

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXXI.—No. 49

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 3, 1911

PRICE TWOPENCE

Subjective immortality based on altruism is superior to an objective resurrection in which egoism is supreme.

—AUGUSTE COMTE.

The Holy War.—II.

(Concluded from p. 755.)

IV.

LONG before Johnson, and soon after Bacon, the wise and witty and generally humane Thomas Fuller dealt with this point in his *History of the Holy War*—that is, of the Crusades. Fuller gives the arguments for and against the "lawfulness of the Holy War" without positively committing himself to either side. Amongst the affirmative arguments, he perhaps implies, but he does not assert, that the Mohammedans were bound to propagate their religion by the sword. "A preventive war," he says, "grounded on a just fear of invasion is lawful; but such was this holy war." The only "fear" he actually alleges, however, is based upon the Saracenic conquests, which had driven Christianity out of Africa and Asia, and were threatening it in Europe. This might have justified the Christian nations in joining together to keep the Saracens out of Europe; but, as a matter of fact, they did not join together for that object; their aim was simply to wrest Palestine—and with it Jerusalem and the Sepulchre of Christ—from the hands of the "unbelievers," who had been peaceably settled there for four hundred and sixty years!

Fuller, although a doctor of divinity, was so little of a bigot that he not only slurred over the popular Christian belief so openly adopted by Bacon, but often put in a good word for the Mohammedans. The following admission, touching the state of the Christians in Palestine, is quite remarkable:—

"Now the condition of the Christians under these Saracens was as uncertain as April weather. Sometimes they enjoyed the liberty and public exercise of their religion; and, to give the Mahometans their due, they are generally good fellows on this point, and Christians amongst them may keep their consciences free, if their tongues be fettered not to oppose the doctrine of Mahomet."

We do not believe that such an honest sentence concerning Mohammedanism can be found in the pages of any contemporary writer. Fuller probably felt in his heart that Christianity was the more intolerant religion of the two.

Historically, it is quite true that the Mohammedans have always allowed Christians to live amongst them in peace—at least to a far greater extent than Christians have tolerated Mohammedans. Mohammed himself never oppressed the Christians who would live at peace with him. Gibbon justly observes that he "readily granted the security of their persons, the freedom of their trade, the property of their goods, and the toleration of their worship." Christian churches were permitted in Mohammedan states, although no Christian state would have tolerated a Mohammedan mosque. The Mohammedan conquerors of India showed religious toleration to the inhabitants; and the first empire in modern times in which perfect religious freedom was universal was that of Akbar, whose magnanimity has

been sung by Tennyson. The Arabian caliphs gave freedom to all the oriental sects, employed Christians as secretaries and physicians, appointed them collectors of the revenue, and sometimes raised them to the command of cities and provinces. Saladin, on recapturing Jerusalem from the Crusaders, treated the Latin Christians as foreigners, and therefore as captives of war; but he regarded the Greek and Oriental Christians as inhabitants of the locality, and therefore permitted them to remain as his subjects, and to worship their gods in their own fashion. Nor has this tolerant tradition ever been violated. Many a fugitive from Christian bigotry has found shelter in Turkey. Jews and Christians enjoy equal liberty of conscience throughout the Turkish empire. Latin and Greek Christians are both allowed to worship in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem. Yet their hatred of each other is still so great that a line of Turkish soldiers stand between them to prevent their flying at each other's throats. What a spectacle! And how the Turk, who worships one God, without a rival or a partner, must look down with contempt on these quarrelsome superstitionists!

V.

With regard to the Turks, in particular, it is a common Christian notion that they were always brutal conquerors, who upheld and extended their religion simply by the sword. This is a very mistaken notion. When the Turkish power was flourishing, before it began to decay under the attacks and diplomacy of Russia, and the general pressure of the European governments, it was renowned for its liberality.

Let us pause here to tell a story—a true one. During the bitter persecution of the inoffensive Quakers in England in the seventeenth century, many women were stripped and flogged on their naked backs in public places. This suffering and indignity was inflicted upon them by their fellow Christians; not tumultuously, but deliberately, in the name of the law, and by the order of the authorities. One simple young woman was flogged from town to town, and frequently imprisoned under shocking conditions. Being an invincible enthusiast, she took it into her head to go off to the East and speak to the Sultan of Turkey. She succeeded in making her way there, and found the Sultan encamped before Adrianople. She was brought before him, and he listened courteously to her "message from God." When she had finished he told her that what she had said was very good, and thanked her for her trouble, although he could not quite believe all that she did. He then asked her how she came so far alone. She replied that she trusted in God. Whereupon he smiled, and said he hardly thought this protection enough for a lonely maid. He saw that her wants were supplied, and appointed a guard to conduct her safely through his own dominions.

What a fine gentleman! If men must have kings, this is the sort they should have. And just think of the two different experiences of that Quaker maiden. Brutally ill-treated in her own country by her fellow-Christians, and treated with the noblest courtesy by a Mohammedan ruler in a foreign land!

The spirit displayed by that Sultan was far from singular in the great days of the Turkish empire. There was, indeed, a tradition of magnanimity in the

Mohammedan world. It was remembered how finely the Caliph Omar had acted after his capture of Jerusalem; how the lives, liberties, possessions, and churches of the Christians were respected. It was remembered how the Crusaders, hundreds of years afterwards, recaptured Jerusalem, and turned it into a slaughter-house. It was remembered how, in spite of this terrible provocation, Saladin listened to the voice of humanity when he won Jerusalem back from the Christians; how he shed no unnecessary drop of blood, and showed the tenderest compassion to his captives. Never had the great Mohammedan rulers dealt with the Christians after the method so often employed in Europe. They could have swept Christianity out of their dominions as easily as Ferdinand and Isabella drove Islam out of Spain, or as Louis XIV. drove Protestantism out of France. But they did nothing of the kind. If they had, there would have been no Christian Churches, or Christian provinces, left to give rise to the present-day troubles in the Turkish empire.

When the Turks took Constantinople, in 1453, the first thing Mohammed II. did, after re-establishing order in the city, was to issue a decree of toleration to the Christians, who were practically allowed to regulate their own affairs. Indeed, the majority of them found the change a welcome relief, after their experience of Christian misrule.

Mohammedanism spread in South-east Europe subsequently without compulsion. The fact is that freedom and toleration were only to be found under the Sultan's government. Jews fled to it from persecution; persecuted Protestants looked towards it with longing eyes. Even the Russians praised it when the Catholic Poles, in the seventeenth century, inflicted frightful atrocities on the members of the orthodox Eastern Church. It was in reference to these horrors that Macarius, the Patriarch of Antioch, exclaimed "God perpetuate the empire of the Turks for ever! For they," he added, "take their impost, and enter into no account of religion, be their subjects Christians or Nazarenes, Jews or Samaritans."

It may be objected that the Turks carved out an empire with the sword, and that this is tantamount to the spread of Mohammedanism by the same means. But is not this objection nonsensical? With what, pray, did the British carve out an empire in India? And is that empire, won as it was, a proof that Christianity is spread by the sword?

VI.

Now if Mohammedanism has, as a matter of fact, been far more tolerant than Christianity, there must be something wrong somewhere when Christians stand up and address Mohammedans as persecutors, represent them as being under a fatal necessity of propagating their religion by the sword, and accuse them of being a perpetual menace to all their neighbors.

Mohammed distinctly says in the Koran, "Let there be no compulsion in religion." "Wilt thou," he asks, "compel men to become believers? No soul can believe but by the permission of God." The Prophet of Islam never said anything really contrary to this. All the texts that are cited about war with unbelievers were, as we shall see presently, of local and special application.

That the Mussulman faith never forced consciences was emphasised by one of the Spanish Mohammedans who was driven out of Spain in the last expulsion of the Moriscoes in 1610, at the instigation of the bloody Inquisition. Here are some of his words:—

"Did our victorious ancestors ever once attempt to extirpate Christianity out of Spain, when it was in their power? Did they not suffer your forefathers to enjoy the free use of their rites at the same time that they wore their chains? Is not the absolute injunction of our Prophet, that whatever nation is conquered by Mussulman steel, should, upon payment of a moderate annual tribute, be permitted to persevere in their own pristine persuasion, how absurd soever, or to embrace what other belief they themselves best approved of? If there may have been some examples of forced con-

versions, they are so rare as scarce to deserve mentioning, and only attempted by men who had not the fear of God, and the Prophet, before their eyes, and who, in so doing, have acted directly and diametrically contrary to the holy precepts and ordinances of Islam, which cannot, without sacrilege, be violated by any who would be held worthy of the honorable epithet of Mussulman..... You can never produce, among us, any bloodthirsty, formal tribunal, on account of different persuasions in points of faith, that anywise approaches your execrable Inquisition. Our arms, it is true, are ever open to receive all who are disposed to embrace our religion; but we are not allowed by our sacred Kuran to tyrannise over consciences."

This very toleration was urged against them as one of their principal crimes by the Archbishop of Valencia, who presented Philip III., in 1602, with an account of the "Apostacies and Treasons of the Moriscoes," with a view to their expulsion from the Christian soil of Spain. One article against them was: "That they commended nothing so much as liberty of conscience, in all matters of religion, which the Turks, and all other Mohammedans, suffer their subjects to enjoy."

In spite of all this, it is urged that the Jihad, or Holy War, is taught in the Koran, and is a part of the law and faith of Islam.

Professor Arnold, who devotes a chapter to this subject, shows conclusively that the meaning of the verb *jahada* is really to "strive, labor, toil, exert oneself, take pains, be diligent." "Primarily," he says, "the word bears no reference to war or fighting, much less to fighting against unbelievers or forcible conversion of them, but derives its particular application from the context only." This he proves by citing all the passages in the Koran in which the word occurs.

There is no higher English authority than Lane, and his verdict is clear and decisive. "No precept," he says, "is to be found in the Kur'an which, taken with the context, can justify unprovoked war."

Professor Arnold shows that the verses so often quoted from the ninth chapter of the Koran had reference only to the Meccans, who had violated a truce and compelled Mohammed to fight by attacking his allies. To accept them as of universal application is like accepting the Old Testament order to exterminate the Canaanites as implying a similar duty on the part of modern Christians.

We may observe, in passing, that it has been maintained that all the wars of Mohammed were defensive. He also appears to have warned his followers against beginning a war. "The holy war," as Dozy says, "is only imposed as a duty in the single case of the enemies of Islam being the aggressors; if the prescriptions of the Koran are taken otherwise, it is by an arbitrary interpretation on the part of theologians."

Professor Arnold's summary of the whole matter is as follows:—

"It is due to the Muhammadan legists and commentators that jihad came to be interpreted as a religious war against unbelievers, who might be attacked even though they were not the aggressors; but such a doctrine is wholly unauthorised by the Qur'an, and can only be extracted therefrom by quoting isolated portions of different verses, considered apart from the context and the special circumstances under which they were delivered and to which alone they were held to refer, being in no way intended as positive injunctions for future observance or religious precepts for coming generations. But though some Muhammadan legists have maintained the rightfulness of unprovoked war against unbelievers, none (as far as I am aware) have ventured to justify compulsory conversion, but have always vindicated for the conquered the right of retaining their own faith on payment of *jizyah*."

The only points to be added is that "some legists" are not all legists. As far as we can ascertain, the majority of Mohammedan legists have been against unprovoked war on unbelievers. There were always some of these gentlemen ready to second the policy of ambitious conquerors. But whenever has Christendom been short of the same fraternity?

VII.

When all is said and done, the fact remains that all the great Holy Wars in history have been fought

by Christians. If the tree is to be judged by its fruit—or, to use a more homely image, if the proof of the pudding is in the eating—it follows that Christianity is the supremely intolerant religion. It was a holy war when Charlemagne offered the Northern Pagans baptism or death. It was a holy war when the Papal sword was sharpened against the Albigenses. It was a holy war when Alva butchered and burnt in the Netherlands. It was a holy war when the Great Armada sailed for England. It was a holy war when the heretics were destroyed by myriads in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. It was a holy war when Louis XIV. dragoonaded the Huguenots and swept the survivors out of France. It was a holy war when Germany was devastated and depopulated for thirty long years. It was a holy war when the Moriscoes and the Jews were driven, in the midst of unspeakable barbarities, out of Spain. It was a holy war when the Spanish conquerors of America, with the Pope's blessing, carried fire and slaughter amongst the mild and hospitable Indians. It was a holy war when the Protestants and Catholics, from England to Poland, fought each other all over the continent of Europe. It was a holy war when the Catholics burnt the Protestants, and the Protestants burnt the Catholics, for a mere difference of opinion. And it has been a holy war every time the Christians have let themselves loose, with massacre and violation, upon the poor inoffensive Jews.

But the greatest of *all* holy wars was the Holy War—the Crusades—whose history was written by Fuller before it was written by Gibbon, Michaud, and Mills. It lasted a hundred and ninety-four years, and was, as Fuller said, “for continuance the longest, for bloodshed the cruellest, for pretences the most pious the world ever saw.” Christianity hurled itself against Mohammedanism in nine successive crusades, with the professed object of wresting the Holy Land from the hands of the “infidels.” It was captured and held for a while; and then lost again for ever. The bogus sepulchre of Christ—for it is no more—was still left in the custody of unbelievers. And in less than two centuries afterwards the Turkish crescent floated over the first Christian cathedral in Europe, in the first Christian city ever built—the city of Constantine. It floats there now, after the lapse of four hundred and fifty years. Perhaps it is destined to disappear. Christian divisions allowed it to come, and Christian divisions allow it to continue. But there is no need to vilify a people who had their great day of empire when our forefathers were little else than barbarians; and still less need, if possible, to fling bigoted libels at the faith they profess. If a proud nation must go down to its grave, those who are digging the pit for it need not prepare to heap over it a mountain of lies.

G. W. FOOTE.

Professor Thomson on Science and Religion.—II.

(Continued from p. 758.)

IN dealing with religion Professor Thomson uses quite a number of confusing antithetical terms. He speaks, for example, of the *aim* of science and the *attitude* of religion, of the *scientific formula* and the *religious idea*. These are what may well be called tendency differentiations. They merely illustrate the desire of the writer to find a region for religion where it shall be secure from scientific criticism, and are consequently without the smallest critical value. Those who approach the subject without such a disturbing bias cannot fail to see that there is a scientific attitude as well as a scientific aim, a governing idea as well as a resultant scientific formula. And, on the other hand, there is both a religious aim and a religious formula. One might put to Professor Thomson the pertinent query, What use would an aim be without an attitude, or an idea without a formula?

For instance, it is the aim of science to explain natural processes. But this involves an attitude of mind in relation to these processes. One must assume the attitude of a careful, critical investigator if one's researches are to bear fruit. The formula also must be preceded and governed by the idea. We must believe that natural processes are explainable, and explainable in terms of known forces. This is the governing idea in all scientific investigation. The formula is merely the expression of its realisation. And, on the other hand, the religious attitude, that we are in the presence of “an independent spiritual reality,” must include the aim of discovering its relation to man, and this clearly involves the creation of a formula as expressive of that relation. Five minutes' serious consideration might well have saved Professor Thomson from drawing up such fantastical differences as those pointed out.

In the Middle Ages, when scientific thought was beginning to throw off the shackles of the Church, the ingenious and convenient discovery was made that there were two kinds of truth. A statement might be true according to philosophy, but false according to religion; or it might be true in religion, but false in philosophy. The arrangement helped to save the face of the Church and to give philosophers and scientists a little more latitude. This typically mediæval discovery appears to be the real parent of the modern notion that religion deals with one branch of human experience and science with an altogether distinct department. This, at any rate, is the popular division nowadays. It is the one adopted by Professor Thomson, and it is hopelessly false. Accepting the Professor's description of religion as the belief in an independent spiritual reality, there is nothing in this that puts it beyond the region of science. If mind—apart from man—is a force in the universe, there is nothing that precludes it becoming an object of scientific investigation. We can and do investigate and measure the extent of the influence of the human mind on affairs; and if the universe is controlled by a greater mind than that of man's, its control must be manifested somewhere, and, therefore, the nature and condition of that control becomes a legitimate subject for investigation. To say that it cannot be studied by scientific methods is really to say that there are no marks by which one can detect the presence of such an “independent spiritual reality.” Ultimately the Theist tries to save his Deity by subscribing to Atheism.

The distinction between religion and science is one that arises gradually in the course of human history. There is no distinction between them in the earlier stages of culture; nor does religion recognise itself as being in the presence of an independent spiritual reality. The unseen powers with which primitive man feels himself encompassed are not thought of as independent, or even as “spiritual,” in the modern sense of the word. They are merely parts of the general body of forces, friendly and unfriendly, with which man feels himself in contact. For all practical purposes religion is part and parcel of early man's science. The division of the single department of knowledge into two—religion and science—arises with a more accurate knowledge of the quality of natural forces. Positive knowledge claims certain discoveries as its own, and religion is “warned off.” The delimitation of the religious territory thus results, not from a positive recognition of the proper sphere of religion, but from the unwilling perception of the truth that it is no longer able to rule over its ancient territory. This is the plain historic aspect of the matter, and the surrender of the whole known universe to science, in our own time, is a tacit recognition of the fact that whenever and wherever religion comes into conflict with positive knowledge it is hopelessly defeated.

There is an unconscious endorsement of this in such passages as the following: “It seems to be an historical fact that many a man has become religious when he has reached the limit of his practical endeavor, and was baffled.” “At the limit of his

emotional tension Man has often become a wor-shiper." "The solutions that Science offers have obvious limitations. They do not satisfy most men, who will persist in asking questions which Science never asks—questions about beginnings and ends, and meanings and values." Really, each of these statements is only a grandiloquent way of saying that religion begins where knowledge ends. Its region of control is that of ignorance and helplessness. Opponents of religious belief have never said more than this; their apparent fault has been that they expressed it plainly. Confirmed religionists understood what they meant. If they understood as well what apologists like Professor Thomson meant, they would be less grateful for their championship.

It may, of course, be true that some people are not satisfied with the limitations of scientific explanations. But one may well ask if the explanations offered by science are not satisfactory, what other explanations are? Does Professor Thomson mean that the test of actual or probable truth is to be whether certain people find the teaching agreeable or not? And if he does not mean this, what does he mean? He would probably reply that people ask questions that science cannot answer, and so turn to religion to gain satisfaction. In that case he is putting in a plea for what a scientific teacher should be the last person in the world to champion—a neglect of mental discipline. For there are two classes of questions that science cannot answer. One class it cannot answer because there is not at present enough knowledge available. And in such cases science says, quite plainly and frankly, "I do not know. I tell you all I can on the subject, but for more you must wait until such time as our knowledge is more precise." But this attitude of science does not imply that, having reached a limit to its power of explaining—for a time—there is some other authority to which it can hand over the matter. There is no such other legitimate authority. The limitations of science are the limitations of the human mind. And a scientific writer should be well aware of this. The call here is for mental discipline; the discipline that enables one to frankly recognise when he has reached the limit of his knowledge and power of legitimate speculation, to quietly and fearlessly confess ignorance where ignorance is inevitable, and to strive for more knowledge by the only means by which it can safely be attained.

The second class of questions science cannot answer, for the simple reason that they ought never to be asked. This, too, is an aspect of mental discipline that Professor Thomson would have been well advised in pressing. Certainly there is greater need for this than there is for manufacturing fantastic notions of scientific generalisations. It is easy enough to ask "questions about beginnings and ends, about meanings and values." But it is really part of the discipline enforced by a scientific culture to realise that often these are not really intelligible questions at all. In the scientific, and only intelligible sense of beginnings and ends, meanings and values, science is always answering questions. The beginning and end of a *thing*—the earth, a sun, a planet, an animal, man—is conceivable, and a question concerning them intelligible. This sort of information science is constantly dispensing. But a beginning and end to *existence* is not conceivable, and any question concerning that fails, of necessity, to be intelligible. It is, of course, hard for an undisciplined mind to recognise and appreciate its own limitations, but the necessity for our doing so is great, and Professor Thomson would have been better advised to have emphasised this, instead of stressing the limitations of scientific knowledge in order to find room for religious speculation.

At any rate—and this is the point that is so often and so conveniently overlooked—where science, in the form of actually acquired knowledge, or in that of legitimate speculation, is compelled to cry "Halt!" religion is incapable of making any advance. Many people write and speak as though religion had some

avenue of information that was closed to the scientific investigator. It is natural for a parson to talk in this strain. As Heine said of God forgiving sins, that's his trade. And while people believed in miraculous revelation, it was natural for laymen to believe this to be possible. But does Professor Thomson believe that religion has this power of acquiring information? Let the fact be borne clearly in mind that where the methods and instruments of science break down nothing faces us but ignorance. The bankruptcy of science is the bankruptcy of the human intelligence—whether that intelligence be in the pulpit or elsewhere. We may still guess, and our guesses will be helpful in proportion as they are based upon our knowledge. We may speculate, and our speculations will be fruitful as we carry what we know into the regions where we know nothing. But science must still be our guide in both our guesses and speculations. There is nothing else to which we can go for guidance; and it is really time that scientific teachers gave up encouraging professional religionists to assume a superior knowledge they are far from possessing. The picture of our religious leaders—the reader will easily find his own subjects for illustration—claiming to possess information where science confesses itself at fault would be only laughable could we exclude from our minds the knowledge that this claim has left its disastrous impress on some of the saddest pages of human history.

(To be concluded.)

C. COHEN.

Secularism at Work.

A CHARGE frequently preferred against Secularism is that it is essentially pessimistic in its treatment of man; but every Secularist knows how utterly false such a charge is. It is based upon the fact that Secularism admits that some people are organically so diseased and depraved as to be incapable of recovery. In theory Christianity ignores this fact, and preaches a Savior who is both able and willing to redeem the very worst characters; but in practice its theory completely breaks down. There are drunkards and criminals whom it is powerless to reclaim. Secularism, on the contrary, recognises in theory what it cannot deny in practice; and because it consistently does this Christian apologists pronounce it pessimistic. If pessimism means facing the facts, blessed be pessimism. It is infinitely better to be pessimistic at the bidding of truth than optimistic on the back of a lie. We must bear in mind, however, that the facts of life as interpreted by Secularism do not lead to pessimism. While undoubtedly there are many irreclaimably bad characters, yet the overwhelming majority of mankind are either by nature good and noble, or amenable to redemptive processes. Unfit members of the race do undeniably exist, and there are no means available of producing within them the requisite fitness. The only problem is how best to get rid of them. It is certain that they ought not to be allowed to perpetuate the unfitness by begetting children. It is to be hoped that the Eugenists will succeed in finding a way out of the difficulty.

Generally speaking, Secularists entertain hopeful views as to the future of humanity. Superstition is slowly receding before the advancing light of truth; and they are convinced that the truth shall make us strong and free. The truth about ourselves and our relationships is gradually leaking out, while the Fables of the Above are beginning to be seen in their true light. Some of us are too apt to imagine that theology is already dead, and that to attack it now is a wicked waste of time and energy. Why do you persist in flogging a dead horse? it is asked. But the horse is not dead, and there are hundreds of thousands of attendants whose business it is to prolong its life. In spite of all their vigilance, however,

it is in the process of expiring, and our duty is to keep on flogging it until the last spark of life has left it. The curious thing about theology is that it is dying in successive bits. Some portions of it have been dead and buried for a considerable period, and are not likely ever to experience a resurrection. Take the sense of sin as an example. The doctrine of sin is still preached almost as much as ever; but it is being preached to a mixture of deaf ears and empty pews: and the over-emphasis laid upon it by many is a sign that the sense of sin has gone.

This is a most significant change; and one of its most important results is the rarity of conversion. Forty years ago conversion was the most dreadful experience conceivable, and everybody who wished to be a Christian had to undergo it. The first stage in it was conviction. Here is a boy fourteen years of age. He has been taught from earliest childhood to believe that he is a lost sinner, lying under the wrath of God; but at fourteen he gets convicted of sin in a downright fashion. God hates him, and he sees the Bottomless Pit yawning beneath him, ready to swallow him up for ever. Inexpressible terrors make him afraid on every side. He can neither eat nor sleep, and existence itself is an intolerable burden to him. This abnormal state of mind lasts for several months; but at the close of it he makes a complete surrender of himself to Jesus Christ, and at once joy unspeakable streams into his heart. Christ has delivered him from the wrath of God, who, for Christ's sake, freely forgives all his sins and makes him an heir to everlasting bliss. That is a chapter from the life of a real boy forty years ago; and there was nothing uncommon about his case. In some instances, indeed, the conviction lasted much longer, and the misery endured was much greater; but there was no other entrance for anybody into what was called the Christian life of peace with God. But how many to-day pass through such a horrible experience as that? Is it not the constant complaint of the Churches that conversions are so few, and are not the few which do take place extremely mild affairs as compared with the one just described? Even conversion has been largely secularised and rationalised by the silent but persuasive influence of Freethought. Yea, within the Churches themselves Secularism is seen doing its splendid work.

As a religious experience conversion is an abnormality, a symptom of mental disease. A boy of fourteen who has always lived in happy subjection to his parents is not a lost sinner, and no God's wrath can be resting upon him. But we are told of drunkards and criminals who as the result of yielding themselves up to Christ instantly become sober and honest. Mr. John Masefield has just published a poem, entitled *The Everlasting Mercy*, in which he tells the story of such a conversion. Saul Kane was a notorious drunkard, and as the Christian custom is, the poet represents him as recounting the history of his unregenerate days himself. Before his conversion he was everything that was bad, "a drunken fighter, lewd and profane, the boon companion of the dissolute and criminal, the despair of his village, and a constant concern of the policeman." We have heard the same tale times without number in the parks and on street corners. We are not surprised to learn that poor Saul went from bad to worse until he reached a climax—"a drunken fight, a hideous debauch, and a frenzy of maddened defiance of heaven and earth." Then the miracle was performed, and he became a new creature in Christ Jesus. It was an instantaneous conversion. But, unfortunately for the case for everlasting mercy, the poet goes into details. He informs us that Saul began to reflect, and that with reflection came disillusion and dissatisfaction. "Then follows the appeal of a little child, crying in the street, to the better nature of the drunken man, succeeded by the bitter, yet, as Saul Kane confesses, the just reproaches of the mother when she finds her little one in such disreputable keeping." Such incidents made a profound impression upon him, and prepared him for the sympathetic ministrations of a fine and

tender woman who loved him. That is the true psychology of Saul's wonderful transformation of character: it was a purely human event brought about by merely human means. God's share in the business was entirely imaginary, as his very existence is. It stands to reason that had God existed, nobody would ever have gone astray, and there would have been no Christian religion in the world. What Secularism teaches is that conversion, as religiously interpreted, is a delusion and a snare; and that even when a genuine reformation actually takes place it can be satisfactorily explained without any reference to supernatural agencies.

There is as great need for emphasising this truth to-day as there ever was. It is perfectly amazing what absurd statements divines still make on the subject. A book has just appeared, under the title of *The Psychology of the Christian Soul*, in which the author declares that a craving, say the craving for alcohol, is mental, and can be rooted out in the twinkling of an eye. Such an assertion is devoid of a single particle of truth, is, indeed, a positive falsehood; and it is equally a lie to say that "simple acceptance of the love and help of God produces instant and final deliverance for women who are victims of alcohol." Even an orthodox believer like Sir William Robertson Nicoll calls that statement in question. But as long as such foolish and lying claims are being made both from the pulpit and in the press, Secularism has plenty of work to do. That bad people can become good by means of exclusively human agencies is an amply attested fact; and it is equally undeniable that no transformation of character has ever taken place apart from such agencies. To prove that such a change is due to supernatural intervention you must produce a case in which it has come to pass without the slightest human collaboration. Such a case is not on record, and in its absence it is safe to affirm that whenever people turn from vice to virtue, or from bad to good courses, they do so in obedience to the voice of reason as uttered within themselves, or because they are encouraged and strengthened by the sympathy and love so lavishly thrown around them by benevolent relations and friends. What is needed is an intelligently instructed reason to supply healthy training for the emotions, and this we shall not secure, on any large scale, until our system of education has been completely reconstructed on strictly secular lines. Morality is an affair of this world alone; and, until we have made this discovery, we shall not be able to make any substantial progress in it. There can be no high morality without good physical health. All anti-social tendencies and activities are the outcome of disease. People are good and do good in the exact proportion in which they are healthy. You remember the old Latin proverb, *mens sana in corpore sano*, a saying which science is now proving to the very hilt. But we cannot obtain perfect health without understanding and observing its laws. A man with a sound brain would never commit a crime, or do anything to injure his fellow-beings.

This is why we should concentrate our attention on education, especially the education of the young.

J. T. LLOYD.

It is a foolish thing to be miserable beforehand, for fear of misery to come; for a man loses the present which he might enjoy in expectation of the future.—*Seneca*.

Obituary.

For the first time in its history, the beautiful little cemetery of Portishead, Somerset, was the scene of a Secular funeral, the occasion being brought about by the death on November 16 of Roland Olaf Cattell, the infant son of Mr. H. J. Cattell, a staunch local Freethinker. Colonel Ingersoll's beautiful address, "At a Child's Grave," was read at the graveside by Mr. B. G. Brown, of Bristol.

Acid Drops.

There is a society called "The Heretics" at Cambridge University. Every now and then they get a more or less distinguished person to address them. Some time ago they had that famous entertainer, Mr. G. Bernard Shaw. Subsequently they had that almost as famous entertainer, Mr. G. K. Chesterton. "G. K. C." was there to deny and oppose everything that "G. B. S." had said. The latter told them of a God "merely evolving with the universe," and thought "that would satisfy the desires of humanity"; the former replied that "if there were such a half-imprisoned purpose in the universe he could not worship it because he would consider his own opinions just as good." Thus do the theologians differ—the amateurs as well as the professionals. It is all guesswork, and agreement is an impossibility.

It must be admitted that Mr. Chesterton made great fun of Mr. Shaw's growing God. Mr. Shaw believed in a purpose in the universe, hence he must have some sort of a deity; but as he couldn't exactly find one he asked his fellow-men to co-operate with him in making one. This reminded Mr. Chesterton of "five poor motherless children coming together and manufacturing a mother for themselves." Which was not only funny but a bit—a palpable hit.

There was wit in Mr. Chesterton's criticism of Nietzsche, who said that the Christian God died about the middle of the eighteenth century. "That was perfectly true," Mr. Chesterton replied, "only the Christian God was used to dying and rising from the dead." It was a capital joke. But half the joke lies in the dexterous evasion of the issue.

Mr. Chesterton's chatter about God is of no more real value than Mr. Shaw's. It is what he happens to say by the way that is interesting. For instance, he resented the idea of calling Mr. Shaw "blasphemous." We were not agreed about religion as we were agreed about wearing clothes. "We had got into a world," Mr. Chesterton said, "in which the majority of the governing classes believed in no religion. He had known many editors and newspaper proprietors, but he had yet to meet one who believed in religion. The overwhelming mass of the governing body of the State was un-Christian." We believe this is true, and we thank Mr. Chesterton for saying it. But the members of the governing body are not so much un-Christian as unanything. They are not Freethinkers, but selfish opportunists. They believe in nothing but themselves. As long as the profession of Christianity pays they will be professed Christians. If the profession of Atheism paid they would be professed Atheists.

What curious things some people write! From an article in the *Times*, for instance, we take the following, apropos of early Christian art:—

"We are beginning to see that in early Christian mosaics and paintings there is a mysterious life and power lacking in the later classical art. The great mosaic of Christ in Ss. Cosmas and Damian in Rome may seem to us less like a man than the Apollo Belvidere, but it is much more like a god, and when once we have experienced the great emotion it has the power to communicate," etc., etc.

Now we should really like to know how anyone can tell that a painting or a mosaic is "more like a god." Our own acquaintance with gods is so scanty that we cannot say whether any particular representation is a faithful likeness or not. By the context it would seem that a picture is more like a god as it is less like a man. In that case we would suggest that a cow would serve much better than the badly drawn effigies of early Christian art of which Shelley well said, "It seems to have been one of the first effects of the Christian religion to destroy the power of producing beauty in art." We were always under the impression that the early Christian artists strove to depict men, but men of a particular type—a type that would properly have failed to command Pagan taste.

If it is the function of art to represent feeling, then it may be that the truth of Christian art is as great as that of Pagan art—ancient and modern. But in that case it can hardly be questioned that the old Pagan art represented a higher and rarer feeling than that expressed in Christian portraiture and sculpture. No one who is not a monk, or whose taste has not been vitiated by Christian teaching, would prefer the portraiture of the ascetic Christian saint to that of the Apollo Belvidere. In the one we have expressed strength, gracefulness, and mental sanity. In the other, human weakness, misery, and a perfect dread of the better aspects of life. One could not really wish for a better

example of how much the world lost in the transition from Paganism to Christianity than by a comparison of the art of the two periods. Moreover, art has only become again great and fruitful as it has returned to the Pagan ideal—plastic, pictorial, and literary. Whether one finds "mysterious life and power" in Christian art, or whether one's emotions are roused by the contemplation of the effigy of a Christian saint, is entirely a matter of a personal idiosyncrasy or of education. We have never had our emotions excited by these means—unless it has been a feeling of despair at such an ideal ever gaining control of the human mind.

The distinction between Christianity and other religions, says Mr. Collier, of the Manchester Mission, is that with other religions man seeks God, with Christianity God seeks man. Success seems equal in both cases.

The Portuguese Republic, which was to be overturned the other day by a Royalist invasion—started, of course, from Spain—still survives, and is stronger than ever. Spasmodic invasions on a small scale have been occurring ever since, but they have all fizzled out, and have now grown contemptible. The Spanish as well as the Portuguese priests are, apparently, up to the neck in this wanton conspiracy against the Republic which was established, and is still chieftained by Freethinkers. It seems to us that the Spanish government, and Alfonso personally, ought to be seriously warned against allowing these aggressions on the Portuguese Republic to be organised on Spanish territory. The thing has become a scandal. Perhaps an announcement that all priests caught in these expeditions will be summarily shot would have a chastening effect on these soldiers of Christ.

Mr. Low Merritt, one of the old Western pioneers, being examined by the Congressional Committee appointed to inquire into the affairs of the Steel Trust, told a long and curious story of the financial trick by which the great and pious J. D. Rockefeller didded him out of his interests in the famous Mesaba ore deposits, now valued at £140,000,000. But the point of the story, for our readers, lies in the following episode, which we quote from the *Daily Chronicle's* (Nov. 23) Washington correspondent:—

"He also said that the Reverend F. T. Gates, Mr. Rockefeller's own spiritual adviser, has frequently acted as a go-between during the negotiations, and was more than anyone instrumental in entangling him in the net, for he relied on the honesty of the clergyman."

"Put not your trust in princes," the Bible says. If it had also said, as it might have done with greater truth, "Put not your trust in clergymen," poor Mr. Low Merritt wouldn't have been "done" so easily.

The *Bo'ness Journal* printed in full the petition of the local sky-pilots against Sunday entertainments (alias cinematograph shows) in the Electric Theatre. We venture to reproduce it in full:—

"To the Councillors of the Burgh of Borrowstounness. The memorial of the undersigned, ministers and representatives of the various religious bodies in the town, hereby sheweth:—That the Sabbath day has been ordained by the law of God to be observed as a day of holy resting, and that obedience to this law has been found for many generations to be of universal benefit. That every Sabbath evening there is given in the Electric Theatre, owned and controlled by Mr. John Jeffrey, a cinematograph entertainment of a distinctly secular character (although advertised in the *Linlithgowshire Gazette* as sacred) and that definite charges are made for admission. That such entertainments are detrimental not only to those who attend them, but to the community at large, by attracting into the town a number of people not altogether desirable, by affecting the vicinity at the times of collecting and dispersing, and in many unseen ways. That even should sacred programs be submitted your petitioners declare that in the circumstances they would not be conducive to the religious edification of the people, and moreover that at present such entertainments are not called for. That it is the desire of your petitioners, as of a large number of citizens, that you request Mr. Jeffrey to discontinue these Sabbath evening entertainments, and should he fail to do so, that, when occasion presents itself, you restrict his licence to six days. And your petitioners will ever pray."

Splendid! We can only suggest one improvement. If the last word were spelt "prey" the petition would be perfect.

Mary Thomas, one of the "Pentecostal Dancers," was charged at the Porth Police-court with cruelly ill-treating her son, a weak-minded lad of fifteen. According to a neighbor the child screamed on the night of October 20, and she found him naked in the rain and covered with weals and bruises. An inspector of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children stated that the defendant said to him:

"You are not saved. I will put the curse of God on you and you will not live until morning." This pious and amiable mother was fined £5, or a month's imprisonment.

The Bishop of Oxford says women have done nine-tenths of the work of the Church. This may be true enough. And in return they have received about one-tenth of the consideration accorded to men, and not any of the emoluments.

Canon Henson, at the same meeting, said that the principle of Christianity was the equality of the sexes. Canon Henson must know better. The principle of Christianity is that man is the head of the woman as Christ is the head of the man. She is to be obedient; to learn in silence, with all subjection. It is getting dangerously near positive mendacity for a leader of the Church, in view of the whole history of Christianity, and with the fact that Church law has forced upon civil law the principle of the legal inferiority of women, to venture on such a statement.

Mr. Ian Malcolm, M.P., says he has observed that the people who object to Foreign Missions until all are converted at home are those who never subscribe to missions at all. Naturally their non-subscription is the logical consequence of their objection. And Mr. Malcolm does not remove the objection by pointing to their refusal to contribute. If the Churches had converted all at home there might be a *prima facie* case for their seeking fresh fields of conquest abroad. But with their losing ground here, one naturally asks, Why go abroad? The unconverted are not hungry for the presence of missionaries. They are the cause of endless friction when they go abroad. It has yet to be shown that Christianity, as such, has ever benefited a people. Lastly, the teachings proclaimed to the "heathen" are usually those that are completely discredited at home. Why, then, spend over two millions annually on Foreign Missions? Sheer fanaticism, partly, no doubt. But a not unimportant influence is that of the many snug posts for those who engineer the various societies.

Christian orators excel most in the art of self-contradiction. For example, whenever they defend their religion they describe it as all-triumphant. The Materialism which made such a noise in the middle of the nineteenth century is now quite dead, and even science itself has turned religious. Christ permeates all the best thought of to-day. But when explaining and enforcing the duties of the Church, they enlarge upon the spiritual deadness and materialistic tendencies of the age. Sir Matthew Dodsworth, speaking at the annual meeting of the Burton-on-Trent Y.M.C.A., said that this institution was needed to resist the drift of to-day—"that drift of Materialism whereby men believed in being wise without Christ." Consistency, thou art a jewel!

Swadlincote has been a Christian town for many generations. Its churches and Christian workers are numerous, and there is a branch of the Free Church Council there in perfect working order; but Dr. Roberts, speaking at the anniversary meeting of the P.S.A., held in the Wesleyan Church, made a most humiliating confession. As reported in the *Burton Daily Mail*, he said:—

"A problem had been before the Free Church Council for the last twelve months, with which they did not know how to deal. The condition of the Swadlincote High-street on a Sunday night—the language and the demeanor of some of those who used the thoroughfare—would be a disgrace to a Pagan country. He had noticed young people on leaving Divine Service go straight there, and go eagerly."

What other proof is needed of the absolute impotence of the Christian religion?

The Rev. Edgar Ball, a member of the Swadlincote Free Church Council, is a wonderfully high and mighty personage, at least in his own estimation. He will not take his orders from anybody of lower rank than Jesus Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords. He doesn't care a rap what people think or say about him. The *Burton Evening Gazette* represents him as saying that "somebody was telling him the other day what men in the public-houses were saying about the Churches. What had he to do with what these people were saying? He had received his commission from Jesus Christ, and would go only to him for his instruction." Would it not be the reverend gentleman's wiser policy to cultivate the grace of humility? Besides, it is reported of his Master that he was "the friend of publicans and sinners"; and were he a faithful follower of his Lord he would dismount from his high horse, and make an attempt to get into touch with the men in the public-houses, in order to make disciples of them. But the whole clerical profession is a farce, and men like Mr. Ball give the show away.

Rev. Dr. Wilkinson, laying the foundation stone of a village club at Bradford-on-Tone, near Taunton, delivered a partisan political discourse. He said himself, at the end, that "it might be out of place to express himself as he had done on such an occasion, but he felt bound to do so in the circumstances." Which might be a passable excuse for a boy but is a ridiculous excuse for a man. What the reverend gentleman "felt bound" to say was simply the most trivial party politics, with quite juvenile references to "Lloyd George's stamp-licking business." No wonder he went back to what is called the Red Terror, and announced that "it seemed to him that England was drifting upon the lines of the French Revolution." He informed the villagers, who must have grinned in their hats, that the Radical government was crushing out the landowners and the aristocracy. That is evidently the class to which the clerical orator himself belongs. Poor servant of the poor Carpenter! He has our sympathy. His is an awful martyrdom. Crucifixion is nothing to it.

Molabene, Chief of the Manthe, Taungs Reserve, was sued by two natives before the High Court at Kimberley for damages for wrongful confiscation of cattle and assault. The Chief ordered them to worship under a particular clergyman, as he did not want another sect in his Reserve. On their refusal he gave them forty lashes each with a heavy sjambok and confiscated five head of their cattle valued at £50. He also told them that if he saw or heard of their attending the wrong church again he would kill them. The Supreme Court held that it had no jurisdiction. Religious liberty, therefore, will continue to exist in the Taungs Reserve at Molabene's pleasure.

A remarkable exhibition of Christian unity, to quote the *Christian World*, took place the other day in the Dean's Chapel of Westminster. The Bishop of Durham and the Rev. F. B. Meyer took part in the laying-on of hands in the ceremony of dedicating the Rev. James Marchant as secretary of the National Council of Public Morals. This pious tomfoolery is, of course, a portion of the ritual of the Church to which the Bishop of Durham belongs. But what on earth do the Rev. F. B. Meyer and his associates imagine will result from his laying hands on the cranium of the secretary? So far as we can see, it is an indication of how ready any preacher is to play the old magic-working game when opportunity arises. And the "remarkable manifestation of Christian unity"? Remarkable that two Christian preachers should meet without a free fight, we presume. They can unite in the work of purifying public morals, we are informed. So far as the cruder forms of immorality are concerned, this may be true. But we have a strong suspicion that public morality is never in so great a danger of demoralisation as when these people take it under their special protection. The influence of the clergy on a really healthy moral sense has always been disastrous, and is likely to remain so.

Henry Beattie, the young New York banker who was electrocuted on November 24 for the brutal murder of his wife, and whose piety did not prevent his committing perjury in the witness-box, confessed at the last hour to a Presbyterian minister. He was so glad to be rid of her, as an interference with his pleasures, that even then "it was quite impossible for him to feign grief." However, he hoped to be forgiven, and felt fairly certain of a good seat in heaven. He walked into the execution chamber with a Bible in his hands. When the electric current was turned on his lips were moving as in prayer. He does not appear to have uttered a word of sympathy or sorrow in regard to the poor young mother of his child—the latter only two weeks old—whom he did to death with such callous brutality.

Lawrence Dillon, sentenced at Manchester to six months' imprisonment for criminal libel on Edwin Walker, who was an applicant for a post that the libeller wanted his own son to get, had two Bishops to help him with testimony to character. His Christianity seems to have been unimpeachable, but in spite of Bishop Knox and Bishop Welldon the judge held that the facts clearly showed that the prisoner was actuated entirely by self-interest.

The *Northern Whig* (Nov. 27) reports a sermon on "The Truth of Christianity" by Bishop D'Arcy. The preacher's chief piece of evidence was the case of a blind old woman whom he found bedridden in a little cabin; she was living on a few crusts and potatoes supplied by neighbors; yet she was the happiest person the Bishop had ever seen. That was all due to Christianity. *Argal*—well, the reader can add the rest for himself. But what a tribute this is to Christianity! After nearly two thousand years of it blind

old women lie bedridden and solitary in little cabins, fed on the crusts and potatoes of neighbors nearly as poor as herself! Such is Christian civilisation—and Bishop D'Arcy is proud of it.

The *Woking News* reports a speech by the Rev. Aldom French at the annual meeting of the local Free Church Council, in which he referred (amongst other things) to aggressive Atheism. He remembered Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant; he also knew that Mr. Foote was still alive, but they had forgotten him "until a brilliant Congregational minister challenged him recently to a debate." Such is Free Church history! The truth is that there was no "challenge" at all. Mr. Warschauer did not challenge Mr. Foote, and Mr. Foote did not challenge Mr. Warschauer. The debate was arranged by a friendly committee who approached both debaters. Mr. French made another slip. He referred to Mr. Horatio Bottomley as the present leader of aggressive Atheism. The truth is that Mr. Bottomley is not an Atheist. We should advise Mr. French to be more certain of his facts in his future speeches—if it were any good to tender such advice to a Free Church minister.

Mr. French was followed by a Mr. Dark, who congratulated the Free Church Council on having been "successful in securing the holding of Nonconformist services in Brookwood Asylum." A very appropriate place to hold them in.

We have said over and over again that it is taxing human simplicity and credulity too much to assume that all the clergy believe what they preach. Some may, but how many no one can tell. Now we ask our readers to peruse the following:—

"There are still thousands of our fellow ministers whose ecclesiastical position depends upon their acceptance and frequent repetition of creeds and liturgies containing much which is not in accord with their knowledge. The dual intellectual life they have to live is akin to hypocrisy, and must be highly detrimental to their own character and to the interests of truth. And the difficulty is felt also in the Free Churches, many of whose ministers, as I have reason to know, feel under the necessity of disguising their real opinions and appearing to accept current beliefs (*e.g.*, the virgin birth of Jesus) as based on real fact, while their intellect does not assent to them."

This is from an article, published some time ago, in a Christian journal, and written by the Rev. E. T. Rice, one of the appointed revisers of the British and Foreign Bible Society. For publishing this Mr. Rice has just been dismissed the Society's service. The secretary says, for entering into public controversy. For our part, we are inclined to think that Mr. Rice is suffering for letting the cat out of the bag. If clergymen are encouraged to go on speaking the truth of their own craft in this manner, who can tell where the matter will end?

Dean Inge has brought down a perfect avalanche of angry denunciation upon his very reverend head for his boldness in owning up that Christianity is a dismal failure; but he is right, and his revilers are wholly wrong. Nowhere is Christ supreme, not even in the Church that bears his name. Everywhere his precepts are trampled in the dust. All this is self-evident to impartial persons. But the generality of parsons cannot afford to acknowledge the truth, and so they systematically conceal it under the cloak of loyalty to Christ. The Dean of St. Paul's is to be congratulated upon his courage, and we venture to express the hope that ere long he will be strong enough to sever all connection with a discredited religion.

Even at Westminster Abbey the Rev. H. Mayne Young has been protesting against "worn-out dogmas" and "lifeless traditions." He declared that the Church of England would be left stranded on the shores of time unless she "remodelled her Creeds so as to meet the requirements of the age." Sagacious men within the Church see that the game is nearly played out, yet they ask for something like a miracle to give it a fresh start. They want to see Christianity go into the dry dock for repairs. It can't be done now. There are too many people looking on, and too many "ribald wits" about.

At the National Liberal Federation gathering at Bath one of the Welsh delegates, Mr. Ellis J. Griffith, K.C., M.P., referred to the Church of England as having "revelled in the bondage of ignorance and reviled the banners of the dawn." He also charged it with "having always been a parasite of the aristocracy." When we speak in this way of Christian Churches generally we are accused of vulgarity and scurrility—and persons like Mr. Griffith and those who applauded him are the first to press the accusation against us.

Rev. A. C. Dixon, the new preacher at Spurgeon's old Tabernacle—or rather the smaller building erected after the fire to succeed it on the same spot—is naturally opposed to amusements in general, and especially so when they trench on the clericals' business on the blessed Sabbath. Picture theatres seem to be his pet aversion. He doesn't like them on week-days, and he would shut them all up on Sundays. The gentlemen of Dr. Dixon's profession want that day all to themselves. "If you destroy the Sabbath," cries Dr. Dixon, "you have destroyed Christian civilisation." What he means is that you destroy *Christianity*. The word *civilisation* is dragged in to give the other word additional respectability and importance. Let the men of God look after Christianity. That will take them all their time. Other people will look after civilisation.

We have heard nothing further of the Leeds "blasphemy" case up to the time of our going to press (Tuesday evening). The Boulter case has been reported in the newspapers. Once more this bold heretic has proved that discretion is much the better part of his valor. He challenges all comers outside the prison gates; when he is inside he is soon tamed into submission. Just as he climbed down after the jury's verdict of guilty in his trial for "blasphemy," and apologised for his conduct and promised not to repeat it; just as he paid the full fine, raised from mistaken Freethinkers, sooner than go to prison when he was prosecuted by the London County Council; so he now slips out of prison by giving sureties for his good behavior. The sureties being reduced from £200 to £20, he was able to find two at that price. We suspected that this would happen. That is why we said beforehand, in our last week's special article, that this would be "a shameful, cowardly climax." We have no desire to hear of this Boabdil again. But before dismissing his case we may observe that there is an old English proverb about tailors. Mr. Boulter is rather fond of circulating his own photograph, and he might want a motto under it. We suggest—"Nine tailors make a man."

We should have expanded our criticism of the police and the police-court methods, which we entirely adhere to still but in view of Mr. Boulter's peculiar heroism, particularly in undertaking not to go near Streatham Common for twelve months, we have no heart for going further.

Credo.

I AM glad to have lived, for 'tis good to have known
What a wonderful thing human love is:
More precious than jewels, rare silk, or fine gold;
Its value compared, high above is.

I am glad to have suffered, for thus I have learned
How closely akin are man's sorrows;
How often a heart that's in anguish and pain,
From sympathy fortitude borrows.

I am glad to have joyed, for when happiness swells
The bosom with feelings of gladness,
We joy then our pleasure to seek to impart
Unto those whom harsh fortune gives sadness.

I am glad we must strive, for true strength will come so,
And will teach us to bear and endure:
The toil that is onward must oft times be slow;
No matter, so that it be sure.

I am glad of the truth, that when reason is free
From fetters of priestly traditions,
The problems of life will be dealt with by all,
Unblighted by vague superstitions.

I am glad we must learn, 'tis a duty we owe,
To give freely our best unto others;
That the time may draw nearer as years onward roll,
When mankind are true sisters and brothers.

I am glad I have lived, yet when Death comes at last,
From joys and from cares Life to sever;
May I go to my grave like a tired child to bed,
To sleep and to rest there—for ever.

W. J. KING.

The vicar of a parish not far from Maidstone was much struck by an unwonted increase in the number of couples who were married recently.

"There seems to have been a number of marriages this month, John," he said to his clerk when in the vestry. "Yes, sir," remarked John; "quite a heat wave, you might say."

Mr. Foote's Engagements.

Sunday, December 3, Stratford Town Hall: at 7.30, "The Crescent and the Cross."

December 10 and 17, Queen's Hall, London.

January 7, Shoreditch Town Hall; 9, London Freethinkers' Annual Dinner; 14, Shoreditch Town Hall; 21, Glasgow.

March 24, Leicester.

April 15, Glasgow.

To Correspondents.

C. COHEN'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—December 10, Manchester; 17, Liverpool.

J. T. LLOYD'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—December 10, Fulham Ethical Society; 31, Harringay.

PRESIDENT'S HONORARIUM FUND, 1911.—Previously acknowledged £323 6s. 8d. Received since:—W. J. P. and Miss P. (Liverpool), 3s. 6d. Per Secretary of South African Rationalist Association: J. Erasmus, 10s.; H. Brinckmann, 5s.; C. E. Franck, 5s. R. Walsh, £2.

D. K. R.—Yes, there are meetings held every Sunday by the Liverpool Branch of the National Secular Society at the Alexandra Hall, Islington-square.

W. G. (Manchester) sends us an interesting letter in which he says: "I was introduced to your wise and witty paper by finding it in a train. I became very interested in its contents in the course of a long railway journey. I now purchase it every week."

W. J. P. (Liverpool).—Not too late, though as you say late. We propose to lift the President's Fund out of our columns now until the new year. Glad you so much enjoyed our afternoon lecture at Liverpool.

E. MILLS writes: "Allow me to congratulate you on the great work you are doing. The *Freethinker* is indispensable."

J. M. MORLEY.—What you want will be found in a volume on *Determinism and Free Will*, written by Mr. Cohen, which the Secular Society, Ltd., is issuing at the price of one shilling through the Walter Scott publishing house. It is in the press and will be ready shortly. With regard to the Rev. Mr. Ballard, his style is not "virulent" but it is insufferably insolent, not in express words, but in attitude and tone. Christian Evidence advocates generally are insolent in controversy. The explanation is partly psychological and partly historical. But we cannot go into details at present.

H. DAWSON.—It was returned, and we hope you received it. Our letters must have crossed.

W. P. BALL.—Much obliged for cuttings.

R. STUBBS.—It seems to us the other way about—that the Labor and Socialist candidates are anxious to label themselves Christians.

B. SIGER.—Matthew Arnold was not specially concerned with the Bible in elementary schools. His contention was that the Bible, speaking generally, might be retained as a book of religious literature, but not as a supernatural revelation.

C. ROBERTS.—Glad the *Freethinker* has been of so much service to you. What a pity you did not meet with it before! But better late than never, thanks to the acquaintance who placed the paper in your hands.

J. D. STEVENS.—See paragraphs and acknowledgments. Thanks.

T. W. HAUGHTON.—See paragraph. Thanks.

J. PARTRIDGE (Birmingham).—Pleased to hear Mr. Davies had a good and highly appreciative audience on Sunday.

JOHN ASHTON.—We quite believe that Nonconformist Liberals don't love the Labor party, but, as we say in reply to another correspondent, the Labor party panders to Christianity (the Free Church form of it generally) for the sake of getting along.

B. G. BROWN.—Kindly convey our sympathy to Mr. Cattell.

J. G. BARTRAM.—We are writing you with a view to arranging a date for Newcastle. The Tyneside Sunday Lecture Society's program, which you enclose, carefully avoids all burning questions. We are reminded of the man who said of a certain Society that they had a lecture on the North Pole one Sunday and a lecture on the South Pole the next Sunday, and he wished they'd tackle something warmer.

Will the correspondent who wrote to us about reading the *Freethinker* in the workhouse write to us again? A subscriber wishes to pay for a year's issue of the paper for him.

BEEZEBUB.—Next week.

R. WALSH, subscribing to the President's Fund, says: "I consider the *Freethinker* is now the best written paper in England."

SOME correspondence stands over till next week.

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

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

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

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

Sugar Plums.

The four Sunday evening lectures originally planned for the Stratford Town Hall are now over. The extra one subsequently arranged will be delivered this evening (Dec. 3) by Mr. Foote, his subject being "The Crescent and the Cross." This is a very timely subject in view of the attack by Christian Italy on Mohammedan Turkey. Mr. Foote always has a large audience at the Stratford Town Hall, but it should be even larger than usual on this occasion.

Mr. Foote had another capital audience at Queen's Hall on Sunday evening—an improvement on the previous Sunday evening's. Mr. Victor Roger acted as chairman. Prior to the lecture Mr. Foote held the audience deeply interested while he performed the ceremony of "naming" a baby boy. There was loud and long applause as he handed the baby back to its proud and happy mother. The lecture on "The Dying God," with reference to Professor Frazer's new book, was enthusiastically cheered. Several questions were answered and one critic replied to.

The Queen's Hall platform will be occupied this evening (Dec. 3) by Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner, her subject being "The Fourth Centenary of Servetus: Heretic, Scientist, and Martyr." Servetus was hunted down to his death by John Calvin. He was a great man and a real thinker, but he perished at the stake, like so many distinguished men in that age of Christian predominance. Mrs. Bonner's lecture should be very interesting.

Mr. W. W. Collins, whose fine lecture on "The Bible and the Spirit of Revenge" we are reproducing from the pages of his monthly *Examiner*, was born and bred in England. His family belonged to Birmingham and is still remembered there. Mr. Collins joined the Freethought movement in the early eighties and lectured in connection with the National Secular Society. Some twenty-five years ago he accepted an invitation to become a resident Freethought lecturer at the antipodes. He has been a member of the New Zealand parliament, but he appears to regard Freethought as the main thing after all; at any rate, he devotes most of his time and energy to it now. Mr. Collins is naturally a good speaker, and long practice must have made him very effective on the platform. Our readers will, substantially, be able to form an opinion on this point for themselves. Mr. Collins still remains a Vice-President of the National Secular Society.

We hope Mr. S. A. Gimson, 20 Glebe-street, Leicester, has received some donations in response to the financial appeal of the Leicester Secular Society which recently appeared in our columns. A few small subscriptions have reached us:—G. W. Foote, 10s. 6d.; Mrs. A. W. Hutt, 2s. 6d.; Mrs. B. Siger, 1s.; B. O. Frampton, 2s. 6d.; R. Carpenter, 3s. Perhaps these acknowledgments may lead to more. We repeat that the Leicester Secular Society deserves support even from outside. To keep a Secular Hall going year after year, with good lectures every Sunday evening except during the summer, and a Sunday-school on Sunday afternoons, is no mean achievement. Few of the members are blessed with "the means of grace" in the shape of spare cash; and a few members have had to tax themselves heavily—Mr. Gimson, we are sure, particularly so. We think there must be some of our readers who can contribute to the Leicester Society's special fund without robbing other objects or inconveniencing themselves.

The account of the unveiling of the Ingersoll monument, reprinted in our columns from the *Peoria Star*, we are indirectly indebted for to our gallant contemporary the *Truthseeker* (New York).

Thomas A. Edison sent the following letter to the Ingersoll Monument Committee at Peoria:—

"Replying to your letter regarding the erecting of a monument in memory of Mr. Robert G. Ingersoll, will say I am not capable of making a public speech, but I should like to add my mite toward the statue if acceptable. Some day when the veil of superstition is lifted Ingersoll will stand out as a great personality."

Haeckel wrote that "it would be a great delight" to him to be present at the unveiling of the monument, but his age and infirmities would not allow of his undertaking the journey. The Hon. Andrew D. White, formerly President of Cornell University, pleaded his eighty years as an excuse for his absence; otherwise, he said, "I would be glad and proud to accept the invitation to speak, for though differing from Colonel Ingersoll on various minor matters, I still

retain respect and admiration for him as one who fought a great and good and brilliant fight for the rights of conscience, of free thought, and free speech." With reference to Ingersoll's eloquence, President White instanced the dinner at New York given to Mr. Frank Carpenter on the occasion of the sending of his picture of the "Alabama" commissioners to Queen Victoria. "I called Mr. Ingersoll out," Principal White said, "with the result that he gave us infinitely the most original, the most suggestive, and the most noble discourse, by far, of the whole evening. Never in my life have I heard so beautiful a tribute to the mission of high art in a republic like ours."

The letter from Mr. Andrew Carnegie was a longish one, but we venture to reproduce it *in extenso* :—

"As we are soon leaving for Scotland to spend our summer as usual, it is impossible for me to be present at the unveiling of the statue to my late friend, Colonel Ingersoll. He was one of the most original characters I have ever had the privilege of knowing well, ranking even with Lincoln in some ways. He was certainly the greatest public orator I have ever heard. If I recollect aright, his father was a Presbyterian minister of the old school, strong on all the doctrinal points of that severe, but in many respects strengthening faith, for Scotland owes much of its character and achievements to John Knox and his followers.

"We think less of belief now and more of conduct than in the early days, and the Colonel rebelled, and with his emotional and oratorical nature his way of putting things sometimes alarmed the timid; but apart from all this, I know of no man who had more of the truly Christian virtues, and a purer, nobler nature than his would indeed be hard to find—a high and lofty character seeking only the good of his fellow-men.

"As the world knows, Lincoln and Ingersoll were the two orators of Illinois who thought alike upon political and religious subjects; little of the sectarian and a great deal of the humanitarian in both. They were cordial friends, and to have known both of those characters is one of the satisfactions of my life—veritable Abou Ben Adhems—who could both say to the Recording Angel, 'Write me as one who loved his fellow-men.' 'If there is another world, they live in bliss; if there be none, they made the best of this.'—
ANDREW CARNEGIE."

Cut out the nonsense about "truly Christian virtues" and the rest of "Andrew's" letter is all right.

We have pleasure in reproducing the following letter from the *Newcastle Weekly Chronicle* of November 4, which escaped our notice till now:—

"MR. J. M. ROBERTSON, M.P., AND SECULARISM.

"Sir,—In recording the elevation of Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P., to the post of Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, there is an error in the *Chronicle's* account which may profitably be put right. He is described as 'the last survivor of the old Secularist movement headed by Mr. Bradlaugh.' Fortunately, that is not the case. Other members of the band of devoted men who fought around Charles Bradlaugh are still living and actively engaged in propagating the principles associated with the name of the great 'Iconoclast.' Mr. G. W. Foote, the man to whom Bradlaugh handed over the presidency of the society which he formed, is still leading the most militant freethought movement in this country, assisted by a staff of scholarly writers who never mince words in their attack on Christianity, and on their insistence that in attention to this world's duties lies the salvation of man. The Rationalist Press Association, whose issue of Secularist books runs to well over two millions, owes its constitution—which guarantees its immunity from prosecution—entirely to the President of the National Secular Society. Mr. J. M. Robertson, M.P., therefore, instead of being the last survivor of the Secularist movement, is but one of a rapidly increasing number of scholars and men of action who recognise that Christianity is the great anti-progressive force in social matters, and who consider its destruction the first step towards social reform.—I am, etc.,
H. B. DODDS."

It is curious what a conspiracy there is to burke the name of Mr. Foote, the *Freethinker*, the National Secular Society, and everybody and everything connected with him. But we think we understand it. Anyhow, we are so used to it that we don't mind; nevertheless, we thank Mr. Dodds for his generous intervention.

George Meredith's manuscripts were largely given away by him to friends and friendly dependents, who have realised considerable sums for them since his death. This was characteristic of his fine generosity; but a better course, perhaps, has been pursued by Thomas Hardy. The author of the immortal *Tess* refused the big price offered him by a well-known Yankee millionaire for the manuscripts of his books, and resolved to let them remain in the land of his birth and amongst his own people. The manuscripts of *Tess* and the *Dynasts* have been presented to the British Museum, two others have gone to the Fitzwilliam Museum, two to the Bodleian, one to Birmingham, one to Aberdeen, and one to Manchester. Hardy has only kept two himself.

The Bible and the Spirit of Revenge.—II.

A Lecture by W. W. COLLINS at Christchurch,
New Zealand.

(Concluded from p. 765.)

THE high-water mark of moral development will never be attained till man has overcome the spirit of revenge. However useful and even necessary that spirit may have been to the primitive savage races, before any law save that of retaliation had dawned in man's mind: when only the apprehension that injury would be met by injury, and bloodshed by bloodshed: in other words, when fear of sure and speedy revenge was the only restraining force, we, in these days, recognise that *retaliation*, once man's only weapon of defence, has become harmful and needless, that as Milton said:—

"Revenge at first though sweet
Bitter ere long back on itself recoils."

In the process of social development the time came, as it was bound to do, when the interests of the community were defended and maintained by some general agreements, and "law," in its simplest form, interposed to punish wrong-doing either against the individual or the community. Quite naturally such law aimed to strike fear and terror into the heart of the evil doer, it still sought to restrain by retaliation and revenge. But we are no longer—

"Children of the sun
With whom revenge is virtue."

We have begun to feel ashamed of retaliation in kind, and are at last learning that the best way to promote that which is right is to encourage an instinctive abhorrence of that which is wrong. It is here we feel the full force of those inherited tendencies and false teachings which, like rank weeds, have to be subdued and destroyed in order that the finer fruits of the mind may give sweetness to society. These are inherited tendencies which would long since have atrophied for want of nourishment had not false teachings provided it. Had the most ancient code of laws which has come down to us—the code of Hammurabi, King of Babylon—been declared to have been of divine origin, had its commands been prefaced with a "Thus saith the Lord God," the declaration itself would have been condemned as presumptuous and blasphemous. Yet so strangely paradoxical, so inconsistent are religious teachers, that when that same code, modified only by a fierce and senseless intolerance which forms a significant contrast to the original, is, by the Bible, declared to have been given by God himself, any denial of that declaration is asserted to be presumptuous and blasphemous. *Lex Talionis* is, of course, a striking characteristic in the code of Hammurabi, but it is the striking feature in the code represented in the Bible as given by God through Moses. An eye for an eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe, a life for a life. Such are the commands of the Lord as given by the mouth of Moses. And these laws have been excused, if not defended, by highly religious men, on the ground that the Lord had to consider the low social condition of his people. So that God, instead of ordaining laws of an elevating moral tendency, stooped to the savage level of his people, nay to a lower level, for did he not ordain the death penalty for the Sabbath-breaker and for the blasphemer; for the son, daughter, wife, or friend who should say "Let us go and serve other gods"? Did he not make it a capital offence to compound oil like that used for anointing the priests, or for making any colorable imitation of the incense used in the temple? And now note the contrast: the Hammurabi code, which has come to us from an age nearly a thousand years earlier than the time of Moses, contains neither trace nor suggestion of religious persecution. It is essentially a civil code. The Mosaic code, on the other hand, is full of the spirit of persecution, and is just as essentially a

priestly code. The Babylonian laws are the king's commands, while the commands of the Bible are declared to have emanated from God himself. Surely the suggestiveness of all this is too apparent to need emphasising. The government of the Israelites was a Theocracy, and the priest was the administrator of God's laws. With a God whose moral level was no higher than that of the priest, who is, indeed, a priest magnified and endowed with supernatural power, it is easy to understand that both in precept and example he would be represented as the embodiment of priestly pettiness and passion. So we find him represented as a jealous and a revengeful God, who will visit even the slightest disobedience, indifference, neglect, or forgetfulness with most direful retribution. Listen to the curses God utters against those who will not hearken to his voice:—

"Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field.

"Cursed shall be thy basket and thy store.

"Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy land, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep.

"Cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out.

"The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation and rebuke, in all that thou settest thine hand unto for to do, until thou be destroyed and until thou perish quickly because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken Me.

"The Lord shall make the pestilence cleave unto thee, until He have consumed thee off the land whither thou goest to possess it.

"The Lord shall smite thee with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflammation, and with an extreme burning, and with the sword, and with blasting, and with mildew, and they shall pursue thee until thou perish.....

"And the Lord shall smite thee with the botch of Egypt, and with the emroids, and with the scab, and with the itch whereof thou canst not be cured.

"And the Lord shall smite thee with madness, and blindness, and astonishment of heart.....

"If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD.

"Then the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues and of long continuance, and sore sicknesses, and of long continuance."

So to the end of that twenty-eighth chapter of Deuteronomy, through almost every verse of the sixty-seven contained in it, the Lord continues his threatenings; showing conclusively that he is a God to be held in fear and trembling, demanding the abject service which the slave renders his task-master, and exacting it in the same tyrannical manner. What slight offences were sufficient to kindle his wrath? He slew fifty thousand and seventy because some had had the curiosity to look into the Ark. And did he not slay Uzzab, who thoughtlessly put forth his hand to steady the Ark and prevent its falling? Was it not by his direct command that the Midianites were spoiled, their cities burned, every male of their little ones killed and every mother slaughtered? Did he not send a lying spirit to tempt David to number the people, and then in his anger slay seventy thousand from Dan to Beer-sheba to punish him for so doing? Had he not previously hardened the heart of Pharaoh, that he might, by his plagues, get honor on Pharaoh and upon all his hosts? Was it not by his command that Samuel hewed Agag in pieces, who had been mercifully spared by Saul? Do we not see the same spirit of bloodthirstiness conjoined to an approval of deceit and treachery in God's promise to Jehu, that, because he had by "subtlety" brought about the destruction of the worshipers of Baal, his children, down to the fourth generation should sit on the throne of Israel? What else ought we to expect from a God who has respect to Abel and his offering of blood, but unto Cain and his bloodless offering had not respect. Think of the countless creatures sacrificed on the altars of the Lord. Numbers so vast that at the dedication of the Temple in the time of Solomon 22,000 oxen and 120,000 sheep were slaughtered as

a peace offering, special space being "hallowed" in the middle of the court that was before the Lord, because the brazen altar was too little to receive the burnt offerings. If all this bloodshed did not perpetuate a callous indifference to suffering, and transmit a deadened sense of guilt in causing it, Nature itself must have changed and like causes ceased to produce like effects. It is useless to point to the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Micah, and to tell us that these represent God as being "full of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts"; as "delighting not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of goats"; as even declaring "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt offering or sacrifices"; and as asking "Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams.....shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruits of my body for the sin of my soul?" This is but setting prophet against prophet, and citing God against God. Their morality may be a little higher than that of the earlier prophets, but they still represent God as wrathful and revengeful, a "Lord of hosts," through whose anger "the land is darkened and the people shall be as fuel of the fire, and no man shall spare his own brother." Nor does it avail to say that this revengeful aspect of God's character is peculiar to the Old Testament. Nothing of the kind. What were the words of Jesus when sending out his disciples? Did he not say, "Whosoever shall not receive you nor hear your words, when ye depart from that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet. Verily, I say unto you, it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrha in the Day of Judgment than for that city." His second coming is to be a day of vengeance, when the sheep shall be divided from the goats, and when those who believed on him shall be rewarded with eternal life, while unbelievers are to be cast into everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels. Paul declares that the Lord shall descend from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire "taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." And again, "If any man preach any other gospel than that ye have received, let him be accursed." Finally, in the book called "The Revelation of St. John the Divine," an angel is represented as saying with a loud voice, "If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels and in the presence of the Lamb, and the smoke of their torments ascendeth for ever and ever." Could the spirit of revenge go further? Truly the wrath of the Lord is insatiable. Not even an eternity of time will suffice to quench his thirst for revenge upon his enemies. It is the apotheosis of savagery and the *ne plus ultra* of wickedness. As has forcefully and truthfully been said, "No pagan horror ever excelled the fanged and frightful dogma that souls were made to feed the eternal hunger of God's revenge." The belief that God punishes is the warrant for human cruelty. The Psalmist says, "Do I not hate them, O Lord, that hate Thee? Yea, I hate them with perfect hatred," and the simple fact is "the greatest horrors of religion were carried out by men of holy zeal, men who, realising the awful character of infinite punishment, shrank from no horror, if thereby souls might be saved from unending torment." That men are growing cold towards such repulsive teachings is a sure and happy augury that, despite the voice of God, the voice of man will yet assert itself. On the strength of those very teachings preachers have for centuries been warning men to flee from the wrath to come, to secure the salvation of their own souls. And what has been the result? What must be the result when man's chief concern is how to escape an eternity of torment? Will he not become self-centred and sel-

fish? The more fervently he believes it to be true, the greater will be his desire to suppress the better promptings of his nature, which tell him it cannot be true. If God's justice inflicts punishments of never-ending, inconceivable torture, why should not man punish to the utmost limit of his power? How can we look for mercy and justice, with any expectation of finding it, in souls sodden with fear of a revengeful celestial tyrant? With such fear in his heart, man will be a slave, and worst of all, a slave bound by chains of his own forging. It is little natures which are by turns cowardly and cruel, which, cringing to power, are brutal in the presence of helplessness and weakness. If we would have man self-reliant, strong to suppress wrong, yet considerate, merciful, and just to the wrong-doer; if we would have them see the right and do it, and find their highest satisfaction in the doing of it, we must bid them cast aside every fear save the fear of wrong itself, uproot the spirit of revenge, and gather the rich fruits of brotherhood by cultivating the tree of Love.—*The Examiner.*

Edison and Maxim.

THE following is a most remarkable article from the *Catholic Herald* :—

"BEYOND HIS LAST.

"It has been found frequently that when a great man 'goes beyond his last' he may become quite ridiculous, or, at least, illogical. In no case is that so apparent as when some scientists tread upon the domain of theology. They see things theological, not from the point of view of theology, but in the light of whatever science they are versed in. This peculiarity was dealt with by Mgr. Benson in an article in the *Dublin Review*, and admirably illustrated by a picture of a geologist, a farmer, and a poet gazing upon a piece of land, expressing their points of view and their contempt for one another.

"Sir Hiram Maxim, whose eminence in the invention of guns no one will deny, occasionally dips into religious controversy with disastrous results for himself, as was illustrated not long ago. Another famous inventor, Edison, appears to have a hankering for the same kind of diversion, and he appears to fare no better.

"Airing his views to a Press representative at Geneva, Mr. Edison referred to the situation in Portugal, and gave utterance to the following:—

"Whatever the defects of the temporary rule in Portugal, one thing is certain—the democratic movement will bring school-houses into existence there. I trust to the school-house to give the people a chance to learn, and the country will move easily enough along the lines of enlightenment. The priests in Portugal will go, and, with the disappearance of the black frocks, light will come; and we can trust to light, whether it is electric or otherwise."

"Edison, if he had taken the trouble to inquire, would have found that schools were numerous in Portugal when the Church had a free hand; and if he had been following modern times, to say nothing of history, he would find out that, even on the testimony of Protestants, the best friend of education has been, and is, the Catholic Church. Had he not been as ignorant in these matters as he is eminent in his own domain, he could have spared the public his witless flippancy about black frocks, etc."

When the great Ingersoll was shown a very ridiculous sermon, and requested to write something funny about it, he replied that it would be absolutely impossible for him to write anything half as funny as the sermon itself, and the same may be said of this article in the *Catholic Herald*. It would certainly be difficult to write anything more absurd and wider off the truth.

Mr. Thomas Edison, who, without question, is one of the greatest scientific men in the world to-day, has expressed his mind very freely regarding the ignorance of the priest-ridden people of Portugal, and the editor of the *Catholic Herald* quotes from what Mgr. Benson has said, by which it will be seen that the geologist does not agree with the farmer, because they do not look upon things from the same standpoint. If Mr. Edison looked upon things from

the same standpoint as the editor, there would be no disagreement between them, but they do not. Mr. Edison only considers the subject from the standpoint of the poor, ignorant, and superstitious people. He sees clearly *why* they are poor and wretched. He has witnessed the great change for the better that took place in Italy when the Pope, the priests, and the brigands were dethroned. True, it was bad for the priests and the brigands, but a very good thing for the people. Mr. Edison has also witnessed the marvellous change that took place in Mexico when the reign of the priests was suppressed and the Church property confiscated. He has also had the opportunity of comparing Spain and Portugal with Germany and France; and, living in the States, he could not fail to have observed that the percentage of criminals among the Catholic population is much greater than among the non-Catholics. It is, therefore, nothing more than reasonable that Mr. Edison, with his remarkable power of observation, should pity the poor, oppressed, and ignorant people of Portugal; and it is nothing more than reasonable that he should come to the conclusion that the same remedy that has worked so well in other countries should work equally well in Portugal; therefore, he said, "The priests will go, and, with the disappearance of the black frocks, light will come." But the editor of the *Catholic Herald* looks upon the subject from a diametrically different standpoint. Mr. Edison had no sympathy for the priests, and the editor has no sympathy for the people, and consequently considers the subject from the priests' standpoint—how can the greatest number of priests live off the people? how can they be kept in a state of ignorance sufficiently dense to be easily fleeced by the priests?

The editor also has his fling at Sir Hiram Maxim. He admits Sir Hiram's eminence as a great inventor, but tells us that when he dips into religious controversy the result is very disastrous to himself.

Now, as a matter of fact, Sir Hiram Maxim is one of the best read men in the world. It appears that the chief amusement of his life has been study. He is not only well up in all the philosophy of the present time, but is deeply read in all religious subjects. When Li Hung Chang was in England he said: "Sir Hiram is the only one that I have ever met outside of China who understands the religion and philosophy of my country." Mr. Ivan Chen, late Secretary of Legation in London, said on one occasion: "I am ashamed to admit it, but Sir Hiram Maxim knows more of the history, philosophy, and religion of my own country than I know myself."

It is quite true that Sir Hiram Maxim did have a little controversy some months ago with the editor of the *Catholic Herald*. I was much interested, and I followed the correspondence very closely. Sir Hiram stuck strictly to the facts and the truth, and no fair-minded party could read this controversy without seeing that Sir Hiram had altogether the best of it; in fact, he completely floored the editor at every point. The only weakness shown by Sir Hiram was certainly not in learning, but in lying. In this he was not "in it" with the editor—in fact, not in the same category; he was outclassed altogether. The editor denied point blank that either Galileo or Bruno was persecuted by the Roman Catholic Church. He would not admit that the Church has ever burnt anyone at the stake. He denied the truth of all secular history, and even Catholic history of a few hundred years ago. Sir Hiram's articles were always cut down on account of "limited space," but doubtless it was the unanswerable arguments that were left out.

The editor has much to say of the deplorable ignorance of Mr. Edison. Although Mr. Edison may not be so well read as Sir Hiram Maxim in religious matters, still he is endowed with a faculty that is worth a great deal more than book knowledge. He has common sense in a remarkable degree, is able to look all subjects squarely in the face, and is honest enough if he says anything at all to tell the exact truth; and I have no hesitation in stating that Mr.

Edison actually knows more of the facts relating to religion than the Pope of Rome, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Grand Llama of Thibet, General Booth, and the editor of the *Catholic Herald*. All of Mr. Edison's religious education has been of the positive type, whereas these other gentlemen have never received anything except negative education. One party has been educated to increase their knowledge and the other to intensify their ignorance, and if such a thing as an honest controversy on purely religious subjects were possible, Mr. Edison with very little effort would be able to wipe the ground with the lot.

RENEE ROBIN.

In Honor of Ingersoll.

In the presence of a splendid gathering of many thousands of people, with a series of addresses whose brilliancy, eloquence, and feeling have never been equalled in Peoria, and amid evidence of such sympathy, enthusiasm, and deep feeling as gave rich token of the love in which his memory is held in this city, the statue of Robert G. Ingersoll was unveiled at Glen Oak Park, on October 28, 1911.

The day was one of unexampled splendor. Skies as clear and blue and radiantly tender as the eyes with which the great philosopher had looked out upon the world he did so much to free from fear and sadness—sunshine as gloriously rich and golden as the smile with which he was wont to greet the friends he loved—lent their enchantment to the brilliant scene. And as if even Nature herself had wished to do honor to one who had worshiped so ardently at her shrine, autumn had touched every bush and shrub and tree with magic fire.

The whole hillside which rose like the setting of a stage back of the great bronze figure on its granite pedestal, was aflame with gold and crimson, and the trees which bordered the driveways on either side of the statue, lifted their shimmering heads, torchlike, to the sky.

The great moment when, the cord pulled by Robert Brown, Ingersoll's grandson, the flag which had concealed it, slowly fluttered earthward, and the splendid, virile figure stood revealed sharply outlined against the glory of the hills, proved poignantly dramatic.

As if impelled by a single impulse, the great concourse arose to its feet. Every head was bared, and for a brief instant everyone stood silent and spellbound, touched to the heart by the sudden apparition. It was as if Ingersoll himself all at once stood forth before them, fearless and splendid as he had always stood in life. Then, suddenly as it had come, the spell passed, and with its passing came the realization of the art which had caused the illusion, and the assemblage broke into applause and cheers.

The figure of Ingersoll is of heroic size, seven and a half feet in height, and stands in an easeful and characteristic pose—the broad shoulders swung back and one hand thrust into the pocket holding back the familiar frock coat which for many years was as much a part of Ingersoll's personality as his hearty hand grip and his frank, unaffected, boyish charm of manner. If the artist has perhaps failed in a measure to perfectly reproduce the fine head, with its splendid forehead, on which heaven had set the unmistakable seal of great genius, he has succeeded admirably in depicting the full sensitive mouth with its half-womanish charm, the delicate nose, tilting slightly upwards at the tip, and the eyes which look out over the beautiful prospect stretching before, with all the splendid, fearless frankness those who know him best remember so well.

The figure, on the whole, is a striking one, full of vitality and force—a work of which any artist might well feel proud.

Best of it all, it represented the deep and abiding affection of those with whom Ingersoll spent the richest and fullest years of his life, and crowns the efforts of a little band of his closest friends who have labored long that Peoria might do honor to herself in honoring the name of the greatest of her children.

The crowds which attended the dedication began to gather early, and when the hour set for the beginning had arrived, every chair of those set in front of the statue and platform was filled, and hundreds stood throughout the ceremonies, forgetful of fatigue, unheeding the chill which began to delicately ice the air as the sun sank westward, hanging eagerly on every word of the speakers and never too distant or distracted to give spontaneous response in applause or laughter to each golden thought or flashing play of wit. For the wit was as plenty as the eloquence, and jests crowded the flights of poesy for first honors in the discourses.

Not once was the funeral note struck during the afternoon. That joy whose gospel Ingersoll had so eloquently preached and gloriously lived reigned throughout the exer-

cises, and the tears that stung the eyes at some loving word or tender allusion were soon dried in heartwhole laughter.

Eugene F. Baldwin, as president of the Ingersoll Monument Association, opened the exercises with an address. He told of the Robert Ingersoll of long ago, the dear, ardent, impassioned youth, his heart warm with love for humanity, his brain aflame with genius, his spirit always poised for flights.

With swift, sure strokes he pictured the gradual development of this great personality—the sure triumph of the ever-ripening genius, and his story of a great success which only enriched instead of weakening the nature of him to whom it had been granted, was sweet indeed to hear. After the dramatic interval which marked the unveiling of the statue and the incidents following it, Mr. Baldwin then introduced Charles Frederick Adams, of New York, the great grandson of John Quincy Adams, and one of the advanced thinkers of our times.

Mr. Adams has the polished elegance of diction which distinguished an earlier stage of oratory than our own, and from his distinguished forbears he has inherited a freedom and largeness of thought which gave to his address a peculiar charm. Although, like other speakers of the day, Mr. Adams used no notes, he spoke with a whirlwind rapidity, his polished phrases and neatly turned epigrams fairly tumbling over each other. His tribute to Ingersoll was also a personal one, but he had known the great philosopher at a later day, when his long fight against prejudice and superstition was nearing an end. It was a less picturesque and more mellowed genius which he held up to the audience, and if his Ingersoll was less lovable and endearing he was even more to be revered and admired.

Mr. Adams' remarks were interrupted at frequent intervals by the warmest applause, and he was given a genuine ovation at the close.

Congressman John J. Lentz, of Ohio, gave the assemblage its greatest and pleasantest surprise. Mr. Lentz is a big, broad-shouldered fellow with a handsome rosy, clean-cut face and a splendid helmet of silvered hair. He had not been advertised as an orator beforehand, and not much was expected of him. But he had not been talking two minutes before he had captured his audience to a man—and woman. His glowing tribute to Ingersoll, coming so evidently as it did straight from his heart, thrilled the crowd through and through. And when he set Ingersoll side by side with Lincoln and Jefferson cheer upon cheer rent the air.

Mr. Lentz owned that his ancestors had been Catholic on one side and Lutheran on the other. "And if they haven't raised more hell than anything else in the world I'd like to know why," he said truculently. This gave him an excuse to get after the preachers, which he did with obvious enjoyment, laying about him so lustily in the process that his audience was swept constantly by gusts of laughter.

And it was just after the close of the congressman's spicy discourse that Mr. E. F. Baldwin was moved to introduce the Rev. Dr. Carpenter. The reverend gentleman's eye had a somewhat dangerous gleam in it as he stepped to the front of the platform.

"Since our friend the congressman from Ohio has been saying so much about preachers," he remarked pleasantly, "I'd like to say that if the congressmen of the present day have anything in the way of morality and virtue on the preachers, I'm from Missouri." The crowd caught the amiable irony of the rector, and shouted its approval.

Hon. Clark E. Carr followed Dr. Carpenter, and spoke a few words of affectionate admiration of the great man whom they had gathered there to honor.

He was in turn followed by Judge French, of Davenport, whom Mr. Baldwin jocosely introduced as a boy from Davenport who had studied law with Mr. Ingersoll. The judge added his quota of heartfelt praise to the already overflowing measure, and with his address the exercises came to a close.

As soon as the formal part of the program was over a large part of the audience crowded up on the platform to shake hands with Mrs. Ingersoll and her daughters, who had been deeply moved spectators of the proceedings. Many were the warm words of affection for the dead man spoken by those who grasped the hands of his dearly loved wife and daughters, and the impromptu reception added the finishing touch to the tender sentiment pervading the occasion.

It was not until nearly an hour later that the crowds at last dispersed, the ranks of carriages and motor-cars thinned, broke, and disappeared. Then the statue was left alone, standing where it will stand for ever, with flowers heaped about its feet, and the setting sun resting like a benison upon its head, and Peoria's great day was over—a day planned and striven for and achieved in love—that love which is the greatest thing on earth, and which Robert Ingersoll knew and understood as it is given to few to know and understand.

—Peoria Star (October 29, 1911).

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

LONDON.

INDOOR.

QUEEN'S (MINOR HALL (Langham-place, Regent-street, W.): 7.30, Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner, "The Fourth Centenary of Servetus: Heretic, Scientist, and Martyr."

STRATFORD TOWN HALL: 7.30, G. W. Foote, "The Crescent and the Cross."

OUTDOOR.

EDMONTON BRANCH N. S. S. (The Green): 7.30, W. Davidson, "Civilising the Lord."

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

COUNTRY.

INDOOR.

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (Hall, 110 Brunswick-street): Joseph McCabe, 12 noon, "The Tercentenary of the English Bible"; 6.30, "Australia as a Witness to Evolution." With lantern illustrations.

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate): 6.30, W. Bell, "Flowers and Fruits in the Gardens and Hedges." Lantern illustrations.

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N. S. S. (Alexandra Hall, Islington-square): 6.30, J. Arthur, "The Failure of Theism."

MANCHESTER BRANCH N. S. S. (Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, All Saints): 6.30, George Mason, "Bishop Welldon and H. G. Wells."

SOUTH SHIELDS BRANCH N. S. S. (Victoria Hall Buildings, second floor, Fowler-street): 7, Music; 7.15, F. A. Hudson, "Old Ideals and the New Morality."

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.

THE CLARION OVERCOAT.—Made from the new fleecy Blanket Cloth, in greys, browns, and mixtures. Double-breasted, wide lapels, storm collar, strap back, and cuffs, leather buttons, smart and comfy. 35s.—HARRY BOULTER, 108 City-road. 10 to 8 at 108.

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

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

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

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 incommodious 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 VESSEY 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.

A NEW (THE THIRD) EDITION OF

FROM FICTION TO FACT.
 By F. BONTE.

(Issued by the Secular Society, Limited.)

REVISED AND ENLARGED.
 SHOULD BE SCATTERED BROADCAST.

SIXTY-FOUR PAGES.
PRICE ONE PENNY.

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

DEFENCE OF FREE SPEECH

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

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

With Special Preface and many Footnotes

Price FOURPENCE. Post free FIVEPENCE.

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

SUNDAY EVENING FREETHOUGHT LECTURES

AT

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

DURING DECEMBER, 1911.

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

Dec. 3.—Mrs. BRADLAUGH BONNER,
“The Fourth Centenary of Servetus: Heretic, Scientist, and Martyr.”

Dec. 10 & 17, Mr. G. W. FOOTE.

MUSIC BEFORE EACH LECTURE.

Front Seats, 1s. Second Seats, 6d. A Few Free Seats at Back.
Doors open at 7. Musical Program 7 to 7.30. Lecture at 7.30.

Sunday Evening Lectures

AT

STRATFORD TOWN HALL

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

DECEMBER 3,

Mr. G. W. FOOTE,
“The Crescent and the Cross.”

Admission Free. Doors open at 7. Lecture at 7.30. Collection.

THE POPULAR EDITION

(Revised and Enlarged)

OF

“BIBLE ROMANCES”

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

With a Portrait of the Author

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