

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXXII.—No. 6

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1912

PRICE TWOPENCE

*For within the hollow crown
That rounds the mortal temples of a king
Keeps Death his court, and there the antick sits,
Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp ;
Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
To monarchise, be fear'd, and kill with looks ;
Infusing him with self and vain conceit,
As if this flesh which walls about our life
Were brass impregnable ; and humor'd thus
Comes at the last, and with a little pin
Bores through his castle wall, and farewell King !*
—SHAKESPEARE, *Richard the Second*, Act III., Sc. 2.

“A Christian People.”

THE title of this article is borrowed from a letter addressed by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the chairman of the executive of the Imperial Sunday Alliance. His Grace is “profoundly convinced” that—

“to bring about the opening of our theatres and other similar places of entertainment, however innocent and wholesome, on Sundays, would be to take a terribly false step in our national life, as a Christian people, and to inflict a grave wrong upon tens of thousands of persons, whose weekly day of rest, of freedom, and, I hope, of worship, would be destroyed.”

This is a cleverly written passage of the Archbishop's letter, both for what it says and for what it omits. His Grace knows that myriads of people are employed on Sunday already, many of them in hired attendance at places of worship. He must also know that a stroke of the pen on the part of the licensing magistrates is sufficient to prevent any theatre employee from working seven days a week. But he is silent on both points. His object is to create the false impression that the extension of Sunday freedom means a seven days' working week for a vast number of artisans and laborers—whereas it means nothing of the sort. But we do not quarrel with him on this account. He is far from being singular in practising the time-honored arts of priestcraft. He wants to maintain the clerical monopoly of Sunday as far as possible, and he is prepared to do whatever is requisite to that end.

Our quarrel is with only one expression in the above passage from the Archbishop's letter. He speaks of our “national life” and of our being “a Christian people,” and assumes that no law or custom should be permitted that is in any way antagonistic to that supposition.

We admit that England is a Christian country in a very loose meaning of the words. It has been a Christian country in a stricter sense of the words in the past; laws for the special protection of Christianity still remain on the Statute Book; there still exists a Christian Church, spread throughout the whole land, established and endowed by the State; and the professed Christians, of course, outnumber the professed adherents of any other principle or organisation. But we deny, for all that, that Englishmen are “a Christian people.”

It would be interesting to have the Archbishop's definition of a Christian people. But we fancy he

is too discreet to give it. We must therefore apply our own tests to his wide assertion.

We deny that the Archbishop is himself a Christian, in any honest sense of the term. He may be a Christian as he accepts the Articles of the Church of England, but he is plainly and palpably not a Christian as obeying the teaching of Jesus Christ in the four Gospels. Jesus Christ told his disciples to carry neither scrip nor purse. We dare say the Archbishop of Canterbury has “scrip” in his safe or at the bank, and a well-filled purse when he takes a continental trip for the benefit of his health. Jesus taught that poverty is a blessing and a safety, and wealth a curse and a danger. Does the Archbishop really believe this? We are not asking whether he pays it lip-homage; we are asking whether he believes it up to the point of acting upon it. We are not prying into his personal affairs when we say that he does not. It is public information that he lives in a palace; it is public information that the Ecclesiastical Commissioners pay him a salary of £15,000 a year.

With regard to the central teachings of Jesus Christ, the great bulk of the professed Christians in England are no more real Christians than the Archbishop of Canterbury. They are as much after money as any non-Christian could possibly be. The race for wealth, and the race for such pleasures as wealth can purchase, is characteristic of England as well as other Christian countries. It is in “heathen” countries that one has to look for the quieter and more dignified life. And the result is that drink, gambling, and prostitution are the constant disgrace of the land inhabited by the Archbishop of Canterbury's “Christian people.”

That is a tragic instance. But a comic one emerged at the close of the Bradlaugh struggle. Christians who had entered the House of Commons by disobeying Jesus Christ's commandment, “Swear not at all,” kept Bradlaugh out by refusing to let *him* swear, even when it was proved that affirmation was not available. We need not say how Bradlaugh fought for his seat and finally took it. But that was not all. He introduced and carried a Bill making oath and affirmation optional. It was reserved for an Atheist to originate an Act of Parliament enabling Christians to obey Jesus Christ.

It is simply Christian impudence to call the inhabitants of England “a Christian people.” Three-fourths of these alleged Christian people never darken church or chapel doors. They are not Free-thinkers, of course, but they are not Christians. They are indifferentists. Talk about “God” and “Christ” and “Heaven” and “Hell” has ceased to interest them. They do not yearn for “Salvation,” which is the be-all and the end-all of Christianity. All they want is to be better-off in this world. And they are wise in their way, although it is to be wished that they took the problems of existence more seriously, and threw more of their weight into the crusade against the enemies of liberty and progress. If the non-Christians were all anti-Christians, there would be an immense change in the attitude of Christian Churches towards the rest of the community. At present they assume to rule the roost; they would then be forced to practise “humility.”

G. W. FOOTE.

Practical Atheism.

THE phrase, on this occasion at least, is not mine, save by adoption. It is one that is in great vogue in religious circles, and may, so far, be called a religious phrase. When very pious people wish to picture the distressful condition in which a large number of the people live, they express themselves by saying they are living in a condition of "practical Atheism." Pious Labor leaders attack the idle rich by saying they are "practical Atheists." In religious journals the phrase does good service as indicating people who have lost all sense of responsibility, and with whom moral rules are observed only in the breach. When a religious slum visitor comes across a child whose knowledge of theology is *nil*, it is described as a practical Atheist. It is a much-used, hard-worked expression, and therefore a valuable asset to religionists. It helps to sustain the impression that even though Atheism be not the cause of these evils, it is at least an accompaniment of their existence; and, that were all these people properly pious, the social consequences would be very different indeed.

If one were not familiar with the vagaries of religious reasoning, one would be surprised at any condition, social or individual, being taken as the consequence of either the presence or the absence of religious belief. For if experience goes for anything, it proves conclusively that religious belief may co-exist with every conceivable condition of vice or virtue, of health or disease. The religious belief of a fool may be as fervent as that of a philosopher. A criminal may believe as sincerely as a thoroughly virtuous person. The sweater will repeat his confession of faith with as much earnestness as the sweater's victim. People have gone to the stake in the name of the same Deity that those who sent them there believed in. Neither poverty nor wealth, neither vice nor virtue, neither cruelty nor kindness creates religious conviction. Its existence is consonant with any and every condition both of the individual and of society. This is one of the plainest lessons of history and experience, and the ignoring of it by religious people is just one more piece of evidence of how ineffective religion is for purposes of mental and moral discipline.

It is not merely the absence of a belief in God that pious people have in mind when the phrase "practical Atheism" is used. No purpose would be served if it only meant that people did not believe in God, but were all right in their domestic and social relations. The way to refer to people of this kind is to speak of them as being Christians without knowing it. To give point to the expression, it must be applied to people whose conduct is plainly reprehensible, or whose general condition is deplorable. The useful fact is not that these people do not believe in God, but that they are bad citizens. They may, as they often do, believe in God, and are not Atheists at all; but this circumstance is screened by the blessed word "practical." If they are not Atheists in theory, well, they at least act as though there were no God of whom they stand in dread; and to those who cannot conceive morality as resulting from any other force than that of a policeman, earthly or heavenly, the argument is conclusive enough. They are carrying out in practice what all Atheists would do if they married their conduct to their theory. The Theist who is a bad man is so because he does not allow his belief to direct his practice. The Atheist who is good is so because he, also, does not square his conduct with his theory. It is the good old game of heads I win, tails you lose. An old game, and yet one that is being continuously played with success wherever unscrupulousness encounters stupidity.

Why on earth should religionists place the responsibility for the world's evil on Atheism—practical or theoretical? When it suits their game, we are assured that Atheism makes no advance; on the contrary, it is suffering a constant decrease. Atheists are few in number, they say, and exert

but little influence. Why, then, give to "practical Atheism" the responsibility for the world's undesirable conditions? Surely, if the charge be soundly based, Atheism is one of the most powerful of the world's forces. Even a Bishop Ingram or a Dr. Horton should be able to see that a theory cannot at the same time be without influence, and yet responsible for the existence of one of the largest of social facts. The Christian ought to make up his mind which course of argument he will adopt—and stick to it. The Atheist is quite prepared to meet him in either direction. But how is one to attack a man who takes up, at the same time, both positions? If the Atheist does not meet him, it is because he declines to be met. He gathers his stupidity around him like a coat of armor; and against stupidity even the gods fight in vain.

The world, as we have it, is really not an Atheistic world. Atheism has never had the direction of affairs. Even in France and Portugal, the overwhelming majority of the people are religious. The present generation of man springs from a religious stock, with the religious factor becoming more and more pronounced as we retrace its history. People have based their theories of morals and of social institutions on religion. They have looked to religion in times of health and disease, of joy and sorrow. It is the priest, not the Atheist teacher, who has had the world in leading strings. Priests and parsons have elaborated extensive and costly machinery for dealing with evils of various kinds. Still, the evils remain. And it will clearly not do to place the responsibility for their continuance upon a theory which has never been consciously advocated by but a fraction of the people, which was never, until recent times, allowed to consciously air itself at all, and which, even now, can only be advocated when its advocates are prepared to face penalties for their speech. The religionist is really on the horns of a dilemma. He must either admit that religion is responsible for the evils he laments, or that it is powerless to remove them. And his case is most exquisitely damned on either conclusion.

Besides, neither the lower-class nor the upper class dregs of our population are really Atheistic. Our neuropaths, and our socially degraded classes, actually contain a larger proportion of religionists than does the normal population of the country. Why, we are always being told by preachers how little Free-thought there is among the lower classes; how eagerly they listen to the preacher, and how gladly they receive his message. The working man who threw up his hat and called for "three cheers for Jesus" has become a greatly magnified and stock figure of popular preaching. And my own personal experience goes to prove that the lower the neighborhood and the more degraded the population, the less likelihood there is of the Freethought speaker getting—not merely a fair hearing, but any hearing at all. Examples of sensualism, cases of moral degradation, or a submerged social class, cannot, by the wildest stretch of imagination, be attributed to Atheism. They are far more the products of generations of unreason and misdirection of energies. And when a sensualist is found, he will, in nine cases out of ten, spend no small portion of his time in defaming Atheism, if he is bitten with the itch of either speaking or writing.

The only honest and intelligible meaning of practical Atheism is living without belief in God. And why should this be supposed to result in evil living, in ignorance, and in a general disregard for one's duties and responsibilities? These things are not now seriously charged against Atheists. On the contrary, the Christian is sometimes told that many Atheists set him an example in right living, although the value of the compliment is discounted by the assurance that the avowed Atheist is what he is because of his Christian environment. So that while a Christian environment cannot keep a believer straight, it is duly credited with having that influence on the unbeliever. The truer aspect of the case was much more clearly and fairly put by the

late Mr. Justice Stephen in the following passage:—

"If human life is in the course of being fully described by science, I do not see what materials there are for any religion, or indeed, what would be the use of one, or why it is wanted. We can get on very well without one; for, though the view of life which science is opening to us gives us nothing to worship, it gives us an infinite number of things to enjoy.....The world seems a very good world, if it would only last. It is full of pleasant people and curious things, and I think most men find no great difficulty in turning their eyes away from its transient character. Love, friendship, ambition, science, literature, art, politics, and a thousand other matters will go equally well, as far as I can see, whether there is or is not a God or a future state."

Practical Atheism is, in truth, only one of the many cries designedly or thoughtlessly used in the interests of religion. Some use it knowing its falsity; others repeat it because it is a catch phrase which they know will please their readers. In either case it is only one more illustration of the way in which religion saps men's sense of intellectual veracity, and so influences character for the worse. Misrepresentation, slander, and falsehood are well-tried weapons in the Christian armory, and fervent believers will never dispense with their use until intellectual enlightenment has robbed them of their efficiency. Ignorance is the mother of devotion, and it has a not very distant relationship to all forms of personal and social vice. Christianity, theoretical and practical, has not yet succeeded in making the world what it might have been, and improvement has generally resulted from the control of affairs being taken out of its hands. Atheism, theoretical or practical, could not fail more decisively in the future than religion has in the past. And it may well be that "practical Atheism," with its consequent faith in the power of human knowledge and co-operation, may go far towards solving problems that have withstood the attacks of religion. The assistance of the gods has not protected man from failure. It is only common sense to now try what can be done without their aid.

C. COHEN.

Quibbling.

THE chief business of every theologian is to vindicate the justice and goodness of God in ordaining or permitting the existence of evil on our planet. Every system of divinity is primarily a theodicy, a justification of the Supreme Being. The very existence of theodicies is a tacit admission that God's character is not above suspicion. They are framed for the direct purpose of meeting objections raised against it, and of making future attacks upon it impossible. Judging by a modern instance, God's character is vindicated in two ways; first, by abusing those who defame it, and, second, by a recourse to fallacious reasoning. Those who adduce the existence of evil as a conclusive argument against the existence of a good God are politely dismissed as quibblers. Here is a man who argues thus:—

"If it had not been for God, I should never have been born or created; I should never have committed sin; I should never have come under a penalty for sin; I should never have needed His pardon or His Cross; I was not a party to the contract, and a just God would never enforce such a contract."

"This is an ancient and abiding quibble," answers the theologian. Even so great a man as Omar Khayyam made use of the same argument in the well known lines:—

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

"O poet, thou quibblest," replies the man of God. Scotland's greatest bard expressed the same sentiment in these memorable lines:—

"Thou know'st that Thou hast form'd me
With passions wild and strong;
And list'ning to their witching voice
Has often led me wrong."

"This is ever the disposition of human nature," retorts the divine. Poor old human nature, what a heavy load of imputed guilt it has always had to carry! How profoundly deceitful and desperately wicked are all its ways! As the divine puts it, "We take our own arrogant and reckless way, and then, when we find ourselves involved in the inevitable disaster, we cry out against God, and lay the blame on Him." And all this is said to be "an ancient and abiding quibble." That charge is easily made; but where does the quibble come in? Wherein does it consist? A quibble is an evasion, a cavil, a captious or frivolous objection, a juggle with words, a shift or turn from the point under discussion; but when a man argues that if he is sinful God made him so, and is alone responsible for it, what point does he evade, or what words does he juggle with?

The charge of quibbling preferred against Atheists thus falls to the ground. Their objections to Theism are based on incontestable realities. Evil is a fact universally admitted, and such a fact, the Atheists declare, is wholly inexplicable on the assumption that there exists a just and good God. And because the divines cannot answer this argument they characterise it as "an ancient and abiding quibble." In reality it is they who quibble every time they undertake the defence of Theism. For example, in "The Correspondence of Rev. Prof. David Smith, D.D.," in the *British Weekly* for February 1, we come across quibbles of the highest and truest quality. Here is one:—

"Moral freedom is essential to manhood, and we would not be men at all, but mere automata, had God made us so that we could not choose evil."

That is at present the most popular as well as most palpable of all the theological quibbles. Dr. Smith cannot be ignorant of the fact that, according to the teaching of the orthodox Church in all ages, sinful man is not in possession of moral freedom. He is in a hopeless state of moral slavery, out of which he cannot be rescued except by an act of supernatural grace. Dr. Smith gives a long extract from Milton's *Areopagitica*, but forgets to mention that most of the greatest divines, from Augustine downwards, cannot be claimed as advocates of moral freedom. Both Milton and he represent God as a cruel trifler or irresponsible play-actor. But let that pass, for the present. Dr. Smith's point here is that "we would not be men at all, but mere automata, had God made us so that we could not choose evil." What an obvious fallacy. Is the Christian God so constituted that he can choose evil? If not, is he not a mere automaton? As a matter of fact, the majority of men would infinitely prefer to have been "mere automata" that always went right than free agents that nearly always went wrong.

We now return to God's relation to evil. Dr. Smith says:—

"It is stupid ingratitude to say that God first made us so that we must sin, and now punishes for sinning. The fact is that God created us morally free, that we might work out the possibilities of our manhood; and when we chose evil, He addressed Himself at an exceeding cost to the gracious task of our redemption. It is sin, not God, that takes vengeance on the sinner. God is the Redeemer."

With all due deference, we beg to suggest that the reverend gentleman is guilty of relying upon the authority of gross ignorance. Nothing in the world is easier than to be dogmatic in the absence of knowledge. Dr. Smith does not know that man was ever created at all, the few items of knowledge that we do possess clearly indicating that nothing ever has been or ever can be either created or destroyed. Even the God in whose name our divine so confidently speaks owes his imaginary existence to the audacity of ignorance. The whole of theology is nothing but the fabrication of guideless fancy. A moment's serious reflection would show how utterly ridiculous and revolting is Milton's contention that, having created man, God "left him free, set before him a provoking object, ever almost in his eyes," and then, because man failed to resist that "provoking

object, ever almost in his eyes," drove him out of his presence under a curse. And after all, God is the author of evil, if he exists, because it was he who endowed man with the power actually to produce it. Man's creator is also morally the creator of evil. Dr. Smith's illustration of the "lad who goes to the University and plays the part of Thackeray's Arthur Pendennis, losing his splendid opportunities, and involving himself in disaster and disgrace," is an exceedingly unhappy one, so far as his argument is concerned. "What would you say of him," he asks, "if he cried out against his father for sending him thither, and exposing him to the risk of that free life, especially when his father was meeting his liabilities and offering him a fresh start?" It is passing strange that Professor Smith does not see the real analogy between God as Creator and that boy's father. The true ground of the young man's complaint against his parents, were he to express it, would be, not that they "exposed him to the risk of that free life," but that he had inherited from them a nature fraught with unwholesome and dangerous tendencies. Why was he different from the boys who kept straight and won distinction at the University? If God existed, and were man's Maker, man could justly hold him responsible for all he is and does, because he could not have chosen evil had there not inhered in his constitution a stronger tendency to evil than to good. Otherwise the choice of evil would have been impossible, for exactly the same reason that the choice of evil is held to be impossible for God.

What are we to understand by manhood to which moral freedom is said to be essential? Manhood signifies the state of being a human being and the possession of manly qualities. These manly qualities are the qualities which a man ought to exhibit as a member of society, such as truthfulness, honesty, sympathy, helpfulness, and love. All virtues are social relations. In no other sense do they exist at all. Now, according to Dr. Smith's doctrine, a man cannot be a truth-teller in the moral sense unless he is a potential liar. He cannot be a genuine servant of society unless he has it in him to be a deliberate enemy of it. In other words, a man cannot be moral unless it is equally possible for him to be immoral. If this is not quibbling, what in sanity's name is it? Is it not incontrovertible that in daily life we put our trust in the great law of causation and are not confounded? Do we not order our lives on the principle that honorable people are incapable of dishonorable conduct? If Dr. Smith's doctrine were true, earth would be a veritable hell, for we could not trust one another for two days running. "Moral freedom" would then be synonymous with lawlessness, and a moral agent would mean a lawless agent.

Dr. Smith is entirely mistaken when he seems to hint that those who hold God, if God there be, responsible for all the evils and wrongs of life are only anxious to be relieved of all accountability in the matter themselves. "Excuses," he observes, "are always weak, and when they take the form of accusations, they are criminal." The problem of evil, when honestly faced, gives rise to neither "excuses" nor "accusations," but to a firm conviction that Theism, in all its forms, is fundamentally and absolutely false; that the facts of the Universe, as seen in the clear light of modern science, belie every theodicy the world has ever seen; and that only in the absence of intelligent and purposive guidance could evolution have pursued the course it is now known to have pursued. Man is not a fallen sinner, but a slowly developing animal, who is doing his best, according to his lights, to eliminate undesirable and hurtful elements that are still in his inheritance, and to bring into more and more prominence and power the desirable and profitable ones. For inspiration and help in the accomplishment of this noble task he has only himself and his fellow-beings to rely upon. Dr. Smith's second Adam, like his first, is as non-existent as the sea-serpent of tradition. Our divine is very fond of quoting the utterances of others; but no number of quotations can convert quibbling into reasoning,

or establish the truth of gratuitous assumptions. Nothing but science is destined to survive, and nothing but knowledge can be of service in the gradual ascent of the human race. J. T. LLOYD.

Spain and the Holy "Office."

It is idle to pretend that the spirit of the Inquisition no longer survives in the body of the Church, or that its will to renew upon the flesh and bones and racked nerves of the twentieth century heretic the horrors of the mediæval torture chamber has departed for ever. Not one jot or tittle of the Church's pretensions has been abated, although the power of its holy instruments for torturing mankind into subjection has lessened with the growing years and the increasing power and menace of Freethought. The waning influence of terrorism as a method of locking the conscience of mankind within church doors is seen as well under Protestantism as under Catholicism. Both types of superstition persecuted with the utmost rigor of the law so long as either of them could safely maintain their power to terrorise or obtain the services of wretches, from king and judge down to the common executioner, willing to do the dirty work of torturing, burning, and mutilating the heretic. None of the Churches, with all the long, infamous record of judicial assassination and expropriation behind them, has yet had one tear of contrition or uttered one word of repentance, or disgorged one single penny of the spoils of confiscation by which the clerics of the past and their lineal descendants of to-day were fattened and enriched. He who profits by crime condones the crime, and, in like manner, the gorgeous ecclesiastics, in Spain and elsewhere, of to-day continue to coin their salaries out of the blood of the heretics of the past, and still robe themselves with sacred vestments dyed in the blood of men who, like Ferrer of yesterday, were first assassinated and then robbed.

The Inquisition had the three graces: it had the grace of God to play upon the body of the heretic every tune of torture that a refined malignancy could imagine; the grace of God to kill the heretic; and, finally, the grace of God, after bestowing one or the other of these kind attentions, to rob the victim, to render his name infamous through all generations, and expropriate his fortune and belongings to the service of Holy Mother Church. Pey y Ordeix makes all this very clear in the *Almanack of the Inquisition*, which I again make the fruitful text of these my final observations.* The illuminating instances and references given by him of the working of the Holy Office, show plainly enough that the Inquisition was inspired not only on the spiritual side but on the fleshly and financial sides as well. He points out that the hunt after the heretic was not a chase after butterflies; it was the discovery and exploitation by the astute defenders of the faith of a rich unfailing source of boundless wealth. The love of God and the love of gold burned with equal fervor in their pious breasts.

The method of enrichment was simplicity itself. After fastening upon its victim the charge of heresy, the Inquisition confiscated his property. The spoil was divided into three parts: one for the Inquisition, one for the King, and the third for the informer. Not infrequently the thieves fell out about the division of the spoil. The Inquisition sometimes defrauded the King of his rightful share, and his Catholic Majesty was obliged to frame special laws against the holy defrauders of the royal treasury. On the other hand, the King often succeeded in robbing the Inquisitors by means of harsh fiscal imposts. The Popes, in their turn, intervened, of course, for a consideration, and carried on a brisk trade from Rome in absolutions and patents of exemption which

* *Almanaque de la Inquisición*, por *El Motín*. (Madrid. 1911. Pp. 204. 1 peseta.) See my two previous articles in *Freethinker* of January 28 and February 4, 1912.

purported to guarantee the lives and property of the frightened Spaniards from the menace and exactions of the Holy Office. The Spaniard naturally trembled at the prospect of ending his days in the dungeons of the Inquisition, or of having his house burnt over his head by fire and brimstone from on high; and, like a careful business man, he rushed off to secure the Papal "policy of insurance" of life and property against risk from the all-devouring flames of the Inquisition. It was in July, 1485, that the Bull was promulgated enabling the Inquisitors to admit the heretic to the privilege of secret reconciliation. But the Spanish King regarded this happy family transaction as an act of contraband against the States of the Crown, and insisted upon taking his due share in blackmailing the heretic. Accordingly, on February 14, 1486, the Pope limited the enjoyment of this privilege to the heretics recommended by the King, and ordained that the secret reconciliation should be made in the royal presence. According to the palpitating movements of policy in Spain, the Popes gave or conceded their Bulls of exemption, delegating or conferring their ratification to the Spanish Kings. A procession of heretics swarmed to Rome, preferring to pay to the Pope his blood tax on heresy rather than surrender life and limb to the tender mercies of the Holy Inquisition. All through, it was an odious game of hide and seek, of swindle and extortion as between the Supreme Head of the Church, his most Catholic Majesty of Spain, and the Holy Office. The Inquisitors and the King cried out fraud upon the Holy Father and accused the Pope of cheating the Holy Office out of its rights to kill and confiscate. The Pope wanted his rights satisfied before all others, and while the Inquisitors threatened to burn the Pope and his "policies," the Pope, in his turn, threatened to burn the Inquisitors and confiscate their property. The Pope, for ready money considerations, issued his "policy" of absolution, and then, by other Briefs, authorised the Inquisitors to burn the absolved man and his policy; and in this infamous commerce between Popes in Rome and Kings in Spain—carried on on the holy principle that no faith should be kept with the heretic—a number of terrified souls fled from Spain in order to obtain the safeguard of Roman absolution; and all that was granted to them was an expensive, useless thing of straw.

When the golden stream of Roman absolutions ran dry, another trick, invented by the Pope, was the faculty of recusation, whereby the heretic could offer his objections against the Inquisitor. This raised up another source of revenue for Rome. If the rich heretics paid the heaviest bribe, the Inquisitor was rendered incapable of trying the case; but if the Inquisitor paid heavier toll to Rome, he was confirmed in his function as judge. As the Father Inquisitor could always pay the Papal blood money out of the already confiscated property of the heretic, the latter soon found that his choice was only between that of being financially skinned alive by the Roman Curia or by the Holy Office.

Another dodge invented by the Popes was their claim to rehabilitate the reputation of the heretic. This fiscal contrivance had singular grace and efficacy. The children and grandchildren of the heretic condemned by the Inquisition were pronounced infamous and rendered incapable of holding any office or dignity. To obviate these disabilities the Pope invented a new novelty: the rehabilitation of the dead man's reputation in order that the reputation of the living heirs might be delivered of its inherited disability. To buy this favor the children and relatives of the murdered heretic flocked in procession to Rome with their purses fat with money, and the vicar of God swelled the coffers of the Holy See with blackmail levied on the quick and the dead. In the graphic chapter in which Pey y Ordeix describes these Pontifical proceedings, he quotes in support the terrible *réquisitoire* of Llorente:—

"The Roman Curia was fertile in its ingenuity in inventing the opportunity for fresh applications, in multiplying cases for appeals, secret absolutions before

the notary, absolutions in Rome, exemptions from jurisdiction, recusations, transferring cases to other judges, the rehabilitation of the heretic's fame and memory, dispensations from the fulfilment of penances, and many other things of like nature; but, immoral in her very concessions, Rome annulled them when the Kings complained, because she had already drawn the money, the only guiding star of her conduct!

"Let the reader [adds Llorente] read the Bulls cited in this chapter, and any one can then form his own conceptions and opinion as to the objects which the Papacy had in view when she desired and protected the establishment of the Inquisition in Spain—whether it was zeal for the purity of the Catholic religion, or the wish to discover and exploit a gold mine capable of enriching, as it did enrich, Rome while impoverishing Spain."

The Inquisition, and the system connected with it, was a sort of *Maffia* terrorising and blackmailing mankind. The blackmailing sprang from the terror, and the terror was only possible by the conscientiously unscrupulous organisation of the brute force of the Church for the effectuating of its ends. Any other religion, supported by the same weapons, with its grip as firmly fixed on the throats of the people, from the King on the throne to the beggar in the gutter, would have acted—has acted, and always will act—with the same un pitying disregard of the lives and property of its enemies, and the same unfeeling inhumanity would mark the treatment of its victims. The history of religious persecution proves this on every page of its record, and so far as I can see this "ower true" generalisation is the only extenuation discoverable of the pre-eminent scoundrelism that disgraced the annals of the Holy Inquisition.

St. Paul claimed to live by the altar. The Holy Inquisitors were permitted by the Law I., dated January 9, 1485, in the reign of Philip II., to live on the produce of the confiscation of heretics. Pey y Ordeix cites (p. 119) the eleven provisions of that Law, in order to nail to the counter the daring presumption of the modern Catholic who would venture to deny that the ethics of the thieves' kitchen flourished for ages in the Holy Office of the Inquisition.

The organisation of the Inquisition was very thorough. By the Law above cited the Inquisition was established in Seville, Toledo, and Granada, and fifty familiars—veritable angels of death, the hell-hounds of the Holy Inquisition—were appointed in each city. At Valladolid, Cordova, and Cuenca (fellow sufferer with Cullera in the recent torturings in the Valentian district) forty familiars were named for all three places. Towns of 3,000 inhabitants were afflicted with ten familiars; places with 1,000 people had six; those with 500 only had four, and (curious to relate) places of less than 500 inhabitants, if happening to be seaports, also had four—ozone and sea breezes, it is presumed, favoring the bacteria of heresy. If, however, these smaller places were inland, the faith was esteemed sufficiently protected by the watchful eyes of two familiars, "according to the discretion of the Inquisitors" (p. 119).

The Inquisitorial army was certainly well organised, but although recruited, as we are told, from the ranks of "plain and peaceful men," the King did not rely too much on these qualifications, for the royal decree considers that the familiars were capable of the most heinous crimes: "*lese-majesty*, unnatural offence, sedition, rebellion, the forcing of women, rape, highway robbery, incendiarism, and other offences of even greater enormity": and in anticipation of these crimes the Law declares that the delinquent familiars shall not be exempt from the King's justice (p. 119).

So much has been said about the cruelties of the Inquisition that we are tempted to forget—until Pey y Ordeix pulls us up—that these Jobs did not serve God and torture man for nought. In *El Motin* of January 25, the *Acta del tormento* of Dona Isabel Nunez relates that, after this poor old lady of sixty years of age had been stripped stark naked and tortured, the Inquisitors presented to her their modest

bill of charges, which had to be met out of her estate:—

"To the executioner who tormented her, 220 reales.

"To the surgeon who cured her after the torment, 100 reales.

"For the medicines to cure her, 60.

"For the costs of the tribunal and payment to the Inquisitors, 5,500 reales."

This adding of insult to injury happened on May 17, 1654, at Cuenca, and the full account of the proceedings are in the *Archivo Historico Nacional*.

El Motin is still continuing the publication week by week of these harrowing records of the Holy Office. It is doing a nauseous but necessary work. Buried away in the Archives of Spain are the accusing documents which only await some patient Pey y Ordeix to unearth them for the enlightenment of the nations. It is not enough to read the pages of the ordinary historian with his embellished tale to tell; there is a far-off air of mediævalism, of some closed page of an utterly dead past, about so many of the histories whose writers stand at several removes from the original documents. It is when, as in *El Motin* week by week, or as in *El Almanaque*, published by Nakens at the end of 1911, we are brought right into the chamber of horrors, and are able to watch moment by moment the impassable eye of the Inquisitor and the trembling, quivering form of the racked and robbed heretic, and hear his piercing cries as the torture drags along—it is then that the Inquisition looms before us clothed with an awful reality that tells us how deep-rooted is the hatred of humanity which a fanatical love of God can generate in the human breast.

WILLIAM HEAFORD.

The Gospel Writ in Steel.

CHRISTIAN apologists are never tired of boasting of the tolerance of the religion they profess. At the present moment, when Freethinkers are in prison because of their Freethought, it is well to attempt to dispel the gross ignorance everywhere displayed as to the persecution of "infidels" by their orthodox opponents. Curiously, although trials for blasphemy have been numerous, the comparatively enlightened nineteenth century holds the record for the number of blasphemy and free speech convictions. The reason is not far to seek. For the first time in history the working classes woke to intellectual issues, and Church and State tried hard to strangle Freedom at its birth.

Thomas Paine was one of the earliest to rouse the workers with the Freethought evangel. His *Age of Reason* was circulated extensively. The Freethinkers suffered terribly for publishing this "thunderous engine of revolt." Richard Carlile, one of the bravest soldiers who ever fought for Liberty, endured over nine years' imprisonment. The clergy were aroused by so determined a resistance, and did not hesitate to attack women. Carlile's brave wife and sister were dragged to gaol for two years' each. His shopmen divided among them forty years' imprisonment. Think of it! One small circle of Freethinkers serving between them over fifty years in prison for the right of free speech.

The example of Paine was soon followed. Haslam's *Letters to the Clergy* put the absurdities of Christianity in plain fashion before the people. This was followed by Clarke's *Critical Life of Jesus*. Robert Cooper's *Holy Scriptures Analysed* was another powerful attack on bibliolatry. The clergy were thoroughly alarmed, and Phillpotts, Bishop of Exeter, voiced their terror with no uncertain sound in the House of Lords. Great excitement ensued, and the State clergy and Dissenting ministers for the first time joined hands, and started many new prosecutions against the hated Freethinkers. John Cleave and Henry Hetherington were both prosecuted and sentenced. The Freethinkers were in a fighting mood, and they tested the law to see if it could reach high-class culprits. A prosecution was commenced against Moxon and other publishers for selling

Shelley's *Queen Mab*, for which so many "infidels" had suffered. The ruse succeeded, and Freethought won a step forward. Storm followed, and the first distinctive Freethought periodical, the *Oracle of Reason*, edited by the brilliant and audacious Charles Southwell, was attacked. Southwell was sentenced to a year's imprisonment and a fine of £100. Holyoake, the second editor of the *Oracle*, was the next victim. For a blasphemous remark after a lecture he was sentenced to six months' imprisonment.

Thomas Paterson, the third editor, shared the fate of his predecessors. His defence, published under the caustic title, "God versus Paterson," was astounding in its audacity, and earned for its author the title of "Bulldog." Up in Scotland two Freethinkers, Robinson and Finlay, were sentenced for selling blasphemous works. Then a Freethought heroine, Matilda Roalfe, stepped into the breach, and was sentenced for selling the *Age of Reason*. Her sacrifice was not in vain, and the hydra of clericalism was forced to recoil by the courage of the blasphemers.

In 1857 a poor Cornish well-sinker was sentenced to nearly two years' imprisonment for chalking blasphemous words on a parson's gate. Happily, this case attracted two influential Freethinkers, Buckle and John Stuart Mill. Buckle startled the intellectual world by denouncing such abominable persecution. The prosecuting counsel was John Duke Coleridge, afterwards Lord Chief Justice, and, by the irony of events, the judge in the great blasphemy trial of 1883. It was in this year that the memorable *Freethinker* trials took place. Mr. Foote, who had three trials, was sentenced to a year's imprisonment, and his two colleagues, Ramsey and Kemp, to nine and three months' respectively. Petitions for release were signed by almost everybody of intellectual eminence in England. An agitation was commenced against the Blasphemy Laws, which Judge Stephen well described as "ferocious," but which yet disgrace the Statute Book.

Some of these sentences were very heavy; but, in addition, other indignities were imposed. Daniel Eaton, beside being prosecuted seven times, had the pillory inflicted and £2,500 worth of literature destroyed. The poet, Shelley, was deprived of the custody of his children, and a similar dishonor was inflicted on Mrs. Besant many years later. A very large number of the prosecutions of the unstamped press were simply undisguised blasphemy trials. The authorities covered the odiousness of their acts under cover of proceedings against unstamped papers or pamphlets. Charles Bradlaugh had to win his seat at Northampton in the face of tremendous opposition, and only his alertness prevented his imprisonment for blasphemy. The late Marquis of Queensberry was deprived of his seat in the House of Lords on account of his infidelity. Last, but not least, thousands of pounds bequeathed for Freethought purposes in the past were diverted to other channels. Happily, Mr. Foote has stopped this highway robbery.

The Christian Church sentenced the Freethinkers to prison; but the Freethinkers sentenced the Church to death. The clergy no longer have isolated Freethinkers to deal with; but are now confronted with a compact army upon whose banners is inscribed the significant and stirring phrase, "Crush the Infamous."

MIMNERMUS.

I have made up my mind to say my say. I shall do kindly, distinctly; but I am going to do it. I know there are thousands of men who substantially agree with me, but who are not in a condition to express their thoughts. They are poor; they are in business; and they know that should they tell their honest thought persons will refuse to patronise them, to trade with them.....Every such person is a certificate of the meanness of the community in which he resides. And yet I do not blame these people for not expressing their thought. I say to them: Keep your ideas to yourselves; feed and clothe the ones you love; I will do your talking for you. The Church cannot touch, cannot crush, cannot stop me. I will express your thought.—*Ingersoll*.

Acid Drops.

The Bishop of Oxford (Dr. Gore), formerly of Birmingham, and formerly of the Sermon on the Mount, has been giving his own Church a questionable character at a Caxton Hall meeting. "If you want to get social reform," he said, "you have to go to every kind of Atheist and Nonconformist and every other kind of person. If you go to Churchmen you are confronted with what—well, I shall leave it to Mr. Chesterton to characterise." So, in the language of Jesus Christ, the Atheists go into the Kingdom of Heaven before the members of the Church of England.

The prominence of Freethinkers in the work of mental, moral, and social reform has always been well known. Bishop Gore reveals nothing new. He only breaks the old conspiracy of silence.

Bishop Gore asked a question. It is a question that has been put to Christians by Freethinkers for at least a hundred years. "What would be said," the Bishop asked, "if Christ came into our churches to-day and said what he said about poverty and wealth?" We will answer that question. This is what would be said: "Out you go." And the nearest policeman would look after the rest.

When the Church was disestablished in France, English Protestants began to talk of the glorious opportunity for Protestantism in that country. The *Methodist Times* published special articles on the subject, and English chapol-goers were treated to prophetic pictures of the French people being led captive by that romancing religionist, Gipsy Smith. We pointed out at the time that no one who knew the French people could conceive them being captured by such a moral and intellectual abortion as English Protestantism. Now we observe that no less a person than M. Paul Sabatier points out, in his latest work, that the position of French Protestantism is well-nigh hopeless. He quotes one of the leaders as saying:—

"Our churches and our divinity halls are growing empty. Before long the number of professors will exceed that of the students. The ministerial standard is declining; the local churches find it difficult to adapt themselves to the new conditions, and every election of a pastor becomes an occasion of quarrelling."

Catholic the French people might have remained. A nation of Freethinkers France may become, as it is already in part. But the French mind is too logical in its working, and too uncompromising in its expression, to fall into Protestantism.

"If the movements at present at work go on," says the *Catholic Times*, "fifty years will see the disappearance of all supernatural religion outside the Catholic religion in this land." It also forecasts a great influx of converts into the Church, which "will not be due to the eloquence of her preachers, the skill of her rulers, or the zeal of her propaganda; rather they will come as the natural outcome of the onward sweep of the great anti-Christian movement..... which must result in all those who yet cling to traditional Christianity being forced back on her as their only refuge." We are inclined to agree with this. As a matter of fact, we believe Freethought and Roman Catholicism are both gaining in strength—the first rapidly and the latter more slowly. They represent the logical extremes; and movements do, sooner or later, find their logical place in the sum of things.

Mr. Harold Begbie's batch of Salvation Army "converts" from wickedness to virtue, celebrated in a sensational book of his as evidences of Christianity, have at last been paraded on the platform at a Shepherd's Bush meeting. They turn out to be the usual productions of religious enterprise. Drunkards chiefly, brought to physical sobriety by mental and moral excitement and the constant pressure of a new public opinion. One ill-used his wife, one was always fighting the police, and so on. Such men are the creatures of impulse. Mr. Begbie should try to convert a few brainy criminals.

Christians will never tire of lying about Freethinkers. The last Christian will be found clasping a lie to his breast. It seems full of comfort to these religionists. Ingersoll has been dead nearly thirteen years, yet lies about him still go the round of the United States. We see that a recent article in the *Lawrence Lancet* on Ingersoll remarks as follows:—

"While Bob was raking in the shekels, his wife and daughter were at home attending the Presbyterian Church, and occasionally teaching a class in Sunday-school."

Even if this were true it would be nothing against Ingersoll's character; it would only show that he allowed his wife and

daughters (there were *two* of them) the same liberty that he exercised himself. Nor would it supply any evidence that Ingersoll's lectures were true or false—good, bad, or indifferent. But it is not true. The falsehood was in wide circulation during Ingersoll's lifetime, and his wife and daughters contradicted it again and again in the public press. Contradiction, however, does not kill a pious lie; it does not even impair its prosperity. You would think that the pious lie about Ingersoll's son would have dropped out long ago. It is still alleged that Ingersoll's son went insane through his father's "infidelity" and is still in a lunatic asylum. The fact that Ingersoll never had a son doesn't interfere with the welcome given to this story of an "infidel home."

Note the "Bob" in the lying passage about the Ingersoll family. One can hardly expect liars to show good manners. But how these ill-conditioned fellows would be indignant if we called John the Baptist "Jack," or Jesus Christ "Josh"—for the latter's real name was Jeshua (Joshua) and Jesus is only the Greek form of it.

The Bishop of St. David's got in a home-shot against Nonconformists, the other day. He asked why, when the sphere of the State was being extended to cover so many forms of philanthropic and educational endeavor, should we conclude that "religion is practically the only public interest about which the State should care nothing at all?" Of course, the answer is that religion is not a legitimate concern of the State, but should be left wholly to the individual. From a Freethinker, the answer is conclusive. But how does such a reply lie in the mouth of a Nonconformist? The reply is really based upon the conviction that, so far as the functions of citizenship are concerned, a man is as well off without religion as with it. But does a Nonconformist believe this? If he does, what becomes of the argument that a nation must be saved by its religion? If he does not believe this, how on earth is he going to reply to the Bishop of St. David's? The situation is amusing because there is really little principle on either side. The Bishop clings to his Establishment because it is his church that is established. The Nonconformist clamors for Disestablishment because his church is not established. This is really the essence of the situation. The few men who see a principle, and stick to it, are simply lost in the crowd.

"J. B. is sly, sir! Devilish sly!" Those who took note of the appeals made for the £100,000 on behalf of the new Y. M. C. A. buildings will remember that the chief, almost the whole, emphasis was laid upon its educational, social, and recreative advantages. It was to be a home for young men coming to London. They were to find there clean, healthy recreation, openings for social intercourse, etc. By this method the committee, with the aid of an American hustler, scooped in £70,000. But we gather that certain of the regular and orthodox subscribers of the Y. M. C. A. have been alarmed. They subscribe for the benefit of young men's souls, not their bodies or minds. And as the subscriptions from outsiders have been secured, and the association must now look to its regular supporters for help, the chairman and secretary have issued a notice denying the insinuation that in future "the chief emphasis is to be laid upon educational and recreative advantage, and that less importance is to be attached to soul winning." The council "emphatically" disclaim any said intention, and assure their "old friends" that none of those on the committee would work unless the principal work of the association continued to be that of leading young men "to personal knowledge of Jesus Christ as their Savior." What the committee ought to do is to offer to return all subscriptions which have been given under a misapprehension. We suspect, however, this policy would not be quite in accord with the workings of the Christian conscience.

Humility is one of the Christian virtues, and we are glad to see the *Methodist Times* alive to the fact. Commenting on the "Message" of the Methodist Ecumenical Conference, the editor of the *Methodist Times* remarks that in its statements about "Divine things" it is imperfect. The gracious humility which confesses that there are some things about God imperfectly realised by the Methodist Church is refreshing. Other Churches may take heart, and hope.

An offset to the way in which Christians have been patting themselves on the back because one of the leaders of the Chinese revolution, Sun Yat Sen, is said to be more or less of a Christian, is found in a recent issue of the *Methodist Times*. Writing from Canton, a contributor laments that there is "no really religious sentiment behind the movement." He says, and it is most likely to be true,

that missionaries and native preachers have been denouncing "idolatry," with the sole result that the people have lost, or are losing, their old faith. But they do not appear to be taking on with the white man's creed. On the contrary, there are evidences that "Agnosticism and even blank infidelity are favorite topics of conversation amongst certain sections of the community, and especially by the young, in the exuberance of their new-found liberty." Of course, there follows the usual talk of the "glorious opportunity" opening for the preaching of Christianity; but intelligent Chinamen are not likely to be captivated by a Western form of religion that people at home are getting rid of. China, like Japan, is fairly hopeless so far as Christian missions are concerned.

Here is another compositors' howler. Newman's *Grammar of Assent* was dedicated to Mr. Serjeant Bellasis "in memory of a long, equable, and sunny friendship." The story goes that the "comps." set up "in memory of a long squabble and funny friendship." No wonder Old Nick wouldn't have "comps." in his establishment, and would only give them some matches and brimstone to set up a little bottomless pit of their own.

Ulster Orangemen are trying a new policy, a more peaceful one, but we shall see if it is efficacious. They have been offering up prayers in Ulster churches for the political conversion of the Government. If the Government were asked whether they had felt any interior motions of conversion yet, the Prime Minister would probably answer, "Wait and see." And the praying Orangemen might exclaim, "How long, O Lord, how long?"

The following religious statistics of Ulster from the Census of 1911 are worth looking at:—

Roman Catholics	690,134
Protestant Episcopalians	366,171
Presbyterians	421,566
Methodists	48,490
"All other persuasions"	48,806
Jews	1,336
Information refused	2,069

These figures show that the Protestants are only about nine to seven in comparison with the Catholics. One would think they were nine hundred to seven from the way in which they have been talking lately.

That insufferable person, Rev. F. B. Meyer, is not content with Lord Haldane's decision that rifle-shooting practice may take place on Sunday, provided that attendance is purely voluntary, and that "the amenities of the locality are not interfered with." The policy of letting men do as they please in the matter does not suit Mr. Meyer. They must be prevented doing anything of which he disapproves. His reply to the argument that Sunday is the day on which those who care to do so are free to practise shooting, is that surely employers of labor might be asked to give their men time during the week for practising, without withdrawing them from Church attendance. This is sheer impertinence. Why should employers be expected to give time off so that there may be a chance on Sunday to hear Mr. Meyer? This disciple of the preacher of non-resistance sees no harm in rifle-shooting so long as it is not done on Sunday. And his objection to it on Sunday is that it interferes with his professional occupation. The growth of Stiggins in the social and political world is one of the most ominous of recent developments.

General Booth believes, and his "soldiers" believe it still more, that he is under the special care of Providence. Well, it is a pity that Providence doesn't look after him more carefully. The other day he (we mean the "General") stumbled on the stairs in his home, and bruised and strained himself rather badly. The protection afforded to the General of the first Salvation Army (see Matthew iv. 6) might very well be extended to the General of the present one.

How characteristic is one bit of evidence in the Boxted Farm Colony Inquiry! Mr. George Herring (the "bookie") left £40,000 to General Booth absolutely for the purposes of the contemplated Colony. In a letter dated July 24, 1906, the General "stipulated that he should have the entire administration of the fund." Holy Willie!

Christian charity! This is what Captain Braun said in the recent "scuttling" case:—

"My life has been made intolerable in Penarth owing to the general impression that I scuttled this ship. People won't go to the Lord's table if I am there."

Captain Braun may be a good Christian in a way, but he doesn't appear to be a thoroughly orthodox believer. He

remarked that "The whale which swallowed Jonah performed a physical impossibility." But perhaps he means that a physical impossibility may sleep comfortably in the same bed with a spiritual contradiction.

A ghost has been upsetting the village of St. Mary, near Wisbeach, Cambridgeshire, by rapping at the back door of a cottage. Two spiritualists have laid it. Ghosts haven't a chance nowadays.

Rev. Canon Thomas Teignmouth Shore, formerly chaplain-in-ordinary to King Edward, left £12,328. Not as much as some clerical fortunes, but big enough to keep the ex-poseessor from going through the needle's eye.

Nearly £100,000 is required for the restoration work to be done in Winchester Cathedral—as the Dean announces. All that money to be spent on a house of God while thousands of his creatures live in festering slums! Such is religion.

The Glasgow Presbytery has been talking big against Sunday picture shows. Rev. Mr. Mackinnon said they "had become a menace to the religion of Christ in the city"—which we are pleased to hear. Rev. Mr. Gunson said it was "becoming absolutely intolerable," it was indeed "a popular Sunday evening entertainment, without any pretence to religion about it." Such a state of matters should not be allowed; it was "an abomination," and would have to be "stopped." People crowded in their thousands to see the cinematograph pictures, and, alas, the house of God was neglected. Well, that is sad—for the reverend gentlemen who are straggling to keep up decent congregations. They have our sympathy. But we are unable to recognise their right to suppress competition.

A vast boulder, known as the Rock of the Virgin, fell at Les Cabannes (Ariège) from the hillside through the roof of the church and killed the Abbé Pelegrin, who was celebrating Mass at the altar. A clear case of "Providence."

An earthquake shock has been felt in Scotland. This is getting near home. A bad one has occurred in the Ionian Islands. Several villages are destroyed in Cephalonia. "Providence" again!

The Bishop of Ossory, a member of the recent British deputation of visitors to Russia, preached a sermon at St. Petersburg, which was fairly well reported in the London *Daily Telegraph*. He began by recalling the curious dictum of Leonardo da Vinci that love is the daughter of knowledge; to which he opposed the "doctrine of the Christian Church that knowledge is born of love." It appears to us that both dicta are absurd. William Shakespeare (as usual) hit the bulls-eye with his "Conscience is born of love." One has generally got to go to the uninspired Master for the real truth of things.

"London," says Mr. David Crawford, a Central African missionary, "London is becoming too materialistic; the fight for bread is getting too hard; there is no God in anything. But in Africa they don't need to argue about that. No cannibal dreams of denying the existence of the Everlasting. These things were not arguable away in the dirtiest hole in cannibal land." What a testimonial! The cannibals are such good "believers."

Our warning to lovers of free discussion in our last week's article on "Immoral Literature" is being amply justified already. We see that the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett has been telling a number of Christian preachers and sympathetic ladies at Bristol that the discussion of sex problems is going to be strictly limited to what will not "offend the average common-sense judgment of the father of a family." This was loudly applauded by the preachers and the sympathetic ladies—mostly spinsters. Some of the lovers of free discussion may retaliate with an open attack on the Bible as the dirtiest book in general circulation.

The newly formed Cavendish Club in Piccadilly has a private chapel and a resident chaplain. The spot seems appropriate to the arrangement.

General Gordon, in whose honor (to say nothing of God's) the English cathedral has just been dedicated by the Bishop of London at Khartum, was a very pious Christian. But the Christians need not make too much of that. It is true that he carried about with him a copy of the New Testament, but he also carried the *Meditations of Marcus Aurelius*. Some people would call them Bane and Antidote.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

Orders for literature, of whatever kind, should be sent direct to our new Shop Manager (Mr. H. Sall) at 2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, London, E.C.—and to no one else.

Complaints of any kind should be sent direct to Mr. Foote.

Mr. Foote's Engagements

Sunday, February 11, Queen's (Minor) Hall, Langham-place, London, W.; at 7.30 p.m., "Milton and Burns on the Devil."

February 18, Manchester; 25, Birmingham.

March 3, Liverpool; 10 and 17, Queen's Hall; 24, Leicester.

April 14, Glasgow.

To Correspondents.

C. COHEN'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—February 11, Leicester; 18, Queen's Hall; 25, Glasgow. March 3, Queen's Hall.

J. T. LLOYD'S LECTURE ENGAGEMENTS.—February 11, Glasgow; 25, Queen's Hall. March 3, West Ham; 10, Manchester; 31, Queen's Hall. April 21, West Ham.

PRESIDENT'S HONORARIUM FUND, 1912.—Previously acknowledged, £59 14s. 4d. Received since:—A. H. Smith, 10s.; D. J. D., £5; J. G. Dobson, 5s.; Newcastle-on-Tyne N. S. S. Branch, 10s.; Arthur Firth, 5s.; Robert Stirton and Friends, Dundee (quarterly), £1 10s.; W. Dodd, £1.

E. A. DAVIES.—No need to trouble much about Pastor Wise. He has been "exposing infidelity" (and himself) for more years than we care to count. We cannot even see that he has made any impression on Roman Catholicism in Liverpool. If questions are not allowed after his "exposure" lectures, Free-thinkers should not go near him.

HARRY SHAW.—We note that the new Alfreton N. S. S. Branch was active in organising Mr. Bates's discussion with the Rev. S. Dodd. Glad you are going to have some open-air lectures in the summer.

J. H. LANGFORD.—Yes, the Revised Version shows that "almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian" is a mistranslation. The expression is really not a tribute but a sarcasm.

J. HECHT.—We quite understood, and we thought you would understand too.

E. B.—Thanks for useful cuttings.

F. RICH.—We are obliged.

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

J. G. BARTRAM.—Thanks to the Newcastle Branch.

C. NICHOLLS.—The editor of this journal is not an M.D. Why do you address him so? Neither does he need your reference to Swedenborg.

A. H. SMITH.—Your good wishes are reciprocated.

E. MILLS.—We are glad you have taken our advice about troubling the local press.

PERCY KNIGHT.—Tuesday is too late for paragraphs.

V. WHITTY.—We don't know where you can buy *L'Asino* in England, though we dare say it may be obtained at some one or other of the foreign newspaper shops in Soho.

R. STIRTON.—It is very good of you to take so much trouble. We are getting through this winter nicely on the whole.

R. H. GRANT.—Lecture notices should be drafted on the model of our printed list—not written in the form of a letter. Secretaries save themselves and us trouble by attending to this.

W. G. WILDES.—Look for answer next week.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sugar Plums.

As the Queen's Hall audiences are gathered from all parts of London, and even of Greater London, there was naturally a thin attendance on Sunday evening. Even the main thoroughfares in London were practically deserted. The weather was so shocking that Mr. Foote congratulated himself on finding that his audience was as large as it was in such circumstances. It was a finer compliment to him than a bumping audience might be on a more propitious occasion. Nor did he let the adverse conditions affect his lecture, which was highly appreciated and very warmly applauded. Miss Kough occupied the chair and succeeded in drawing several questioners, who were suitably answered.

It is to be hoped that the weather will be more favorable this evening (Feb. 11), when Mr. Foote delivers the second of the new course of Queen's Hall lectures. His subject is the one that lately drew such a crowded audience at Glasgow on a very wet evening—"Milton and Burns on the Devil." On this occasion Mr. Foote will expand the lecturer's scope a little by introducing Byron's treatment of Satan as well.

Mr. Cohen lectures at the Secular Hall, Leicester, this evening (Feb. 11). Local "saints" have not had an opportunity of hearing him for some time. No doubt they will take advantage of this one.

The press has not treated Mr. Cohen's new book with justice, but that is only what we expected, so we are not upset by the old conspiracy of silence. We have seen one review in the *Morning Leader*, which says:—"A very able and clear discussion of a problem which calls for, but seldom gets, the most severely lucid handling. Mr. Cohen is careful to argue his definitions down to bed rock." Some day before the second coming of Christ we may see similar tributes in other papers.

Mr. J. T. Lloyd delivers two lectures at Glasgow to-day (Feb. 11) in the Secular Hall, Brunswick-street—at 12 noon and at 6.30 p.m. We trust the local "saints" will advertise Mr. Lloyd's visit amongst their friends and acquaintances, and thus secure him large meetings as well as a hearty welcome.

Mr. Joseph Bates's public discussion with the Rev. S. Dodd seems to have been a great success. The Ripley Town Hall was crowded, and the report in the local *Advertiser* praises Mr. Bates's oratory.

Members of the Secular Education League are requested to attend the Annual Meeting at Caxton Hall on Wednesday evening, March 6, at 8. Mr. Halley Stewart takes the chair as the League's President.

London "saints" will remember that the next "social" under the auspices of the N. S. S. Executive is to take place on Monday evening (Feb. 12) at Anderton's Hotel, Fleet-street—starting at 8 and closing soon after 11. N. S. S. members are free to introduce a friend. No charge is made to non-members who may not be able to get introduced in that way, but they must apply to the N. S. S. secretary (Miss E. M. Vance), 2 Newcastle-street, E.C., for tickets of admission. The program includes music, dancing, and "a few words" from the President.

NO TERMINAL FACILITIES.

Two small boys attended church together, and the sermon was long and tedious, to say nothing of being quite above their heads.

"Say, Jim," one urchin remarked, "this man doesn't know how to preach."

"Aw, he knows how to preach all right," was Jimmy's contemptuous answer, "but he hain't no kind of an idea when to quit."

Everyone in the East is familiar with the story of the Chinaman who went to his Sunday-school teacher to say that he did not mean to come any more.

"How is that?" said the missionary; "you seemed to be getting along so nicely."

"Me savey plenty English now; me go hotel-boy; me no care for Amelikan man, Jesus Kilist."—*Douglas Sladen, "The Japs at Home."*

Madame Blavatsky.

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

[Reprinted for the Benefit of Present-Day Readers.]

THE latest book about Madame Blavatsky is entitled *A Modern Priestess of Isis*. The title is by no means so happy as that of the *New Cagliostro*, chosen by Mr. Foote for his open letter to that lady. Madame Blavatsky, though she claimed to have uplifted the veil of Isis, sought rather to be the foundress of a new religion than the priestess of an old one. About this modern priestess there was no austerity and little reticence. She smoked like a chimney, slanged like a music-hall entertainer (which at one time she was), and swore like a trooper. Her oaths were as round and as finished as her cigarettes. Her Theosophy, demanding celibacy for the perfection of occult powers, or perhaps, I should say, assigning non-celibacy as a reason to anyone disappointed at the failure to obtain such powers, it was given out that she was the widow of a Russian General, and the Governor of Erivan, who had left her husband before the marriage was consummated. Really, she ran away some time after her marriage with N. V. Blavatsky, who is still living, (although, according to Mr. Sinnett's untrustworthy *Incidents in the Life of Madame Blavatsky*, the marriage took place in 1848, when she was about seventeen, and he "something between fifty and seventy") without any hope of ever obtaining the generalship or governorship she credited him with, and who had ample cause to consider himself well rid of her. "She had," says the author (p. 141) "the reputation of a priestess of Venus, rather than of Isis." Her early life has not been fully unveiled, and probably is as well left in oblivion. Certainly she had *liasons* with many men.

The famous medium, D. D. Home, who knew her Russian career, speaks of her as of the *demi monde*, and mentions a *liason* with the Prince Emile de Wittgenstein, by whom she had a deformed son, who died at Kieff in 1868.

Madame Coulomb, in a letter to Colonel J. C. Bundy, editor of the *Religio-Philosophical Journal*, of Chicago, in 1885, asserts: "Madame Blavatsky is not Madame Blavatsky; she is Madame Metrovitch. I have known her husband in Egypt."

It was probably the success of D. D. Home, who performed before the Czar, and received a diamond from him, that turned H. P. B. to Spiritism at the period of life when personal charms begin to fade. Certain it is that for many years she was in the medium business.

We gain sight of her in Egypt in 1872. The *Spiritual Magazine* of April for that year (p. 176) reports: "A society of Spiritualists has been formed in Cairo, Egypt, under the direction of Madame Blavatsky, a Russian lady, assisted by several mediums." *Human Nature*, of the same date, has a longer notice, and adds (p. 190): "If you should chance see Mr. D. Home, medium, please tell him that a friend of his late wife, 'Sacha'—a St. Petersburg friend of past years—sends him her best compliments, and wishes him prosperity." Mr. James Burns wrote in the *Daily Chronicle* (September 12, 1891):—

"It may interest your readers to learn that I corresponded with Madame Blavatsky when she was in Cairo twenty years ago. She was then a Spiritualistic investigator of the crudest order, and enclosed a printed circular of her scheme, her quest being to find a physical medium who would go out there and give promiscuous *séances*—a practice which is discountenanced by all enlightened Spiritualists. She then knew nothing of the 'Mahatmas' or the pretended enlightenment of 'Theosophy,' or she never would have thought of opening a shop for phenomenal mediumship."

Madame Coulomb who was with her in Egypt, has left the following account of her "spiritual" fiasco at Cairo:—

"I called again when the closet was ready, but what was my surprise when, instead of finding the kind

spirits there to answer our questions, I found a room full of people, *all alive*, and using most offensive language towards the founder of the Society, saying that she had taken their money and had left them only with this, pointing at the space between the wall and the cloth, where several pieces of twine were still hanging which had served to pull through the ceiling a long glove stuffed with cotton, which was to represent the materialised hand and arm of some spirit. I went away, leaving the crowd as red as fire, ready to knock her down when she came back. Later on I met her again, and I asked her how she came to do such a thing; to which she answered that it was Madame Sebire's doings (this was a lady who lived with Madame Blavatsky), so I let this matter drop. I saw that she looked very unhappy. I called on her the next day, and on hearing that she was really in want I gave her pecuniary help, and continued doing so for some time."

Professor Coues makes the assertion that Madame Blavatsky was expelled from Egypt by the police. She went to Odessa, taking with her Madame Sebire, who abused her confidence so shamefully at Cairo. They started an enterprise of making some extraordinary inks. The speculation was unsuccessful, though utilised afterwards. At Odessa she sought to go in the Russian Service to India *via* Thibet, and her vain attempt to pass that land probably afterwards suggested the location there of the mysterious Mahatmas. She then went to America, landing at New York July 7, 1873. Dr. E. Coues says: "Her real business at that time was in the secret service of her government as a Russian spy, and she was instructed, as usual, to play any part that would divert attention from the facts in the case." One reason for visiting America may be stated in her own words: "For the sake of greater protection than the citizenship of this free country affords." Russian agents in this country and in India are usually naturalised citizens. The fact that H. P. B. was one was urged on her behalf when, upon her arrival in India, she was subjected to formal police surveillance.

Madame Blavatsky went so far in her American citizenship as to get married at Philadelphia early in 1875. Her husband's name was M. C. Betanelly. He was an American from Tiflis, and in business at Philadelphia. Why a lady who had hitherto shown herself untrammelled should have contracted bigamy, with one husband at least still living, is doubtful. Perhaps she thought that at the age of forty-four it is time to become respectable. She pretended to V. S. Solovyoff (author of *A Modern Priestess*) that she was unconscious or hypnotised. Olcott "was a witness at the wedding, and signed the register" (*M.P.*, p. 163). Perhaps he was hypnotised too. The married life of Mrs. Betanelly was brief and stormy. Betanelly scratched the Russian lady, and found the very cream of Tartar. He sought for refuge in the divorce court, and the public records of Philadelphia tell how he obtained it. About the same time the wife of Henry Steele Olcott also obtained a divorce, and the careers of the joint founders of the Theosophical Society were linked henceforward.

Had H. P. B. been only a vulgar impostor and *demi mondaine*, she would certainly never have attracted the attention she did. She was much more. She was a woman of great natural ability, great experience, and great force of character. She had the real secret of all magic—a determined will—and the Committee of the Society for Psychological Research, which sent a special commissioner to India to investigate her alleged wonders there, were constrained to report:—

"For our own part, we regard her neither as the mouthpiece of hidden seers, nor as a mere vulgar adventuress; we think that she has achieved a title to permanent remembrance as one of the most accomplished, ingenious, and interesting impostors in history."

From 1858, when Daniel Douglas Home, immortalised in Browning's "Sludge the Medium," was married in Russia to a sister of Count Koucheleff, one of the richest grandees in the country, Helena Petrovna Blavatsky had been a Spiritist medium. In that year Home met her in Paris, where she

pretended to be a medium. It was, according to Olcott's account in his book entitled *People from the Other World*, at spirit séances at Chiltenden, Vermont, in October, 1874, that he first met H. P. B. Olcott (p. 458) calls her "one of the most remarkable mediums in the world," and gravely relates how numerous spirits came out of the cabinet. Dr. Elliott Coues, formerly president of the Washington Theosophical Society, says of Olcott's book:—

"It is one of the best ghost books extant; full of spectral pictures, not a word of truth in the text, and redolent with the flavor of gullibility. Yet it is a thoroughly dishonest book, for Olcott knew perfectly well, before it came out in book form, that every phenomenon he described was fraudulent; and when somebody proposed to show up the Eddy tricks in their true light, Olcott begged for God's sake not to have it done, because 'it would injure the sale of his work.'"

The manifestations mentioned by Olcott in his book booming Blavatsky having been attacked by Dr. G. M. Beard, H. P. Blavatsky wrote to the *New York Graphic*, October 27, 1874, in defence of Spiritism. She says: "People that know me know I am far from being credulous. Though a Spiritualist of many years' standing, I am more sceptical in receiving evidence from paid mediums than many unbelievers." Again (*New York Graphic*, Nov. 18, 1874): "I deem it my duty as a Spiritualist to," etc. In a letter to *Light* ten years later (October 11, 1884) she said: "I say again, I never was a Spiritualist." Hundreds in America are aware of the contrary. The "familiar spirit" of the lady medium was "John King," buccaneer, who is notable as the original Mahatma. In a letter to Aksakoff (April 12, 1875) she says: "The spirit, John King, is very fond of me, and I am fonder of him than of anything on earth." Colonel Olcott relates that the defunct pirate obligingly offered to commit forgery on any bank desired. This "John King" was such a success that he was patronised by many of the "mejums." The only thing necessary was a hoarse voice and coarse talk. If materialised, a heavy, black horse-hair beard and a white sheet were the only accessories needed. No wonder John was popular. "At this time," says Dr. Coues, "several of her letters to friends, which I have read, are curiously scribbled in red and blue pencils, with sentences and signatures of 'John King,' just as, later on, 'Koot Hoomi' used to miraculously precipitate himself upon her stationery in all sorts of colored crayons." W. E. Coleman, in his *Critical Historical Review of the Theosophical Society* (p. 3) says:—

"Early in 1875 Madame Blavatsky sent to General F. J. Lippitt a picture, which she said had been painted for the General by the spirit John King himself. In *Mind and Matter*, Philadelphia, November 27, 1880, was published conclusive evidence, found in Madame B.'s room in Philadelphia, that she had herself painted this picture, except certain flowers, etc., which were already on the satin when she procured it. Madame B. is known to have fair skill as a painter. Further, Mrs. Hannah M. Wolf, of Washington, D. C., in a published account of her experience with Madame Blavatsky in 1874, has stated that Madame B., having claimed that certain pictures were painted by spiritual power direct, she was watched by three journalists residing in the same house, and they saw Madame B. get up in the night and paint them herself."

V. S. Solovyoff, in his *Modern Priestess of Isis*, has explained from H. P. B.'s own letters to the Russian Spiritist, Aksakoff, how she was forced to find fresh fields and pastures new. D. D. Home had heard of her use of his name, and told the plain facts about her. She had previously dreaded that Aksakoff might reveal something. "To him," says Solovyoff (p. 236), "not foreseeing that she would soon need to play the part of the 'pure virgin,' she presented herself as the 'penitent Magdalen.'" When the blow came she wrote: "There is nothing left but to start for Australia, and change my name for ever." This was, however, not necessary for a woman of her resources, with Olcott to help her. First they started a Miracle Club, and then (Oct. 30, 1875) the Theosophical Society. The immediate cause was the alleged discoveries of a Mr. G. H. Felt, who was said to have

found out the secret whereby the Egyptians evoked the spirits of the dead, and the geometric figures of the Egyptian Cabala. H. P. B., in her *Isis Unveiled* (p. 22), says: "He may one day be recognised as the greatest geometer of the age." Mr. H. J. Newton, the first treasurer of the Theosophical Society, tells how the geometer swindled him out of \$75, which Olcott recommended should be given to him for promised lectures. He adds: "I was out over \$200 before I got through with the society." As the testimony of the first treasurer is somewhat notable, and is referred to neither by Mr. Lillie nor by M. Solovyoff, I reprint some important statements from the *Progressive Thinker* of June 6, 1891:—

"In less than two years the society died a natural death. I resigned both my treasurership and membership towards the end of 1877. For months before my resignation, and up to the time Madame Blavatsky and Colonel Olcott were in Europe in 1878, not more than three members could be got together, so it was impossible to have any legal business meetings. The society was practically dead and abandoned when I resigned. Nevertheless, on the eve of their departure from America, an article appeared in the *Sun* stating that Blavatsky and Olcott had been commissioned by the society to go to India and preach Theosophy to the Hindoos. This was not true, as there was no society then in existence, and no such action at any time appears on its records. 'What was the object of publishing such a statement?' queried the reporter. 'I believe it emanated from Colonel Olcott, and was designed simply to screen the real nature of their visit to India. The Russians were then advancing on the Afghan frontier, and it was of great importance that they should have knowledge of the English position and preparations to resist their movement. Madame Blavatsky had twice visited India before, and was an experienced traveller, a clever talker, and an accomplished linguist, speaking ten or twelve languages. Only a short time before they decided on going she spent the whole evening talking with a member of the Russian Legation here in this house [Mr. H. J. Newton's own house, 128 West Forty-Third-street, New York.] Colonel Olcott was also well fitted for a political mission of this kind. His appointment as Colonel in the United States Army was given him by President Lincoln in recognition of his services as Chief of the United States Secret Service during the war. He was also a linguist of rare ability, speaking six or seven languages. It looks as if the religious or philosophical movement, intended at first only as a cloak to their real mission in India, proved such a success that, when their services were no longer needed by the Russian Government, they kept up Theosophy in India, and afterwards started it in England."

Mrs. Emma Hardinge Britten, at whose house some of the early meetings of the society were held, in the *Two Worlds* (June 5, 1891) independently corroborated Mr. Newton's statement. She says:—

"Quite early in the movement one of the officers first appointed made a series of most damaging statements against the life, conduct, and character of the corresponding secretary, Madame Blavatsky; and as Madame Coulomb's tremendous exposures, Dr. Richard Hodgson's *Psychical Research* volume, and Professor Elliott Coues's *New York Sun* exposures were at that time things of the distant future, the chivalric feeling of the newly formed society induced them to expel the too candid but offending member, swear fealty to the great Psychologist founder, and organise themselves into a secret society, with pass words, signs, and grips."

She notices that a library was formed, and remarks its utilisation in the composition of *Isis Unveiled*. This work, the plagiarisms of which, exposed by W. E. Coleman, are mentioned in the appendix to *The Modern Priestess of Isis*, was a composition founded on many works, and on MSS. left by the Baron de Palma, a gentleman who left also some property to the new society. Professor A. Wilder wrote the preface and supervised some part of the work. *Isis Unveiled* certainly shows talent of a peculiar kind, and some of its tall stories illustrate the imaginative power of its compiler.

Mr. Newton was, I believe, right in his surmise. The original idea in going to India was to rope in the leading native princes, rajahs, and maharajahs, prepare them in the esoteric section for the coming

cataclysm, and, when all was ripe, have messages from the Mahatmas commanding revolt. Political designs in the East are usually worked in this way. The Indian Mutiny was by no means to be attributed solely to the use of greased cartridges, but to industriously circulated prophecies that the rule of the English Feringees would come to an end in one hundred years from the date of the battle of Plassey, June, 1759. We shall see later on that Madame Blavatsky admitted having such a scheme.

Before going to India, Olcott wrote to Swami Dyanand Saraswati, president of the Arya Samaj, that the title of the Theosophical Society should be changed to the Theosophical Society of the Arya Samaj, acknowledging the Swami as chief. Early in 1882, however, he realised that he had been imposed upon, and publicly denounced them. In India, Theosophy assumed new features. Spiritism, with its threefold nature of man, was changed for Occultism, with its sevenfold nature. We now hear, for the first time, of the mysterious occult Brotherhood residing in that enlightened but inaccessible country, Thibet. Hindus had for ages believed that holy men called *yogis* could, by a course of meditation or asceticism, obtain magical powers which placed them out of the category of ordinary mortals, and told wonderful stories of these Paramokshas or Mahatmas. The Theosophical adepts were modelled partly on the Indian *yogis*, partly on the mystical Mejnour, in Lytton's *Zanoni*. They could perceive occurrences and precipitate messages, despite any distance, and only used their powers for good. In short, they possessed all the qualifications requisite to make good Scotland Yard detectives.

(To be continued.)

The Arm to Save.

PROBABLY the most remarkable and suggestive feature of the present age is the growing distrust of the Churches, accompanied by an ever-increasing interest in sociological problems. The decline of Christianity is coincidental with an increased appreciation of the necessity for social reform. We are informed from different quarters that the "social conscience" has been aroused; but the impudent claim of ecclesiastical leaders that religion is the cause of the demand for humanitarian measures is sufficiently answered by the facts. As humanistic agencies advance the supernatural beliefs decay.

The wail of the ancient poet that there was "neither eye to pity nor arm to save" is received to-day in a very different way from that in which it was received in days of old. It was *then* supposed that the *only* deliverance from all the ills from which mankind suffered was by the arm of the Lord. But as knowledge has increased and the great principles of evolution have been better understood, man has had his vision clarified, his mind purified, his emotions turned to helping and serving his fellows. It is the eye of humanity that, with true charity, now pities the woes of humanity. It is the arm of humanity that shall deliver humanity. "Waiting on the Lord" is the greatest futility. We must not sit with folded hands; we must be up and doing.

One of the greatest foes to active service for humanity on secular lines is the morbidity engendered in superstitious minds by the "teachings" of supernaturalism. Another foe to progress is self-interest. One does not wish to be severe on individuals who are shut up or imprisoned in a narrow groove by the force of circumstances. The pioneer, the man who is living in advance of his own time, has usually to run great risks. But it is to be feared that there are many people in our midst enjoying considerable independence and actually convinced of the desirability—nay, the necessity—for a secular solution of the evils under which myriads groan and suffer, but who, from indolence, love of comfort, or a distaste for the *sturm und drang* of the arena, do not

give themselves actively to the advancement of the cause which has won their intellects and sympathies.

There is a well-known story which illustrates what the writer is driving at. On one occasion two Scottish clergymen were being ferried over a loch by a stalwart Highland boatman, when a storm arose with such sudden violence as to place the boat in jeopardy. The boatman manfully struggled to keep the boat in the safest possible situation, when one of the clergymen—a tall, powerful man—proposed to offer up prayer. The boatman quickly interposed. "Na, na," he said, "deil a bit. The wee yin"—indicating the other parson, a very small man of slight proportions—"can pray as muckle as he likes; but you'll tak an oar."

When a plague or an epidemic visits the community nowadays, we do not rush to the churches and set the priests a-praying to stop the trouble; we depend upon our knowledge of science; clean out our drains and perfect our sanitary arrangements. Similarly, we do not now regard mental weakness or derangement as the work of extra-natural agencies. Again science steps in to guide us. We have been able to trace the diseases to their causes, and we do what we can in a rational manner and by rational methods to deal with these causes. We are able to detect, classify, and in a measure to account for eccentricities and abnormalities in nature. There are no witches or sorcerers nowadays. And as witches or sorcerers have disappeared, so must priests and other mystery-mongers disappear also.

So, also, it is science and true charity—not the "philanthropy" of the C. O. S. or the sloppy sentimentalism of the Churches—which shall effectually dispose of moral weaknesses and deficiencies and defects. An emancipated humanity will not consist of men and women washed in blood. The greatest force known to us is *human* love, and human love cannot be set free to do its own work in an enlarged and enlarging sphere until the bonds and shackles of supernatural terrorism have been struck from the limbs of the people. Modern psychology is, however, working in the direction of a better appreciation of human individualities, and all the great branches of science—biology, sociology, botany, geology, zoology, and astronomy—the more they are studied point with ever-deepening insistence to a monistic, as opposed to a dualistic, conception of life and the universe. We are all parts of one mighty whole. Religion has always meant division, dissension, disaster. Secularism means union, harmony, healing. Religion imposes belief without knowledge. Secularism says "Prove all things: hold fast that which is good." The greatest lie of religion to-day is that belief is synonymous with morality, and unbelief with immorality. A big, sane, charitable view of life can only be attained from the standpoint of Freethought.

SIMPLE SANDY.

Seeing God.

(Reprinted from the New York "Truthseeker.")

THE best time to see God is probably at night, when nothing else can be seen. What one would see if one saw God is hard to tell. There have been human beings who have seen strange things, if they are to be believed. Men and women one hundred, two hundred, three hundred years ago could see lots of things that did not exist much better than men and women can to-day. Once fairies could be seen, but not to-day. Once ghosts could be seen, but not to-day. Once witches could be seen, but not to-day. Where have these creatures gone? Once the Devil lived on earth and terrified the good people who believed in him. Where is he now? Has he changed his abode? Thousands of persons have seen the Devil where one person has seen God. Even the father of Protestantism, the great Luther, saw the Devil and threw his inkstand at him. Why do we not see things to-day? Why does not someone see a witch, see a fairy, see a ghost, see a Devil, or see God? What is the reason for our blindness?

A great many persons have claimed to be on intimate terms with the Lord. None of these has impressed the world with his claim than has Moses. Mankind generally,

as well as the Israelites in particular, have had confidence in his word. Moses has been regarded as standing very close to God, and as having relations with him such as to make him, as it were, the mouthpiece of God. He spoke for the Lord when the Lord wished to communicate with his people. The common language of the Scripture is, "The Lord said unto Moses," etc., and "Moses said unto the people," etc.

We have now reached a time when no man's claim to divine inspiration, to divine knowledge, or to relations with divinity, can go unchallenged. Moses has escaped this challenge practically since he claimed to have been called up into Mount Sinai for a conference with the Lord God, but he can no longer enjoy this immunity. He is called to account for his language. He must answer to the reason and common sense of the twentieth century, and no longer hide behind the protection of ancient superstition.

If Moses had any knowledge of God, of the divine existence, of the person of God, then it was his duty to give such knowledge to the world in which he lived. What we know of Moses is what he himself has told us, or, rather, what is told to us as his words. Now, in these words have we the language of Moses? Did Moses ever live? If he is a fictitious character, a myth, it is of no account what he said about God or anybody else. If Moses never lived on earth, then we want to get the fellow who has told us of this Hebrew, who filled so much prehistoric space, and who has discoursed so familiarly about God.

But it is to our purpose to assume that Moses was a real character. As someone told the extraordinary stories contained in the book of Exodus, it is just as well to accept him as the author of them as to give the credit to the man who hid behind his name.

The question for us to consider is this: Did Moses give to the world any knowledge of God? And if he did, where and how did he obtain such knowledge? If he knew anything of God, then God must have given him this knowledge, or he must have acquired it through association with God. We have only the word of Moses for everything he tells us about God. Is that word true? Is what he tells us worthy of human belief?

We will consider the words of Moses in only three instances. In the nineteenth chapter of Exodus, Moses makes the Lord say: "The third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people upon Mount Sinai." This promise was broken. The Lord went back on his word. Up to this time, although Moses had had several conversations with God, he had not seen him. In the twenty-fourth chapter of Exodus we read: "Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu and seventy of the children of Israel. And they saw the God of Israel.....And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid out his hand; also, they saw God."

Now, if Moses was not a liar, he, with three of the priests and seventy of the elders, and all of the nobles of the children of Israel, looked upon God.

What shall we say of this man after what he wrote in the twenty-fourth chapter of Exodus, to read in the thirty-third chapter of this book these words of God: "Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see me and live"?

In which of these three instances did Moses or God tell the truth?

How much does one know of God after reading all that Moses says about him?

It may be true that no man can see God and live, but we know of one who is willing to take a chance if he can get a peep at him. The sight of God would clear up the divine mystery as nothing else can do. If God will just come out into the light where he can be seen by men and women, we will guarantee that everyone will try to get a glimpse of him.

To the reason and common sense of this century all that Moses says about God is but silly stuff, without any intelligent meaning.

Moses claimed to bring from God's own hand the Ten Commandments, and he started the notion going of a divine Providence in the affairs of mankind. This man is responsible not only for Judaism, but also for Christianity, more or less, and it is in his words that the world to-day finds its stoutest arguments for the existence of God.

But Moses in the light of human knowledge did not reveal God to man; he only added to the superstition of men. The Lord existed in the imagination of Moses. He created him and made him do all his wonderful works. Moses led the children of Israel out of Egypt and gave God the credit of the enterprise. He wrote the Ten Commandments and put them in the mouth of God. He brought the tribes of Israel together and bound them by the name of God. The God of Moses has become the God of Christendom, but this Deity never did anything after the death of Moses worthy of a decent God. When Moses died the Lord God was put in his tomb.

L. K. WASHBURN.

Correspondence.

THE HOLY INQUISITION.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Congratulations to the *Freethinker* and Mr. Heaford upon being the first to announce to the English-speaking races—for the *Freethinker* penetrates wherever the English language is spoken—the good news of the rehabilitation of Ferrer. The news was evidently suppressed by the usual news agencies, and is even now known to comparatively few in this country.

As a resident of Wolverhampton, I was pleased to see, in the local *Express and Star* of January 30, a letter from Mr. E. Mills, of Willenhall, giving a long quotation—with due acknowledgements to Mr. Heaford and the *Freethinker*—containing all the facts of Ferrer's vindication. Mr. Mills contributes his letter as a final reply to some correspondents who wrote, some months ago, professing to believe in the charges made against Ferrer.

Mr. Heaford, besides informing us of Ferrer's vindication, has done another service by bringing to our notice the fresh facts concerning the devilries of the Inquisition, brought to light by Pey y Ordeix from the National Historical Archives at Madrid, and published in *El Motin*; also, for his introduction to Naken's *Almanaque de la Inquisición*. I, for one, do not think that these facts should be allowed to relapse into oblivion, considering that there is a party—at any rate, in Spain—ready to practise the same tortures again at the first opportunity.

Mr. Foote wrote a chapter upon the Inquisition for the second volume of his *Crimes of Christianity*, but I believe the whole edition was destroyed in the disastrous Clerkenwell-green fire; at least, I have never been able to obtain a copy. I suggest that this be republished, and that a translation of some of the new facts disinterred from the Archives at Madrid be incorporated with it. This would make a formidable propaganda pamphlet.

I also agree with Mr. W. Bailey that the Secular party should take "A long pull and a pull altogether" to relieve Mr. Foote of a great deal of the drudgery which now devolves upon him. The great bulk of his work is not seen or realised—the editing of this paper is only a part of it, and he is not growing younger. As Mr. Bailey remarks, "the effort would bring its reward"; it would set Mr. Foote free to give us his Autobiography—what a work that would be, my stars!—the second volume of his *Crimes of Christianity*, and enable him to devote more time to literary work. Let the party put its shoulder to the wheel before it is too late.

W. MANN.

THE SOUL, WHERE DID IT COME FROM?

Suppose chloroform should be administered to two men. At the end of half an hour one recovers from its effects, the other dies. The one who regains consciousness will tell you that during his unconscious condition he was perfectly oblivious to everything that was transpiring around him. That he did not realise whether he was dead or alive—whether it was day or night, hot or cold; that he could neither hear, see, nor feel; that if he had been touched with a hot iron he would not have felt it.

Now, in the beginning these two men must have been affected precisely alike as far as knowledge is concerned. The difference was that at the end of half an hour the one regained his conscious condition, the other remained unconscious.

Now, the Christian claim is that after life became extinct, his knowledge returned, and that he even knew more than he did while living. Is this a reasonable conclusion? I believe it will be conceded that all animals have knowledge according to the size and quality of the brain.

But there can be no knowledge where there is no brain, and there is no difference between no brain and a dead brain so far as knowledge is concerned.—*John Peck*.

Obituary.

EDMONTON Freethinkers deeply regret the loss of an exceptionally active and enthusiastic supporter, W. Paling, sixty-one, who died after long months of terrible suffering, the result of over-work and insufficient food and sleep. He was locally known as the Old Warhorse. His motto, "The world is my country, mankind are my brethren, to do good is my religion" (Paine), is intended as an inscription for his coffin.—J. HECHT.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

LONDON**INDOOR.**

QUEEN'S (MINOR) HALL (Langham-place, W.): 7.30, G. W. Foote, "Milton and Burns on the Devil."

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (Workman's Hall, Romford-road, Stratford, E.): 7.30, F. A. Davies, "The World, the Flesh, and the Devil."

OUTDOOR.

EDMONTON BRANCH N. S. S. (The Green): 7.45, E. Burke, "The Present Position of the Bible." (Weather permitting.)

COUNTRY.**INDOOR.**

GLASGOW SECULAR SOCIETY (Hall, 110 Brunswick-street): J. T. Lloyd, 12 noon, "The Moral Ideal, Motive and Reward"; 6.30, "A Puzzling Paradox: All Things Die; There is No Death."

LEICESTER SECULAR SOCIETY (Secular Hall, Humberstone Gate): 6.30, C. Cohen, "What the World Pays for Religion."

LIVERPOOL BRANCH N. S. S. (Alexandra Hall, Islington-square): 7, A. G. Sweeney, "Is Blasphemy a Crime?"

MANCHESTER BRANCH N. S. S. (Secular Hall, Rusholme-road, All Saints): 6.30, R. C. Phillips, "Thoughts on Food Reform."

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.

SUPPLIES A LONG FELT WANT.

NOW READY.

Determinism

OR

Free Will?

BY

C. COHEN.

Issued by the Secular Society, Ltd.

A clear and able exposition of the subject in the only adequate light—the light of evolution.

CONTENTS.

I. The Question Stated.—II. "Freedom" and "Will." III. Consciousness, Deliberation, and Choice.—IV. Some Alleged Consequences of Determinism.—V. Professor James on "The Dilemma of Determinism."—VI. The Nature and Implications of Responsibility.—VII. Determinism and Character.—VIII. A Problem in Determinism.—IX. Environment.

PRICE ONE SHILLING NET
(POSTAGE 2d.)

Published by the WALTER SCOTT COMPANY.

Also on Sale by

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

THE SECULAR SOCIETY
(LIMITED)

Company Limited by Guarantees.

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.

WORKS BY G. W. FOOTE.

WORKS BY COL. INGERSOLL

	s.	d.
ATHEIST SHOEMAKER, THE, and the Rev. Hugh Price Hughes	post ½d.	0 1
BIBLE ROMANCES. Popular edition, with portrait, paper	post 2½d.	0 6
BOOK OF GOD, THE, in the Light of the Higher Criticism. With Special Reference to Dean Farrar's Apology. Paper... ..	post 2d.	1 0
Bound in cloth	post 2d.	2 0
CHRISTIANITY AND SECULARISM. Public Debate with Rev. Dr. McCann	post 2d.	1 0
Bound in cloth	post 2d.	1 6
DARWIN ON GOD	post 1d.	0 6
DEFENCE OF FREE SPEECH	post 1d.	0 4
DROPPING THE DEVIL: and other Free Church Performances	post ½d.	0 2
DYING ATHEIST, THE. A Story.	post ½d.	0 1
FLOWERS OF FREETHOUGHT. First Series, cloth	post 3d.	2 6
GOD SAVE THE KING. An English Republican's Coronation Notes	post ½d.	0 2
HALL OF SCIENCE LIBEL CASE, with Full and True Account of the "Leeds Orgies"	post 1d.	0 3
INTERVIEW WITH THE DEVIL	post ½d.	0 2
IS SOCIALISM SOUND? Four Nights' Public Debate with Annie Besant	post 1½d.	1 0
Bound in cloth	post 2½d.	2 0
INGERSOLLISM DEFENDED AGAINST ARCH-DEACON FARRAR	post ½d.	0 2
IMPOSSIBLE CREED, THE. An Open Letter to Bishop Magee on the Sermon on the Mount	post ½d.	0 2
JOHN MORLEY AS A FREETHINKER	post ½d.	0 2
LETTERS TO THE CLERGY (128 pages)	post 2d.	1 0
LIE IN FIVE CHAPTERS, or Hugh Price Hughes' Converted Atheist	post ½d.	0 1
MRS. BESANT'S THEOSOPHY. A Candid Criticism	post ½d.	0 2
MY RESURRECTION. A Missing Chapter from the Gospel of Matthew	post ½d.	0 2
NEW CAGLIOSTRO, THE. An Open Letter to Madame Blavatsky	post ½d.	0 2
PECULIAR PEOPLE. An Open Letter to Mr. Justice Wills	post ½d.	0 1
PHILOSOPHY OF SECULARISM	post ½d.	0 3
REMINISCENCES OF CHARLES BRADLAUGH	post 1d.	0 6
ROME OR ATHEISM? The Great Alternative	post 1d.	0 3
SALVATION SYRUP: or Light on Darkest England. A Reply to General Booth	post ½d.	0 2
SECULARISM AND THEOSOPHY. A Rejoinder to Mrs. Besant	post ½d.	0 2
SIGN OF THE CROSS, THE. A Candid Criticism of Mr. Wilson Barret's Play	post 1½d.	0 6
THE PASSING OF JESUS. The Last Adventures of the First Messiah	post ½d.	0 2
THEISM OR ATHEISM. Public Debate	post 1½d.	1 0
WAS JESUS INSANE?	post ½d.	0 1
WHAT IS AGNOSTICISM?	post ½d.	0 3
WHO WAS THE FATHER OF JESUS?	post ½d.	0 2
WILL CHRIST SAVE US?	post 1d.	0 6

	s.	d.
A CHRISTIAN CATECHISM	post 1d.	0 6
A WOODEN GOD	post ½d.	0 1
CHRISTIAN RELIGION, THE	post ½d.	0 3
CREEDS AND SPIRITUALITY... ..	post ½d.	0 1
CRIMES AGAINST CRIMINALS	post ½d.	0 3
DEFENCE OF FREETHOUGHT	post ½d.	0 4
DEVIL, THE	post 1d.	0 6
DO I BLASPHEME?	post ½d.	0 2
ERNEST RENAN	post ½d.	0 2
FAITH AND FACT. Reply to Rev. Dr. Field	post ½d.	0 2
GOD AND THE STATE	post ½d.	0 2
HOLY BIBLE, THE	post ½d.	0 2
HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH, THE	post ½d.	0 2
HOUSE OF DEATH (Funeral Orations)	post 2d.	1 0
INGERSOLL'S ADVICE TO PARENTS.—Keep Children out of Church and Sunday-school	0	0 1
LAST WORDS ON SUICIDE	post ½d.	0 2
LIVE TOPICS	post ½d.	0 1
LIMITS OF TOLERATION, THE	post ½d.	0 2
MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE. An Agnostic's View	post ½d.	0 2
MYTH AND MIRACLE	post ½d.	0 1
ORATION ON LINCOLN	post ½d.	0 3
ORATION ON THE GODS	post 1d.	0 6
ORATION ON VOLTAIRE	post ½d.	0 3
ORATION ON WALT WHITMAN	post 1d.	0 3
REPLY TO GLADSTONE	post 1d.	0 4
ROME OR REASON?	post 1d.	0 3
SHAKESPEARE	post 1d.	0 6
SOCIAL SALVATION	post ½d.	0 2
SUPERSTITION	post 1d.	0 6
TAKE A ROAD OF YOUR OWN	post ½d.	0 1
WHAT MUST WE DO TO BE SAVED?... ..	post ½d.	0 2
WHY AM I AN AGNOSTIC?	post ½d.	0 2

Orders to the amount of 5s. sent post free.

Postage must be included for smaller orders.

THE PIONEER PRESS,

2 Newcastle-street, Farringdon-street, E.C.

J. W. GOTT IN PRISON.—During the time Mr. Gott is tasting Christian Charity in a Prison Cell, Freethinkers can do him a turn by writing for patterns and self-measurement form of his famous 42s. Suits to Measure, which I am offering to do for 30s., cash with order. Ladies in sympathy will do well to write for Dress or Costume patterns, just out, or enclose 21s. for one pair Blankets, one pair Sheets, one Quilt, one pair Curtains, one long and two short Pillow Cases—only 21s. the lot. This parcel I can recommend as real good value.—Mrs. GOTT, 696 Bolton-road, Bradford.

ENGAGEMENT WANTED by a Ledger Clerk in a firm of Freethinkers; good writer; a steady reliable worker. London or country. Salary 28s. per week.—KING, 13 Camera-square, Chelsea, S.W.

POST REQUIRED by young countrywoman; refined; very bright; domesticated; good business abilities. Home lost through death. Freethinker. Broad views.—E. VICK, The Elders, Storrington, Sussex.

SUNDAY EVENING FREETHOUGHT LECTURES

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

AT

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

February 11.—Mr. G. W. FOOTE:

“Milton and Burns on the Devil.”

” 18.—Mr. C. COHEN:

“Materialism and Life.”

” 25.—Mr. J. T. LLOYD:

“Has Science Turned Religious.”

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.

A LIBERAL OFFER—NOTHING LIKE IT.

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

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



Ignorance kills—knowledge saves—be wise in time. Men weaken, sicken, die—not knowing how to live. “Habits that enslave” wreck thousands—young and old. Fathers fail, mothers are “bed-ridden,” babies die. Family feuds, marital miseries, divorces—even murders—All can be avoided by self-knowledge, self-control.

You can discount heaven—dodge hell—here and now, by reading and applying the wisdom of this one book of 1,200 pages, 400 illustrations, 80 lithographs on 13 anatomical color plates, and over 250 prescriptions.

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

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

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

Most Grateful Testimonials From Everywhere.

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

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

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

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

Price EIGHT SHILLINGS by Mail to any Address.

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