, and think it may perhaps be useful to draw attention to the results of the comparisons.

My own edition is the "John Murray. Fifth thousand. 1860."

My daughter, for exam. purposes, had to get a new copy, and procured an edition issued by Ward, Lock & Co., dated 1910, "World Library of Famous Books," a really wonderful bit of book-producing; beautifully clear print on good paper, in neat cloth covers, 1s. net.

I do not know how other cheap editions have been revised or edited, but this one seems just a trifle erratic, seeming to me not consistent with itself in places.

First, on opening opposite the title page in the 1860, there are three short quotations: 1 from Whewell, *Bridgewater Treatise*; 1 from Butler's *Analogy of Revealed Religion*; 1 from Bacon, *Advancement of Learning*.

In the 1910 edition the Butler extract does not appear; it is on the meaning of the word "natural," and is somewhat important from our point of view.

At p. 460, 1860, we have the following:—

"It is, no doubt, extremely difficult even to conjecture by what gradations many structures have been perfected, more especially amongst broken and failing groups of organic beings; but we see so many strange gradations in nature, that we ought to be extremely cautious in saying that any organ....."

At p. 353 of the 1910 edition, after the word "nature," we have these additional words, "as is proclaimed by the canon, *Natura non fait saltum*," the sentence then going on "that we ought," etc.

At p. 480 (1860) is the passage beginning "I have now recapitulated," and ending with "action of His laws."

It is no doubt one of the most explicit of the passages relied upon by the Deists, and there is small doubt that it is a card constantly in play by them. It must, I feel sure, be somewhat of a poser for some of our newer students when this is quoted against them, for some twelve or fifteen lines of this paragraph are omitted in the 1910 edition, and two paragraphs of the 1860 are made one in the 1910.

At p. 484 of 1860 is a paragraph opening, "When the views advanced by me in this volume, and by Mr. Wallace in the *Linnean Journal*"; in the 1910 edition "and by Mr. Wallace in the *Linnean Journal*" are left out, as are the three important words of the close of the preceding paragraph, "by the Creator," but the same three words used on p. 489 are left standing in the edition 1910 (p. 375).

In the closing sentence of the book, p. 490 (1860) "by the Creator" is again used, and in the 1910 this is deleted.

You have more than once remarked on this fashion of "editing" by the Rationalist Press Association and others, and it occurs to me from the reading of the Warschauer and it occurs to me from the reading of the Warschauer trickery that you could do the new generation of readers a real good turn by a detailed exposure of Christian Evidence lecturers' quotation dodges.

Darwin is, I suppose, before all the author most relied upon in this game; your encounter with the Christian Jew is the latest, and will for a very long time be the most complete, exposure of the knavish, unscrupulous game, and it seems to me it would be an exceedingly valuable thing to have in one book, handy and permanent, a detailed examination of Darwin's original position, his development and practical recantation of the orthodox belief, not forgetting the letters to Baron Mengden, etc.

I am sorry that you cannot see your way to do more than you do in the way of regular direction—positive instruction in the use of the best books for our work.

Seeing the ever-growing output of the printed word, seekers after truth are to be forgiven and pitied for sometimes going wide of the mark, and though our people are very prone to resent too much of the *ex cathedra*, there is no doubt room for more trained, definite guidance than yet seems available for our special work.

Trusting this may be interesting and perhaps even useful,

T. SHORE.

Anthropomorphism

IN his charming work *With Nature and a Camera*, Mr. Richard Kearton relates as follows:—

"Captain McCallum told me an amusing anecdote about a poor old woman who accompanied her kinsmen on a journey from St. Kilda to Harris in the days when they used to visit the latter place in their large boat. On the occasion in question, night fell before a landing was effected, and when they did succeed in getting ashore it was on an unknown part of the coast. In searching for some kind of habitation the old woman accidentally got separated from her companions, and fell in with an object of supernatural brilliancy at which she marvelled greatly,—a lighthouse. It being a sultry night the keeper had left the door open, that he might benefit by the improved ventilation. The old woman mounted the tower-stairs in great awe, and when she came into the presence of the attendant and the dazzling brilliancy of his lanterns' rays she fell on her knees and began to address him as the Almighty. The man was, on his part, so startled that he concluded the aged St. Kildan was some hag from the nether regions, to which he bade her get back in language more forcible than polite" (p. 42).

Mr. Kearton adds:—

"A somewhat similar thing is said to have happened near London in the early days of ballooning, when an aeronaut alighted in a ploughed field at Coulsdon, in Surrey. A laborer who happened to be working close by at the time was so overcome with fear at the unusual sight that, when asked the name of the place by the man who dropped from the clouds, he fell on his knees and replied: 'Coulsdon, if you please, God Almighty'" (page 42).

F. J. GOULD.

A Passion Play.

[The following is an extract from one of our readers to another. The writer is travelling in Austria. It shows what Catholics stand in the name of their faith.]

WE saw the Passion Play at Rendburg last week. O what a joke! Everybody (except us) as gloomy as guys and as serious as a Sunday-school. Act I., Paradise. God (an elderly gent with white hair and a crown); Adam and Eve (naked except a flesh-colored loincloth each); Serpent (the funniest thing I ever saw on any stage. It had to be a man because it was a speaking part. It had an elongated imitation serpent body half round a tree). God smacked the serpent two or three times to emphasize his remonstrance. Adam was chewing "the apple" when the latter fell among the audience. A peasant pitched back the apple, which Adam caught and went on eating and talking. Then—to see Adam and Eve pretending to be for the first time conscious of their own nakedness. It was weird to see their idiotic antics, indicating "shyness"; but the cream of the joke was when they each pinned a fig leaf on to the other's tummy. Then God comes out again, sees the fig leaves, touches them, and demands explanations. Act II. was the Crucifixion—too ghastly to be amusing.

A TOAST.

Here's to the Garden of Eden,
Which Adam was always a-weedin'
Till Eve by mistake
Got bit by a snake,
Who on the ripe pippins was feedin'.
Then a longing it seemed to possess her
For clothing sufficient to dress her;
And ever since then it's been up to us men
To pay for the dresses—God bless her.

A PSALM REVISED.

The politician is my shepherd, I shall not want for anything during this campaign. He leadeth me into the saloon for my vote's sake. He filleth my pocket with good cigars; my cup of beer runneth o'er. He inquireth concerning my family, even unto the fourth generation. Yea, though I walk through the mud and the rain to vote for him, and shout myself hoarse when he is elected, straightway he forgetteth me. Although I meet him at his own house, he knoweth me not. Surely the wool has been pulled over my eyes all the days of my life and I shall dwell in the house of a chump forever.

ONCE WAS ENOUGH.

"Did you ever," said one preacher to another, "stand at the door after your sermon and listen to what people said about it as they passed out?"
Replied he: "I did once"—a pause and a sigh—"but I'll never do it again."

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

LONDON.

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Victoria Park, near the Bandstand): 3.15, Miss Kough, a Lecture.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S. (Brockwell Park): 3.15, Andrew Allison, "The Blasphemy of the Holy Ghost."

EDMONTON BRANCH N. S. S. (The Green): 7.15, E. Burke, "Secularism and Christian Civilisation."

FINSBURY PARK: 11.30, C. Cohen, a Lecture.

ISLINGTON BRANCH N. S. S. (Highbury Corner): 12 noon, Ivan Paperno and Walter Bradford. Newington Green: 7.30, Ivan Paperno, a Lecture. Highbury Corner: Wednesday, at 8, Ivan Paperno, a Lecture.

KINGSLAND BRANCH N. S. S. (Ridley-road): 11.30, F. A. Davies, "Secularism."

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Parliament Hill): 5, a Demonstration.

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (outside Maryland Point Station, Stratford): 7, F. A. Davies, a Lecture.

WOOD GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Jolly Butchers Hill, opposite Public Library): 7, Mr. Marshall, "Christis."

COUNTRY.

OUTDOOR.

HUDDESFIELD BRANCH N. S. S. (Market Cross): 8.45, Geo. T. Whitehead, a Lecture. Saturday, at 8, Geo. T. Whitehead, a Lecture.

KEIGHLEY, YORKS (Market Square): Joseph A. E. Bates—Sunday, at 7.15, "Philosophy of Materialism"; Monday, at 7.30, "In the Valley of the Shadow"; Tuesday, at 7.30, "Kingcraft—Past and Present"; Wednesday, at 7.30, "The Immediate Objects of the N. S. S.: What they are and where they lead"; Thursday, at 7.30, "Origin of the Christ Myth" (with diagrammatic illustrations); Friday, at 7.30, "The Paradox of Christian Socialism."

LAINDON, ESSEX (opposite Luff's Hairdressing Saloon): 7, R. H. Rosetti, "Genesis and the First Week's Work."

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.

PROPAGANDIST LEAFLETS. New Issue. 1. *Hunting Skunks*, G. W. Foote; 2. *Bible and Teetotalism*, J. M. Wheeler; 3. *Principles of Secularism*, C. Watts; 4. *Where Are Your Hospitals?* R. Ingersoll. 5. *Because the Bible Tells Me So*, W. P. Ball. Often the means of arresting attention and making new members. Price 6d. per hundred, post free 7d. Special rates for larger quantities. Samples on receipt of stamped addressed envelope.—N. S. S. SECRETARY, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

LAYING OUT GARDENS, FANCY PONDS, AND ROCKWORK.—Expert Advice given. Estimates supplied. Distance no object.—S. C. FISON, Garden Expert, Wells Cottage, Gladstone-road, Farnborough, Kent.

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.

Ralph Cricklewood,

A Twentieth Century Critical and Rational
Exposé of Christian Mythology.

(IN THE FORM OF A NOVEL.)

By STEPHEN FITZ-STEPHEN.

A Well-Wisher of the Human Family.

388 pages, cloth. Price 3s. 6d.

Post Free.

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 Battock, 23 Rood-lane, Fenchurch-street, London, E.C.

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

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

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. BENNETT, 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 VESY STREET, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

PAMPHLETS by C. COHEN.

- 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.

Bradlaugh Fellowship.

THE EIGHTH

ANNUAL DINNER

WILL BE HELD AT THE

HOLBORN RESTAURANT,
On Wednesday, September 27, 1911.

Chairman:

Mr. G. W. FOOTE
(President of the National Secular Society)

The Tickets are 3s. each, this is one shilling less than the cost of the Dinner.

The Committee are enabled to make this reduction by means of the bequest of the late James Dowling.

Chair taken at 7 p.m.

After Dinner there will be Speeches, Toasts, and Vocal and Instrumental Music.

Application for tickets must be made not later than Saturday, September 23, to the Hon. Sec.,

W. J. RAMSEY, 146 Lansdowne-road, Hackney, N.E.

Evening dress not desired but quite optional.

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—not 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 "grewed" 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.

THE POPULAR EDITION

(Revised and Enlarged)

OF

"BIBLE ROMANCES"

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

With a Portrait of the Author

Beynolds's Newspaper says:—"Mr. G. W. Foote, chairman of the Secular Society, is well known as a man of exceptional ability. His *Bible Romances* have had a large sale the original edition. A popular, revised, and enlarged edition, at the price of 8d., has now been published by the Pioneer Press, 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, for the Secular Society. Thus, within the reach of almost everyone, the ripest thought of the leaders of modern opinion is being placed from day to day."

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

SIXPENCE—NET

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