

THE Freethinker

Edited by G. W. FOOTE.

VOL. XXXII.—No. 21

SUNDAY, MAY 26, 1912

PRICE TWOPENCE

Is the earth only a hospital? are health and heaven to come?—JOHN RUSKIN.

“Ye Have Heard His Blasphemy”

—Matthew xxvi. 65.

THE words forming the heading of this article were spoken by the Jewish high priest in Jerusalem at the preliminary examination of Jesus Christ when he was arrested. Jesus and the high priest, in presence of the Sanhedrin, got mixed up in a sort of theological controversy, and as the Prophet of Nazareth was under a cloud just then his language was naturally “offensive” to the other gentleman in the dispute, and to all that gentleman’s friends. “Ye have heard his blasphemy,” said the eminent official to the poor friendless prisoner. He invited them to say what they thought of it, and as straight as a thunderbolt came their answer. “He is guilty of death,” they cried. And the next moment they were spitting at him and knocking him about, according to what the late Mr. Matthew Arnold called “the usual amenities of theological discussion.”

The life of Jesus in the four gospels is probably all imaginary, but the writers were well-informed and clever in their way. That little picture of Jesus and the high priest, and the Sanhedrin, and the examination of the prisoner, and the charge of blasphemy, and its prompt endorsement, and the sweet temper of the “authorities,” and the abuse of the “blasphemer” in the dock, is painted with a skilled and powerful hand. The artist knew the “give a dog a bad name and hang him” character of such occurrences. To cry “blasphemy!” against a man was to give him short shrift either before a mob or in a criminal court.

Happily for Jesus, if he had only possessed the sagacity to extricate himself honorably from a dangerous position, the Jewish Sanhedrin could no longer pass capital sentences. The power of life and death was reserved to the Roman governor. Moreover, the Roman authorities carried out with strict impartiality the principle of toleration, which was sacred to the Roman jurisprudence. Pontius Pilate, therefore, would not receive a charge of “blasphemy.” As an educated Roman he knew all about that contemptible outcome of religious bigotry. He was not going to take sides in a mere sectarian quarrel; still less was he going to shed the blood of one religionist to please the malignancy of others. Accordingly, he dismissed the case; and in order to secure the death of Jesus his enemies had to arraign him before the tribunal of Pilate on a charge of sedition against Rome.

The impartial toleration within the Roman Empire is further shown in the Acts of the Apostles. It is not an “infidel” allegation but a Christian admission. Paul, being in dire peril from the fanaticism of his fellow Jews, and recollecting that he was a free-born Roman citizen, cried out, “I appeal unto Cæsar.” That was his shield and it gave him full protection.

One would think that the Christians would loathe the very word “blasphemy” after its wicked mis-

chief was tried upon the founder of their faith. But the fact is precisely the opposite. They have been positively in love with the word, hurling it at everybody who denied the truth of any point of their religion, and, when that was no longer feasible, shouting it at everybody who criticised their creed with the freedom allowed in the discussion of all other questions. What a disgraceful chapter of history they have filled in with their doings in this line may be seen in Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner’s excellent little book entitled *Penalties Upon Opinion*.

From 1888, when the *Freethinker* prosecutions took place, the Blasphemy Laws slumbered until they were roused up in the recent Boulter case in London. Since then there have been two prosecutions at Leeds, with the result of three and four months’ imprisonment respectively to Messrs. Stewart and Gott. More recently still came the prosecution of Mr. T. A. Jackson at Leeds and his imprisonment for a fortnight. This diminution of punishment needs an explanation. It is not due to Christian mercy.

Mr. Jackson was not prosecuted for “blasphemy,” although his “offence” was precisely the same as that of the other culprits. He was prosecuted under the Police Act of July 22, 1847, which provides for the maximum sentence of fourteen days’ imprisonment on any person who “sings any profane or obscene Song or Ballad, or uses any profane or obscene language” in the public streets. Mr. Jackson argued quite rightly, in our judgment, that this Act could never have been intended to apply to the language of speakers carrying on public discussions in public open spaces provided or commonly used for such purposes. The Assistant Stipendiary’s ruling on that point would probably have been upset on appeal. Still worse, if possible, was Mr. Marshall’s treating “profanity” and “blasphemy” as the same thing. Any police-court can deal with the former; the latter must go the Assizes. This, indeed, is provided for by a special statute. Mr. Atkinson, the Senior Stipendiary, would not have blundered as Mr. Marshall did.

The police secured a conviction in Mr. Jackson’s case by their usual methods. Single sentences were torn from the context, touched up for the worse, and presented to the Court together, as if they were all spoken consecutively, if not in the same breath. Any treatment is good enough for an Atheist. The formality of law is all that he can expect. And the Leeds clergy, as well as the Leeds police, are thoroughly satisfied with this travesty of justice. We wonder what they would say if Freethinkers got the upper hand in England (as they have in France) and treated them in the same fashion.

A similar prosecution is pending, as we write, at Ilkeston. Two Nottingham Freethinkers went over there on Sunday, May 12, one delivering an open-air lecture, and the other taking the chair. The lecturer is proceeded against for using “profane language” and the chairman for “aiding and abetting” him. The case is to be heard on Thursday (May 23). We have given Messrs. Chasty and Muirhead all the advice and help we can, and we hope the magistrates will not follow the Leeds example. We wish we felt certain on that point. In any case, the police will not frighten Freethought speakers into silence. This is the one point that is certain.

G. W. FOOTE.

Religion and Life.—IV.

(Continued from p. 307.)

As a clear example of the influence of religion on race preservation, Mr. and Mrs. Whetham cite the Jews. They say:—

"Alone among the ancient religions, that of the Jews has survived in the Western world to the present time. They disliked the alien populations with whom they were surrounded, and discouraged association and inter-marriage with them.....The segregating genius of their great Law-giver, and the code attributed to him, embodying the national experience, seems to enshrine the many profound biological truths.....No system less organically sound from the biological point of view could have made it possible for a nation, insignificant in numbers, bereft of a fixed habitation, to survive so many of its oppressors."

In the same vein, a *Times* reviewer, with that air of finality which seems characteristic of review writing, remarks:—

"Biologically, there is no doubt of the 'purity' of the Jewish race, at any rate, for the last three thousand years.....The two features in the Jewish code which stand out most clearly are, first, the restriction against marriage with non-Jews; and, secondly, the large number of sanitary laws. In fact, we see in the history of the Jews a nation developed largely according to two of the principles advocated by eugenicists, the pure breeding extending over a large number of years, and the less important principle of the maintenance of environment at as high a level as possible."

To me those two quotations are interesting chiefly because of their ability to illustrate the power of tradition. Otherwise, there is not a single point in them that is not open to serious challenge, and many to actual disproof. To name some of them rapidly: (1) The Jews are not a "pure race" at all. Inter-marriage has always existed from Biblical times down to our own day. (2) The segregation of the early Jews was most probably of a totemic origin, and rested on no better foundation than similar segregation amongst existing uncivilised people. (3) The bar against marrying aliens was not a eugenic prohibition, and never had the slightest connection with biological fitness or unfitness. It was based on religious difference, and once this was overcome, no other objection remained. (4) The Jewish people present much the same variations of character and physique presented by other races under similar conditions. (5) The Jewish problem, with the persistence of the Jews, is fundamentally a question of sociology, and not of religion at all.

There is, perhaps, no surer indication of want of balance in a writer than the tendency to credit people living in one culture-stage with opinions that only arise at a much later stage of development. It is this that, in the religious world, leads to people crediting Jesus Christ with teachings that have direct and exclusive application to modern life, or, in science, to credit a writer, such as Aristotle, with opinions that, in the absence of data which did not then exist, it would have been impossible for him to originate. The greatest genius cannot nourish itself on air; and there is a profound lesson in Swift's delightful stricture on Homer's ignorance of the Church of England's Articles. In a real sense, and not in the fallacious Bergsonian sense, opinions grow out of life, life does not proceed from opinion. Thinking and teaching, whether they be those of a fool or a sage, are necessarily dependent upon contemporary social development. The genius creates only in the sense that he recombines in terms of a wider generalisation and a more profound insight.

To credit Jewish tribal religion with a teaching that could only be based upon knowledge which we know the Jews did not possess, is in the highest degree absurd. The minute attention to details of social life among the early Jews, to which Mr. and Mrs. Whetham refer, have no genuine eugenic value; or, if they have, it is as accidental as the regulations that govern primitive life in general. As a matter of fact, the protective power of the Jewish dietary

has been extremely over-valued from a medical point of view, while fundamentally it rested upon the totemic basis that is found existing in savage life generally. The Jews, as members of a class, did not eat the totems of the clan. One need only to read the list of prohibited foods in the eleventh chapter of Leviticus to realise that the "knowledge of obscure facts" to which our authors refer, is pure fancy. We see much the same regulations concerning food with Mohammedans, Hindoos, and others. Even the shadow of a member of another creed falling upon food is enough, in some cases, to render it sacramentally unclean. In fact, as Robertson Smith pointed out long since, among primitive peoples "unclean" has a sacramental, not a hygienic significance.

The myth of the Jews being a "pure" race has derived support from both Jews and Gentiles. The religious objection of the Jews to inter-marriage has led them to proclaim the purity of their race, and the Church's anathema on marriages between people of different beliefs, together with the later European tendency to look upon the Jews as an inferior people, have supported the claim. It is also said that wherever the Jews exist they can be clearly distinguished from the surrounding population. With great and important qualifications this may be admitted, although the explanation of the fact is of a different character to that usually assumed. In practice, this discrimination is generally an illustration of counting the hits and ignoring the misses. Like the people who never forget, which means they remember nothing they do forget, these observers count all those they pick out as Jews, but are obviously unable to reckon those who baffle their scrutiny. Were the Jews really a "pure" race one would expect to find them by this time a fairly homogeneous type. Instead of this, we find them tall and short, long-headed and broad-headed, dark, medium colored, and fair—there exists large numbers of Jews who are actually red-headed, with blue eyes. In brief, instead of presenting the features of a race made homogeneous by centuries of in-breeding, we have all the varying and discordant characteristics of a pronounced "mongrel" breed.

What is it that is taken as distinctive features of the Jewish race? The popular impression is that the nose—hooked or aquiline—gives us a fairly constant feature. As a matter of fact, among the Jews of Western Europe the straight or Greek nose predominates. Amongst those of North Africa and Egypt, there is a large proportion of the broad, rather flat nose, a type fairly common among Russian and Polish Jews. Amongst some four thousand Jews and Jewesses examined in New York by Dr. Fishberg, about 58 per cent. were found possessing a straight nose, about 20 per cent. with snub noses, and only 14 per cent. with the "characteristic" Jewish hooked nose. Others fix upon stature as a test. Jews, it is said, are invariably shorter than other people. There is more to be said for this than for the nose, but the explanation is not far to seek. To begin with, there are very wide variations here as elsewhere. Where the general population is shortest, the average height of the Jew is lowest, and it varies with that of the people amid whom they dwell. Next, and more important, the Jews are a city people, and have been a city people for many hundreds of years. Legally incapable of holding land in most countries until very recent times, without the security of tenure without which agricultural pursuits are impossible, the Jews have had city life forced upon them. But city life with all people tends to shortness of stature. With non-Jews this is corrected somewhat by the existence of an agricultural population. Having no agricultural population upon which to draw, employed in indoor occupations, the Jew has always been exposed to the full force of this tendency. Where the social and economic conditions are more favorable the Jew steadily approximates to the height of the surrounding town population. Thus, the English Jew of the West End of London is considerably taller

than the poor foreign Jew of the East End. The children and grandchildren of foreign immigrants in England and America also show a marked increase in height.

The phenomena is a social and economic one, not religious or racial. And the same is true of nearly every assumed Jewish characteristic that may be selected for examination. Mr. and Mrs. Whetham, in another book of theirs, *An Introduction to Eugenics*, point to the high birth-rate of Jews in the East End of London, and of Roman Catholics in Ireland, as proving the existence of "some religious factor having a profound significance" in affecting population. It is nothing of the kind. As a matter of fact there is a decline in the Jewish birth-rate all over Europe corresponding to the decline amongst non-Jews, and in many places the Jewish birth-rate is much lower than that of non-Jews. Amongst the Jewish population of the East End, made up largely of immigrants—with whom there is naturally a large proportion of people young enough to become parents, and socially segregated—there is a comparatively high birth-rate. A generation or so later, when they are brought into touch with the general population, the high birth-rate disappears. A high or a low birth-rate, apart from biological considerations, such as those put forward by Spencer, is a phenomenon determined by the social, economic, and intellectual planes on which a people move.

Next, there is the question of intermarriage as bearing upon purity of race. The existence of the many different types of Jews is alone enough to show intermarriage on a fairly large and constant scale, and also to prove the truth of Renan's conclusion that there is no Jewish type; there are only types of Jews. If we are to follow the Bible, it is evident that intermarriage was a far from infrequent occurrence. It occurred with Abraham, Joseph, Moses, David, Solomon, etc. On more certain ground we find Philo describing the marriages of many Gentiles who embraced Judaism. During the Græco-Roman period the Jews were very actively proselytising, and gained many converts. In Spain, Portugal, and Gaul, as Graetz points out, marriages between Jews and Christians were very common at a later period. There were large infusions of Frankish blood under the Merovignian kings, and in Russia a whole tribe of Turanian origin embraced Judaism. We have here the probable origin of the numerous body of blonde Jews. And without multiplying instances it may be said that, from Biblical times until to-day, intermarriage has been fairly common—sometimes on a large, sometimes on a small scale. In the early centuries of the Christian era their prevalence is further shown by the various edicts of Church Councils prohibiting them. In our own day intermarriage is rapidly developing. In Germany, for instance, in 1907, to every 100 Jewish marriages there were no less than 21 marriages between Jew and Christian.

I have dealt with this question of intermarriage very briefly, but it is enough to show that it has always been in operation. I may summarise by saying that on all points the attempt to establish a "pure" Jewish race, or to indicate a persistent Jewish type maintaining itself amid all peculiarities of varying environments, breaks down. There is no pure Jewish race, there is no fixed Jewish type. And yet there are certain features in which the mass of Jews of all countries resemble each other. It is this resemblance, ultimately explainable on social or psychic grounds, that holds the key to the problem.

(To be continued.) C. COHMN.

Grace.

EVERYBODY knows that grace, in its primary meaning as given in the dictionaries, is synonymous with favor, kindness, friendship, or love. The grace of God signifies his lovingkindness, his merciful disposition, his readiness to take pity upon sinful man and restore

him to his own image. To be saved by the grace of God is to be forgiven and accepted in the Beloved. Mankind deserve to burn for ever in hell-fire, and if God consulted his justice only, such would certainly be the doom of all; but inasmuch as his love is stronger than his justice he offers them full deliverance from so terrible a prospect without money and without price. Such is the Christian Gospel in barest outlines. Salvation is of, by, and through grace. That is to say, God could not be justly blamed if not a single man ever got saved. Such is the teaching of the New Testament and of the orthodox Church everywhere. In the ordinary preaching of the Gospel of the grace of God no notice is taken of two fatal objections to it. The first objection is that, on the assumption that Christianity is true, God alone is responsible for the fact that man needs salvation. Had God created a perfect man sin would have been eternally impossible. What right had he to make man capable of sinning, and then when he did sin to threaten him with endless punishment for it? No straightforward answer to this question has ever been given, or can be given. All sorts of excuses have been devised for such an impossible act of creation, but not one of them removes, or even touches the objection. Then there is another objection quite as formidable which the Christian preacher is incapable of successfully answering. Although salvation is said to be through grace, yet the gracious God is represented as being under the necessity of committing a horrible murder before a way of salvation could be found. Every conceivable method of justifying that murder, or of explaining it away, has been resorted to, but without avail. The murder stands there in mid-history, foul, ghastly, and renders salvation by grace the cruelest mockery in existence. The saying is that Christ had to be put to death before his people could be saved from their sins. Until that death occurred God's justice blocked the way of salvation; but ever since God's justice demands the redemption of all true believers. Where on earth does grace come in? It is absolutely shut out.

The Rev. Dr. Orchard makes fun of the orthodox doctrine of grace on the plea that it spoils the grace. In the *Christian Commonwealth* for May 8 and 15 he endeavors to rediscover grace; but in rediscovering grace he drops the New Testament and the Christian Church, and picks up ancient Greece. Surely, this is a perilous policy for a Christian minister to pursue. He says:—

"Grace means beauty. That is the original meaning of the Greek word, and we have retained it unto this day. When we speak of the grace of a flower, we mean not only its beauty, but a certain allurements in its beauty which wakens in us a sense of beauty more than there is to be seen with the visible eye even in the flower. Now, if grace means beauty, I say that no religion ever dared to dispense with it. I know that religion has attempted in the past to get on without beauty, but the divorce has always been disastrous."

Dr. Orchard cannot understand how or why religion broke with beauty, because religion "was conceived to be employed on two serious concerns—the search for truth and the question of morality." As a matter of fact, the Christian religion has never been engaged on any such concerns. Its claim is that it alone is in possession of the truth. Jesus came not to seek for truth, but to declare it, saying, "I am the truth. To look on me is to see the truth, and to believe on me is to receive the truth." The reverend gentleman seems to regard truth as an independent entity, as a something that actually exists and can be found; but truth is not an entity, and truth in the abstract, like man in the abstract, does not exist save in thought. Truth is a relation between us and the rest of the Universe; and the only method of finding this truth is by investigating, or interrogating, all available facts. Christianity never mentions truth in this sense, but confines itself to imaginary truths about God, sin, salvation through the sacrifice of Christ, heaven, hell, and eternity. The question of morality is not a distinctively Christian question at

all, but a purely social question. Dr. Orchard's object just here is to exalt the imagination above the reason: but, surely, he must admit that no truth has ever been discovered except as a result of using the intellect. It is true that the Greeks were ardent lovers of beauty and made splendid use of the imagination; but reason was the faculty they employed in the search for truth and in the study of ethics. Even Plato, the prince of Idealists, never attempts to solve any problems except by means of this power.

Let us go a little deeper into this matter. We will take the problem of evil, as Dr. Orchard does, and see what results from giving the reins to the imagination in contemplating it. The Doctor says:—

"Analyse the problem of evil by the reason, and what can you make of it? Either that it does not exist, which is obviously wrong, or the very presence of evil means that there is no God in the world. What is religion? Religion sees in a moment that our very perception of evil is because we have been enabled to imagine something better, because we have been touched by the pressure of an ideal world; and instead of looking upon evil as a problem to be discussed, it looks upon it as a task to be completed."

With all due deference, we must accuse the reverend gentleman of trifling with a great question. To admit the existence of evil is certainly to charge God with criminal failure as Creator. Quite so, admits Dr. Orchard, if you judge by the intellect. The reason compels us either to deny the existence of evil, or to disbelieve in God. But the reverend gentleman, to avoid doing either, allows his imagination to run riot, and pours out a flood of incoherent, nonsensical, and wickedly misleading phrases. Intellectually, he is baffled by the problem of evil; but he throws himself headlong into the ocean of religious emotionalism and pretends that it no longer exists, but has been transformed into the problem of good in the making, which it is for the Atheist, but never can be for the theologian except at the cost of crucifying his intellect.

We are at one with Dr. Orchard in his denunciation of the orthodox doctrine of grace, in his rejection of the orthodox interpretation of the death of Jesus, and in his hatred of the religion that kills natural joy and the love of beauty; and we admire his courage in so openly dissociating himself from the narrow literalism that prevails in his own denomination; but we are completely out of touch with him when he gets befogged in nauseous sentimentalism, and talks about Gothic cathedrals and Raphael's Madonna and gorgeous sunrises and sunsets and Chopin's Nocturnes and Beethoven's Sonatas as furnishing better arguments for God than all the tomes of theology in all the world. We agree with him in his contempt for the "bulky tomes of Augustine, Aquinas, and Calvin"; but though we are profoundly in love with beautiful objects and admire poetry and art, we find in them not the faintest hint of the existence of God and an ideal world. An Atheist may not be a desirable companion for a clergyman; but he ought not to be dubbed a "poor withered-up specimen" simply because he has no theology. Dr. Orchard goes on to speak of the dead and their probable return. On the crest of an emotional wave he says:—

"Conducting a funeral service last time in the cemetery at home, I came away from the graveside, and walking alone back to the little chapel, I passed a large tombstone which had some doggerel verses expressing the hope that a little child who had been taken away could come back. And suddenly there flashed through my mind—for I am always a Sceptic before I am a Christian—'They never do come back.' As I walked on, by my side there was a glorious row of limes, brown and golden, and against them, set like burnished jewels, was a row of cypresses, dark and deeply green. Do you know what they said to me? You may not understand it, and I pity you if you can't. They said, 'They do come back, they do come back.'"

Then he tells of a woman who had lost her husband in a great tragedy of sorrow, whom Beethoven went to see. The illustrious musician quietly went over to her, took her hands in his, and then without a

word went over to the piano and played a dream of his own composition; and she said, "You have told me all." "That is grace," cries the preacher. So it is, but not the Christian grace. It is fascinating poetry, but not Gospel truth. There is a sense in which the dead do come back; but it is not the sense understood in the Churches.

Dr. Orchard is an Idealist; but it is practically impossible to indicate what else he may be. What is certain is that he is not a Christian in any orthodox acceptance of the term, and that he does not preach the Christian Gospel according to any orthodox interpretation of it. And yet he continues to employ the orthodox and evangelical old terms; but it is impossible to make out what he means by them. When he says that "God is ever and always something greater than man is," or that man "is big enough to sin," or that "God owes me everything, and I owe him everything," what does he mean? Is he only dreaming? A man is free to dream as much as he likes, though his doing so on a large scale would not be a sign of good health; but he has no right to impose his dreams upon his friends as realities. Dr. Orchard prides himself upon being a dreamer; but the fault we have to find with him is that in the pulpit and the press he wants us to accept his dreams as saving truths. The only saving truth is the truth discovered by science, and the name of that truth is knowledge, man's knowledge of himself in relations with Nature, and of Nature in relations with him. This is the sole saving grace in the Universe.

J. T. LLOYD.

Modern Materialism. — X.

(Continued from p. 315.)

"The extant forms of Supernaturalism have deep roots in human nature, and will undoubtedly die hard; but in these latter days, they have to cope with an enemy whose full strength is only just beginning to be put out, and whose forces, gathering strength year by year, are hemming them round on every side. This enemy is Science, in the acceptance of systematised natural knowledge, which, during the last two centuries, has extended those methods of investigation, the worth of which is confirmed by daily appeal to Nature, to every region in which the Supernatural has hitherto been recognised."—PROFESSOR T. H. HUXLEY, *Science and Christian Tradition*, 1902, p. 32.

"To render this victory of science over obsolete faith and superstition complete and enduring, all that remains to be done is to withdraw it from its monastic and corporate seclusion, so that its great results may become the common property of peoples. As soon as this is done, and thus some philosophic light shall have entered the heads of the masses, all spiritual and clerical tyranny must cease, since it only reigns by taking men's consciences and confusing their minds."—LUDWIG BUCHNER, *Force and Matter*, preface to ninth edition.

"If there is one lesson which history forces upon us in every page, it is this: *Keep your children away from the priest, or he will make them the enemies of mankind.* It is not the Catholic clergy and those like them who are to be dreaded in this matter; even the representatives of apparently harmless religions may do incalculable mischief if they get education into their hands."—PROFESSOR W. K. CLIFFORD, *Lectures and Essays*, 1886, p. 382.

No one can have read the various discourses and essays of Professor Huxley without being puzzled by the contradictoriness of his teaching upon certain points. Take, for instance, his attitude towards the Bible. In 1870, in an article on "The School Boards," he advocated "the use of the Bible as an instrument of popular education," praising its literary and humanitarian (!) qualities, and saying nothing about its brutalities, indecencies, and unscientific teachings. Later on, in 1885-6, we find him violently attacking the science and history of the Holy Book in the *Nineteenth Century*, and covering its apologists with ridicule as with a garment.† And, again, in 1879 he complains of the "falsities at present foisted upon the young in the name of the Church."‡

* *Critiques and Addresses*, p. 51.

† *Science and Christian Tradition*, p. 57.

‡ Preface to Haeckel's *Freedom in Science and Teaching*, p. xvii.

Then, in the face of all this, we find him, in 1892,* reaffirming his old position of 1870 as to the policy of teaching it to children in schools. And, finally, in 1895, admitting that it was not, after all, a proper work to teach to children, and supporting secular education.†

Of course, it is some satisfaction that the Professor, after a series of zig-zags, finally arrived at the right solution, which all the while had been advocated by intelligent working-men Secularists. But the satisfaction is qualified by the fact that the advocates of secular education find the earlier position of Huxley constantly quoted against them by the Church and Nonconformist clergy, who oppose secular education and wish to maintain the Bible in the schools. Also, by the feeling that we might be much nearer to the secular solution, if Huxley had cast the weight of his authority on the secular side at first, than we seem to be at present.

The explanation of Huxley's vacillation in this matter was, of course, that he himself had been brought up on Bible teaching,‡ and he never really got rid of the bias towards the book thus instilled into his mind in early childhood. If he had never read the book until he had arrived at manhood, he would no more have thought of advocating its use in the school than he would that of the Koran or the Book of Mormon.

The same perverse spirit pervades all Huxley's scientific teaching. No one developed Materialism, automatism, and the mechanism of living bodies to a further extreme than Huxley did, and yet nothing enraged him more than to be called a Materialist. In his lecture on "The Physical Basis of Life," he tells us that protoplasm is the physical basis of life:—

"Protoplasm, simple or nucleated, is the formal basis of all life. It is the clay of the potter: which, bake it and paint it as he will, remains clay, separated by artifice, and not by nature, from the commonest brick or sun-dried clod."

It is from this protoplasm that the tissue and organs of plants, animals, and man are built up.

The nettle, the oak, the elephant, and man all have their beginning in a speck of protoplasm.

It is at this point that the Spiritualist, or believer in creation as opposed to evolution, steps in, and says:—

"This protoplasm is alive, and this distinguishes it from mere dead matter; there is something added to it that is not matter, namely, 'vitality,' and this is a spiritual essence added to matter by the power of God, and it cannot be, and never will be, in the power of man to produce it without the help of a previous living germ."

In reply to this, Huxley observes that carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, and nitrogen are all lifeless bodies; from these, under certain conditions, can be produced water, carbonic acid, and certain nitrogenous salts, also lifeless:—

"But when they are brought together, under certain conditions, they give rise to the still more complex body, protoplasm, and this protoplasm exhibits the phenomena

* Prologue to *Controverted Questions*, 1892.

† "In the report upon State Education in New Zealand, 1895, drawn up by R. Laishby, the following occurs, p. 13: 'Professor Huxley gives me leave to state his opinion to be that the principle of strict secularism in State education is sound, and must eventually prevail.'—*Life and Letters of T. H. Huxley*, 1900, vol. ii., p. 343.

‡ Mr. Robertson, who declares that Huxley "did more than any other man of his time to conserve the Bible as a school manual by his politic panegyric of it in that aspect at a time when bolder Rationalists were striving to get it excluded from the State schools," observes, in a footnote: "I am informed on good authority that in later life Huxley changed his views on the subject. He had abundant cause" (*Short History of Freethought*, 1906, vol. ii., pp. 406-7).

§ Huxley says that those responsible for providing him with knowledge "imagined they were discharging that most sacred duty by impressing upon my childish mind the necessity, on pain of reprobation in this world and damnation in the next, of accepting, in the strict and literal sense, every statement contained in the Protestant Bible. I was told to believe, and I did believe, that doubt about any of them was a sin, not less reprehensible than a moral delict."—*Science and Christian Tradition*, 1902, p. 22.

of life. I see no break in this series of steps in molecular complication, and I am unable to understand why the language which is applicable to any one term of the series may not be used to any of the others."

When the two inflammable gases, hydrogen and oxygen, are mixed in certain proportions and an electric spark is passed through them, they combine to produce water, a substance as different from its original constituents as anything can well be. Hydrogen, in air, burns with an extremely hot flame. With the addition of oxygen gas to an ordinary flame, iron can be easily melted, a knowledge which the burglar has availed himself of in his nefarious profession. On the other hand, water is a most efficient extinguisher of fire. At 32 degrees Fahrenheit water crystallises into a solid—ice, but this temperature has no appreciable effect on oxygen or hydrogen; but we do not assume that something called aquosity (from "aqua," Latin for water) has taken possession of these two fiery gases and converted them into water. Says Huxley:—

"What justification is there, then, for the assumption of the existence in the living matter of a something which has no representative, or correlative, in the not living matter which gave rise to it? What better philosophical status has 'vitality' than 'aquosity'? And why should 'vitality' hope for a better fate than the other 'itys' which have disappeared since Martinus Scriblerus accounted for the operation of the meat-jack by its inherent 'meat-roasting quality,' and scorned the Materialism of those who explained the turning of the spit by a certain mechanism worked by the draught of the chimney?"

We can imagine any Materialist attending this lecture applauding this presentation of Materialism; if so, the applause was premature. The Professor has slain the Spiritualist, or Vitalist; he is now sharpening his sword to attack the Materialist. He observes: "I should not wonder if 'gross and brutal Materialism' were the mildest phrase" applied to the proposition I have just placed before you.

"And, most undoubtedly, the terms of the proposition are distinctly materialistic. Nevertheless, two things are certain; the one, that I hold the statements to be substantially true; the other, that I, individually, am no Materialist, but, on the contrary, believe Materialism to involve grave philosophical error."

He observes that "This union of materialistic terminology with the repudiation of materialistic philosophy I share with some of the most thoughtful men with whom I am acquainted." This, of course, is an allusion to Herbert Spencer and Professor Tyndall, who, as we have seen, adopted the same attitude. Professor Huxley goes on to say that, having led his audience into the "materialistic slough," he will now extricate them, which he proceeds to do as follows:—

"After all, what do we know of this terrible 'matter,' except as a name for the unknown and hypothetical cause of states of our own consciousness? And what do we know of that 'spirit' over whose threatened extinction by matter a great lamentation is arising, like that which was heard at the death of Pan, except that it is also a name for an unknown and hypothetical cause, or condition, of states of consciousness?"

The doctrines of Materialism and Spiritualism, he declares, "lie outside the limits of philosophical inquiry," concluding:—

"In itself it is of little moment whether we express the phenomena of matter in terms of spirit, or the phenomena of spirit in terms of matter: matter may be regarded as a form of thought, thought may be regarded as a property of matter—each statement has a certain relative truth. But with a view to the progress of science, the materialistic terminology is in every way to be preferred.....Whereas, the alternative, or spiritualistic, terminology is utterly barren, and leads to nothing but obscurity and confusion of ideas."

It seems to us that it is the Professor who is in the "slough"; his sentences positively shout contradictions to one another. First of all, he develops the materialistic hypothesis to the extent of making life a by-product, or property of matter. Not only so, but he accepts the extreme materialistic position

that thought itself has the same origin, declaring, "the thoughts to which I am now giving utterance, and your thoughts regarding them, are the expression of molecular changes in that matter of life which is the source of our other vital phenomena." Then he observes that he would not be surprised if somebody called him a Materialist—we should be surprised if they did not—declares Materialism "to involve grave philosophical error," and dubs it a "slough"; then he interjects the remark that "matter and law have devoured spirit and spontaneity"; afterwards placidly observing that it is of no moment "whether we express the phenomena of matter in terms of spirit, or the phenomena of spirit in terms of matter"—spirit having been, apparently, vomited up by "matter and law" for this occasion only—finally concluding with the statement that "the materialistic terminology is in every way to be preferred," the spiritualistic terminology leading "to nothing but obscurity and confusion of ideas."*

W. MANN.

(To be continued.)

Freethinkers and Peace.

FOLLOWING the Peace Congress, the Rationalist Peace Society held a meeting at the Queen's Hall, London, on Sunday. The list of speakers was a representative one, and included Mr. John M. Robertson, M.P. (who presided), Mr. George Greenwood, M.P., Mr. G. W. Foote, and Mr. S. H. Swinny, whilst two ladies, Mrs. H. Bradlaugh Bonner and Miss Kough, lent additional attractiveness to the platform. Mr. Herbert Burrows, who was present, unfortunately was unable to say more than a few words owing to illness.

Mr. Robertson, in his opening remarks, pointed out that Rationalists were often embarrassed by the dogmatic tone of peace meetings, and that their object was to deprecate the intrusion of theology into what should be a purely humane movement. The Peace movement was markedly upward, and even the introduction of aviation to the sinister purposes of war might quicken the thought of people with regard to peace ideas.

Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner said that many aspects of the modern Peace movement were anticipated by Thomas Paine. When Paine was alive the Navy cost £8,000,000 annually, whilst now it had reached £44,000,000. The six Christian nations spent £110,000,000 yearly, and this sum might have been spent on the betterment of the people.

Mr. S. H. Swinny paid a tribute to the representatives of the Rationalist Peace Society who had attended the Peace Congress.

Miss Kough put the woman's case against war in an eloquent speech, in which she said that in old time war was the province of men; but women were not consulted. Rationalistic women have made up their minds concerning war, which they regard as a relic of barbarism.

Mr. G. W. Foote was in a happy vein. The reason for the existence of a Rationalist Peace Society was necessary when the overwhelming bulk of the money spent on war was contributed by Christian nations. When heathens wished to follow the Christian example, they had to borrow admirals and generals in order to practise the gospel of peace. The Czar's Peace Congress was like a burglars' conference to consider the risks and dangers of the profession. If all Europe cannot stop the war between Turkey and Italy, the talk of peace congresses was simply wasted breath. Mr. Foote's peroration carried the meeting with it. "Everything," he said finely, "must come before the tribunal of morality. A few people with morality in their hearts and reason in their heads were more than a match for their opponents, and all they want is time."

Mr. George Greenwood, M.P., followed with a very witty speech, which was punctuated with laughter and applause. Christian pacifists, he said, had done all they could, and had excellent results—on paper. Nowadays, God was considered to be the generalissimo of both forces; but in the olden days each side invoked its own deity. War and finance were absolutely antagonistic. No country gained by war. It reminded him of an old picture of two pugilists, one labelled "The man what won," and the other "The man what lost," and the winner seemed to have had by far the worst time.

C. E. S.

* "The Physical Basis of Life" is reprinted in Huxley's *Lay Sermons*.

Acid Drops.

"Was Shakespeare a Christian?" was a bold headline across two columns in last week's *Christian Commonwealth*; and, having lectured on that very question ourselves lately, we were naturally curious to see what our contemporary had to say upon it. We were, however, seriously disappointed. The article was simply a brief report of an interview, or a report of a brief interview, with Sir H. Beerbohm Tree. Our contemporary appears to have imagined that the famous actor and stage manager was the one man in all England to speak with authority on the subject of Shakespeare's religious (or any other) opinions. Archbishop Tree, if we may call him so for the occasion, while very civil, was also very circumspect. He refused to commit himself as to whether Shakespeare was or was not a Christian. Yet he let it be seen that, in his opinion, the great poet, if a Christian at all, was a Christian with a difference. The interviewer put the leading question quite bluntly—"Was Shakespeare, matchless genius of our race, a Christian?" "Let me say at once," Archbishop Tree replied, fencing the blunt question, "that Shakespeare did not narrow himself to this or that religion. Call it what you will, his was the religion of humanity." Later on, the famous actor said: "In any case Shakespeare was too broad for the religion of our childhood, 'Open your mouth and shut your eyes.' To him it would have seemed a selfish creed to be good in order to obtain reward. Was he a Christian? Well, he was in a great sense even something more." And what is that? The speaker did not say. He chose to conclude with some rather cheap talk about the "sublimest worship of Eternal Verities"—which is only a poor echo of Carlyle.

It is well known to historical students that King Henry VIII. in taking away the Church lands had to share the plunder with the aristocracy. Most of them were Catholics, but that made no difference to "business." And it was even worse during the so-called Reformation in Scotland. Noble families there have been living ever since on the robbery of Holy Mother Church. The same thing, of course, has obtained in England. It was perfectly fair on Mr. Lloyd George's part to hit back as he did at Lord Hugh Cecil and the rest of them who talked so haughtily about the Welsh Disestablishment Bill as the "robbery of God." Some of these high and mighty gentlemen must be the smuggest hypocrites in England. Mr. Lloyd George only told them the truth. This is what he said:—

"I say that charges of this kind ought not to be brought against a whole people by those whose family trees are laden with the fruits of sacrilege. I am not blaming them for what their ancestors did. But they are still in the enjoyment of some of the property, and they are subscribing out of that property to leaflets which attack us and call us thieves. What is their story? Look at the whole story of the pillage at the Reformation. They robbed the Catholic Church, they robbed the monasteries, they robbed the altars, they robbed the almshouses, they robbed the poor, they robbed the dead. And then, when we are trying to recover some part of this pillaged property for the poor for whom it was originally given, they come here and venture, with hands dripping with the fat of sacrilege, to accuse us of robbery of God."

No wonder Mr. Lloyd George's reply to those men's insolence made them howl. "Respectable" thieves always make the most noise when they are brought to book.

Mr. Lloyd George's diatribe was vigorous and effective, but it would have been better for more finish. What a pity he did not fortify himself with a little study beforehand of Burke's classic reply to the Duke of Bedford in the "Letter to a Noble Lord." The Duke had giped at Burke for accepting a Civil List pension. Burke's answer was crushing. The King had been pleased to confer upon him a modest reward. But what of that? He was only a minnow in those waters. The Duke of Bedford was a whale. He swam in an ocean of royal bounty. His bone, his blubber, and everything about him derived from Henry the Eighth's plunder of the Catholic Church. It was a splendid retort, and it still lives in English literature. But, of course, Burke was a man of genius; and something fine was to be expected from his pen when the genius that guided it was animated by strong personal feeling.

In the discussions on the Welsh Disestablishment Bill in the House of Commons there has been a marked tendency to rest the case for Disestablishment on the question of whether the measure will injure or benefit religion. Mr. Balfour, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Silvester Horne, Lord Hugh Cecil, and others discussed the question from this point of view. Mr. Harwood, one of the Liberals who voted against

the Bill said plainly that "If they were going to debate Disestablishment they had better make up their minds whether the connection with the State was or was not an advantage to the Church." And no one seemed to have either the courage or the wit to point out that whether Establishment injured or benefited a Church was one with which a modern House of Commons ought not to concern itself. The claim for Disestablishment rests properly upon religion being outside the legitimate functions of a modern State. Once the plain ground is forsaken or ignored, the question becomes saturated with hypocrisy and self-seeking. The protests of Nonconformists that they are aiming at benefiting the Church in supporting this Bill is simply nauseating. The idea that one Church is working to benefit another receives the lie from the whole of Christianity. If it is really a question of whether a Church will lose or gain by Disestablishment, it is the Church threatened that should have the decisive word, *not* its enemies.

Nevertheless, some awkward truths were expressed during the course of the debate. Mr. Harwood reminded the House that Christianity had never been adopted, save by immigration, in any country except under the influence of the State, and Protestantism had not been adopted in a single country except under the ægis of the State. This is a truth usually ignored by Christians, and an examination of the causes that have led to the establishment of Christianity would show that its greatest helpers have been bribery, terrorism, or physical force. This is strikingly true of the establishment of Protestantism in England. Mr. Hobhouse said—without seeing the full force of his statement—that while Nonconformists and Churchmen were ready to co-operate on other matters, when it came to religious belief and divine worship there was no co-operation at all. Exactly; the one thing on which people cannot work together harmoniously is the one thing we are told lies at the foundation of human brotherhood and good fellowship. It is not merely that they each have enough religion to hate each other, but that religion provides the most enduring cause of ill-will.

We must confess to a certain sympathy with Mr. Balfour's plea that there is greater liberality within the Establishment than without. Taken in a general sense this is true, although there might easily be greater liberality still in the absence of both Churches. But an Established Church is theoretically national, and therefore comprehensive. A Disestablished Church is partisan and exclusive. Historically, there has always been a narrower spirit in the Nonconformist Churches; although, when it came to dealing with non-Christians the same bigotry has characterised both. But hardly any of the so-called "Free" Churches would tolerate the extreme diversity of doctrine that exists in the Church of England, from high Ritualism on the one side to Latitudinarianism at the other side. And it is as well to remember that the demand for the State to step in and maintain discipline in the Church has come mainly from Nonconformists. Mr. Balfour might well ask whether Scotland, Geneva, or Massachusetts could give the Church of England lessons in liberality?

There was a great descent in Mr. Balfour's speech when he put in a plea for the maintenance of an Establishment in Wales on the ground of the need for reconciling religion and modern thought. The great problem before all Churches, he said, was how to deal with the mass of modern knowledge and combine it with the teachings of religion, and he suggested that the Government was weakening the capacity for doing this by disestablishing the Church. But it is not the function of the Government to maintain a body of men for this purpose; and the manner in which this has been done hitherto is one of the most discreditable chapters in the history of human thought. Mr. Balfour may be correct when he says that no Church has accomplished this task better than the Church of England. It is a case of the better, the worse. For neither the Church of England nor any other Church has provided a body of men who were aiming at the truth, but a body of paid apologists who strove by all kinds of dialectical trickery to give irrational doctrines a semblance of reason. From the religious point of view, these men may have done their duty to their respective Churches. From any other point of view, they have simply acted as centres of intellectual demoralisation.

That supreme example of folly and charlatanry, General Booth's Anti-Suicide Bureau, has issued its fifth report. Colonel Emerson, who is in charge of this department, reports that during the year 4,754 people came to the Bureau. These comprised clergymen, missionaries, military officers, doctors, policemen, journalists, etc. We notice there

is no mention of Freethinkers. The idea that people who mean to commit suicide would go to the Salvation Army in order to find out whether they should do so or not, is so supremely silly that we question whether anywhere but in this country it could impose on the public. Of course, the Bureau has no effect whatever on the number of suicides. As a matter of fact the total number of suicides in London is, in any year, barely a fourth of the number Colonel Emerson professes to have saved from self-destruction. But this does not prevent General Booth describing the work of the Bureau as "successful beyond our highest anticipations." Really, a people that can tolerate this kind of foolery can swallow anything.

Mr. Harold Begbie has been interviewing General Booth (aged 84) for the *Daily Chronicle*. Of course old William the Conqueror number two has done wonders in the world. But what do they amount to, after all? He admits that "the crowd is turning away from the Churches." "The outlook," he says, "is not promising. I might even say it is melancholy. When I think of it all I am distressed." Such is the profit and loss account of this old Evangelist's enterprise—as well as of all the other Christian enterprises that spend so many millions a year.

Some letters have just been published from John Bright to the Sturge family, written in the early 'seventies. Bright expected that the suffrage would be granted to women, and he prophesied that it "would add to the power of Priestcraft in every part of the Three Kingdoms." No doubt the restricted suffrage then in contemplation would have that effect. What the effect of women voting under complete adult suffrage would have remains to be seen. But the odds seem rather in favor of the increased "power of Priestcraft" for a considerable time, though perhaps not so in the long run.

The Portuguese Government has laid before Parliament a proposal for reducing expenses in connection with the diplomatic and consular services, and for suppressing the Legation at the Vatican. The sooner the latter is carried the better. The priests in Portugal are stirring up hostility to the Republic everywhere, and if they elect to fight a political battle they must take the natural consequences of failure. On other grounds, too, the Legation to the Vatican should be suppressed. The temporal power of the Pope is now only a ridiculous fiction, and the total separation of Church and State is one of the essential principles of modern civilisation.

The Rev. Fleming Williams told the Congregational Union that "the people outside the Churches were developing a social conscience in the exact ratio that you are neglecting to cultivate it." But this is not only true of the Congregational Union; it is true of all forms of organised religion. New movements and new ideas always begin outside the Churches, and among these new developments is that of the deliberate resolve to place social concerns in the forefront. That this is often done in the name of religion matters little. We must learn to discriminate between the essence of a thing and the form in which it finds expression. When men live in a professedly Christian country, and are attached to a particular Christian Church, it is only natural that their feelings should find expression in the jargon of their sect. There is no more in this than Englishmen, Germans, or Frenchmen expressing themselves in different languages. But the social sense of man is wider than religion and deeper than religion. It antedates religion, and is one of the great forces that make for the transformation of religious beliefs. And the man who does not recognise this has not yet mastered the alphabet of social philosophy.

Those who read history for enlightenment, instead of with the desire to select facts that will bolster up preconceived ideas, know that it is to the growing social sense that we owe every change for the better that has taken place in religious teaching. They can see the idea of God changing from that of an arbitrary irresponsible being to the present constitutional ruler under pressure of the reflective force of social growth. They see the orthodox ideas of heaven and hell changing and dying as a consequence of the growth of a humanised moral sense. And it is equally plain that the whole of the modern demand for social betterment is a direct consequence of the weakening of theology during the past 150 years. Without this breaking down of religious belief, modern labor and social movements would have been impossible. Reinstating theology, or withdrawing from these movements their definitely Freethought elements, and their vitality and usefulness disappears. True, the Churches—some of them—are now talking glibly of the need for social betterment; but no Church can afford to quite neglect

popular opinion. Their talk is evidence, not of their vitality, but of their decay. Mr. R. J. Campbell said the other day that he used to believe that people held aloof from religion because they were disgusted with the Churches. He now finds he is mistaken. It is because of the "Materialistic spirit" that is abroad. For "Materialistic" read "Free-thinking," and you have the truth of the matter.

"The pursuit of truth," says the Dean of Westminster, "must continually adapt itself to the altering conditions of humanity." We thought the Dean of Westminster was a Christian with a special—and, of course, unalterable—revelation from God. He throws it to the winds in his last Sunday's utterance. We don't suppose, though, that he will serve his salary in the same way.

Gipsy Smith is fond of talking about the 25,000 miles he has travelled in America, and the 400 meetings he has addressed, and the Lord knows how many people. Perhaps he will produce from headquarters a certificate of the number of souls he has saved. Meanwhile the American people will no doubt be grateful to know that Gipsy Smith "likes them immensely."

Alderman John Badley "names" many babies of Socialist parents at Leeds, and, according to the *Sketch*, the local clergy are much concerned about it. One of them told a representative of that paper that Church people are doing all they can to counteract the evil of Atheism; three speakers have already been convicted of "blasphemy," but "the atheistic movement is not being scotched so quickly as one could wish." Of course not. Who but a clergyman could fancy that prosecuting Atheists is the way to put down Atheism?

When the Nonconformists have done publishing the financial truth concerning the Church of England, there will be an opportunity of telling them the financial truth concerning themselves. They dip their hands far deeper than is generally known into the public pocket. Money is paid to them directly from the Consolidated Fund, their buildings are exempted from rates and taxes, and their special religious teaching is established in the Council elementary schools all over the country at the national expense. They get all they can from the State. Their quarrel with the Anglican Church is that she gets more.

"It has often been hinted that much-heralded 'conversions' to this or that religion were prompted by other motives than honest conviction; but it is not often that one of these bribed converts has so little sense of shame as openly to advertise an elastic conscience for sale to the highest bidder. If anything can be viler than physical prostitution, it is this deliberate fixing a price on profession of belief. An astounding example of this utter corruption of character, generally confessed only by European princesses who put their religion on and off as an old cloak in order to sit on a throne with a husband of different original faith, and by degenerate American girls to whom sincere conviction means nothing compared to successful snobbery, comes to light through an extraordinary law suit in New York city. A certain Meta Kerns agreed with her mother-in-law, one Mrs. Henrietta Obst, to make profession of the Jewish religion for the cash consideration of \$20 a month. The wage of dishonor was duly paid throughout the remaining life of the mother-in-law; and the so-called 'convert' is now suing the estate for later payments. It remains to be seen whether any Court will recognize so immoral a bargain as consistent with public policy and enforceable at law. For the decency of human nature and society, it is to be hoped that the venal creature will receive the formal rebuke which she merits. In that case, any Christian proselytiser who wishes to buy her back will undoubtedly find it necessary to pay cash in advance. Any religion that will stoop to the reception of adherents of this type is more than worthy of them."—*Truthseeker* (New York).

There is a spot in the Castle-esplanade, Edinburgh, where witches used to be burnt. The spot is now marked by a tablet and a fountain. The inscription ought to be, but isn't—"Here Christianity murdered innocent women. Drink of the real water of life, and beware of that detestable superstition."

At the Central Criminal Court on Friday, May 18, John Rhodes, 31, a traveller, was sentenced to two years' hard labor for abducting Ivy Day, 17, a typist. The Recorder

remarked that he had "never seen a bigger scoundrel stand in that dock." Prisoner had led a life of crime for many years, and was always trying to mislead and ruin women, to whom he always represented himself as a single man. He represented himself in that way to Ivy Day, whom he induced to go away with him. He talked of marriage and asked Mrs. Day's consent, saying, "I want God's greatest gift on earth—a pure, good woman in marriage." Fortunately he has got another of "God's" greatest gifts on earth—*rest*.

Clarence Virgil Richeson, the "eloquent" Massachusetts preacher, who brutally murdered the girl he was engaged to in order to marry a wealthier "society" girl, was duly electrocuted on Tuesday morning. His crime was utterly commonplace, and his personality was of the same character. His only attraction seems to have been the "eloquence" and a peculiar sort of hysterical sentimentalism which is well known to experts in mental and moral pathology. However, he made a most edifying end; his last few days were spent in expounding his favorite Psalms to the prison officials; he actually treated them to a religious service in his cell on the Monday night, and the next morning he walked to the electrocution chair singing a hymn. A theatrical humbug to the very last! It is almost needless to say that he showed no anxiety about his victim.

Mr. Justice Horridge, who tried the Leeds "blasphemy" cases, and gave the defendants savage sentences, tried on May 17, an action for damages on behalf of James Henry Ward, aged seven years, against a tram company. The child had to be brought up to the bench to be visible, and the judge asked him "Do you know where you will go if you are a naughty boy?" No wonder the poor child was frightened, so that his father had to go up and stand beside him while he gave evidence. Mr. Justice Horridge would have been puzzled to answer his own question. He would have been wiser if he had shown the spirit of the judge in the story. Counsel asked a small witness, "Do you know where little boys go to who tell lies?" The small witness said "No." Whereupon the judge remarked, "I don't know myself; do you?"

We are very far from deprecating the exertions of those who are moving heaven and earth, as the saying is, to obtain the release of Miss Malocka. Her treatment and her sentence are both abominable, and if we cannot rescue her from such outrage, out of regard for the "good understanding" with Russia, Great Britain sinks into the position of a weak and timid country that cannot protect its own subjects. But how is it that her friends who declare that expressing her opinions is her only crime, do not bestir themselves when men are imprisoned in England for no other offence? Mr. Tom Mann is suffering six months' imprisonment for simply expressing an opinion at a public meeting; an opinion, by the way, which has been openly expressed in the writings of Tolstoy and others for any number of years, without the slightest interference or even the slightest complaint. Then there are the "blasphemy" prosecutions at Leeds, London, and Nottingham. It is as clear as daylight that the "blasphemers" who have been imprisoned lately—one for three months and another for four months—were punished for their opinions; for it was obviously their opinions, and their opinions only, that gave the "offensiveness" to their "language." On any other topic such "language" would have attracted no attention whatever.

As we go to press we learn that the Home Secretary has released Mr. Guy Bowman and reduced Mr. Tom Mann's sentence to two months. Everybody knows that this is a purely political move on the part of the Liberal Government. They stirred up a hornet's nest unwittingly, and they were glad to get the buzzing and stinging over as promptly as possible. Mr. McKenna would have done the same for the Leeds "blasphemers" if they had been powerful enough to frighten him. His conscience in these matters is a perfectly negligible quantity. We quite understand him. And his punishment will commence whenever he begins to understand himself. We admit, of course, that this is not bound to happen, either in the early or the late future.

Mr. Keir Hardie has introduced a Bill making all political offenders first class misdemeanants. This is all right as far as it goes. But why not offenders of every kind on account of opinion included? This is the general rule on the continent. It is peculiarly British logic to treat those who get into trouble over politics as first class misdemeanants and those who get into trouble over religion as felons.

Mr. Foote's Engagements

Sunday, May 26, N. S. S. Conference, The Assembly Rooms, Briggate, Leeds.

To Correspondents.

PRESIDENT'S HONORARIUM FUND, 1912.—Previously acknowledged, £140 4s. 2d. Received since:—R. Wood, 5s.; Joseph Roeckel, £1 1s.; W. Stevens, £1 1s.

R. H. ROSETTI (Laindon, Essex) writes: "Re paragraph in *Freethinker* concerning Mr. R. C. Young, I shall have pleasure in forwarding him a copy of the paper each week."

A. E. WILLIAMS.—The joke is a very old one. It is really a part of a more elaborate joke that we heard in our boyhood. But it may serve again some day. Thanks for your kind offer and good wishes. Only those "actually engaged in journalism" can, as you say, know "the amount of work that has to be put in to produce a paper" like ours every week.

R. NORTH traverses our remark that Jesus Christ and the twelve apostles never played cricket. He draws our attention to the fact that, on the day of Pentecost, Peter "stood up with the eleven" and was bold!

E. B.—Obliged for cuttings.

J. TOMKINS.—We have frequently referred to the decrease in the membership of pretty nearly all the so-called Free Churches.

R. T. NICHOLS.—See paragraph. Thanks.

W. P. BALL.—Thanks for welcome cuttings.

F. (Birmingham).—We don't print your full name or initials. The *Freethinker* is already being sent to R. C. Young, so your kind offer is not necessary. Thanks for your trouble.

W. H. POWELL.—We cannot attend to such matters personally. Your letter has been passed over to the N. S. S. secretary, and we hope the Burial Service will be in time.

C. BAKER (S. Africa).—Pleased to hear that you and your friends so "greatly admire the extremely straightforward, logical, and interesting articles by the Editor" and find this journal "most interesting, instructive, and elevating from cover to cover."

ILLITERATE MINER.—This is what you call yourself, but very inaccurately. You are right in the specific instance, which is uncommon, but we were right in our general proposition. Glad to hear that after reading the *Freethinker* for six years your "interest in it increases rather than otherwise." Your letter is in every way encouraging.

HORACE DAWSON.—The Registrar was quite wrong. Your statement of your ground for claiming to affirm is decisive. He has no right to catechise you. You should get and keep by you a copy of the "Right to Affirm" which Charles Bradlaugh drew up himself for the N. S. S. Thanks for the pleasant personal note at the end of your letter.

W. H. EALES.—Thanks for letter. The enclosures may be useful.

F. J. GOULD.—Just too late for this week. In our next issue.

W. P. ADAMSON.—There is nothing in the book except reckless assertion and glaring impudence.

R. WOOD.—It is funny, as you say, though intrinsically so dull and utterly unimportant.

F. WALSH.—Shall be writing you shortly. Glad you liked our articles on Harrison. As for the Shakespeare book, we are looking forward to finishing it in the early future.

LESLIE T. SMITH.—We are glad to hear of Mr. Joseph Bates's successful lecturing visit to Lincoln. There is a mistake, however, in the supposition that he was representing the National Secular Society; we mean, of course, in the strict sense of the words. The idea of his being engaged by the N. S. S. was mooted but it did not reach realisation. No one but Mr. Bates himself is responsible for the literature he sells at his lectures; and where there is no responsibility there is no need to express an opinion. Mr. Bates enjoys his full liberty as far as we are concerned.

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. 6d.; half year, 5s. 3d.; three months, 2s. 8d.

Sugar Plums.

The National Secular Society's Annual Conference takes place to-day (Whit-Sunday) at the Assembly Rooms, Briggate, Leeds—which is in the very centre of the town. The business sittings will be from 10.30 to 12.30 and from 2.30 to 4.30. There will be a luncheon for delegates, visitors, and local "saints" who like to take part in this function, at the Metropole Hotel—where the President, the Secretary, and several other well-known Freethinkers from London and elsewhere, will be staying. The business sittings are, of course, for members of the N. S. S. only. At 7 there will be a public demonstration, with free seats all round, in the big hall, and the list of speakers includes the President, Messrs. C. Cohen, J. T. Lloyd, F. A. Davies, A. B. Moss, W. Heaford, John Grange, and Miss Kough.

In connection with the Conference an excursion for delegates, visitors, and local "saints" has been arranged, the destination being the interesting and historical old town of Knaresboro. Fuller particulars will be announced at the Conference and the evening public meeting.

We have just learnt that the Conference Excursion to Knaresboro starts at 9.30 a.m. on Whit-Monday. Brakes leave the Hotel Metropole, King-street, Leeds, at that hour. The luncheon is timed for 1.30 p.m. at the "Elephant and Castle," Knaresboro. The price of the ticket (inclusive) is 5s. Given a fine day this ought to be an ideal outing. We should add that application for excursion tickets ought to be made as soon as possible to Mr. George Weir, 59 Elford-grove, Leeds.

The President hopes to see a strong rally of "saints" at Leeds from all parts of the country on Whit-Sunday. There is almost certainly more trouble brewing for the Freethought party. The "authorities" seem to have arrived at a common understanding as to harrying the Freethought movement without ever invoking the Blasphemy Laws, and it is the duty of Freethinkers to answer this mean as well as impudent challenge. A bold pronouncement from the Leeds Conference will be worth making.

A number of Cornell University students have set about finding or forming a new religion. Twelve of them met in the "Dutch Kitchen" and started a Robert Ingersoll Club, "to study, investigate, and criticise the existing religious creeds of to-day, with a view of reconstructing religious thought and setting it upon a basis of fact and truth, instead of needless faith and traditional superstition." All success to these brave young fellows!

INTERVIEWING A PREACHER.

The pastor began by interviewing the little girl before he knew that she was doing something in that line herself.

"Are you a preacher?" she asked.

"I am," he admitted.

"Preachers is good, ain't they?"

"Well, they are supposed to be."

"Are you?"

"I hope so."

"What do you do?"

"I try to make people better."

"Is that all?"

"Yes; that is enough. If I can do that I shall be sure of my reward."

"What reward?"

"Heaven."

"Where all the good ones go?"

"Yes, dear."

"Well, what'll you do for a livin' when you get there?"

A MISTAUGHT LITTLE GIRL.

Miss Brown was giving an elaborate description of a blacksmith preparatory to teaching Longfellow's poem to her pupils.

"Now, children, we are going to learn a poem to-day about someone who works very hard. He is very large and has great arms that can lift such heavy things. His face is blackened with soot that comes from his great, blazing fires. And he wears a dirty black apron, and he has a fire that glows, oh, so red, and whenever he makes anything he puts it into his fire and then pounds it with a great, big hammer, which makes the loudest clanging noise and makes the sparks fly about in every direction. Now, who can tell me what I have been describing?"

A little maid who had listened to these vivid details with eyes twice their natural size, sprang to her feet and said in an awed whisper: "The Devil."

Christian Science.

MRS. EDDY, in *Science and Health*, p. 110, claims that no human tongue or pen taught her the so-called science contained in its pages, and elsewhere alleges that God himself dictated its contents to her—that she merely played the rôle of automatic scribe, “echoing the harmonies of heaven in divine metaphysics.” This, of course, is scarcely reconcilable with the claim that she alone was “the discoverer and founder” of Christian Science; but to expect intellectual consistency from the author of such metaphysical verbiage as *Science and Health*, would indeed be a vain hope. For seeing that Mrs. Eddy denies the Personality of the Christian God, and substitutes a Principle, with a big P, in his place, and yet continues to speak of this Principle as if it possessed the attributes of Personality, it is little wonder that Christian Science literature exhibits a strange confusion of thought.

Mrs. Eddy's claim to be the originator of the ideas she manipulated was, of course, very strenuously contested at the outset of her public career. Those who are acquainted with the history of the movement, will have some knowledge of the long and bitter controversy that was waged in the American press between Julius A. Dresser and Mrs. Eddy when she first publicly claimed the “science” she learned from P. P. Quimby as her own. Our present concern, however, is not with the famous Quimby controversy but with the mental atmosphere of the period antecedent to Mrs. Eddy's public appearance and somewhat audacious claim. The ideas of P. P. Quimby, which Mrs. Eddy imbibed, at least, the fundamental ideas upon which his healing practice was based, were not by any means new, but had been widely propagated in the leading cities of America for many years before he adopted the healing profession as a means of livelihood. Indeed, a knowledge of the mental antecedents of Christian Science is sufficient to effectively dispose of its claim, either to originality or divine inspiration. Some of the theories that were advocated in those times of mental ferment will perhaps serve as an instructive setting to Mrs. Eddy's “science of divine metaphysics.”

In the year 1850, Dr. John Bovee Dods, who had gained some notoriety by his lectures on mental science in relation to disease, was invited by several well-known members of the American Senate to deliver his course of lectures in Washington, the Hall of Representatives being placed at his disposal for the purpose. The invitation speaks of the favorable accounts which had reached the Senators of the addresses the Doctor had delivered in different sections of the Union. The title of these lectures was “Electrical Psychology,” and their subject matter “the philosophy of disease, and the reciprocal action of *mind* and *matter* upon each other.” Dr. Dods had advocated the ideas advanced in these lectures as far back as 1832. He professed to have discovered in electricity not only the connecting link between mind and inert matter, but the all-pervading active agent which controlled and governed universal phenomena. Applying this theory to the functions of the body, he maintained there was only one grand cause of all diseases, viz., the disturbing of the vital force of the body. Equanimity of mind was the parent of health, peace, and happiness. The disturbing factors of this normal state he divided into mental impressions and physical impressions, and those diseases, he said, which were due to mental disturbance, such as excessive fear and joy, and the functional derangement they set up, could be cured by the action of the mind. Even those troubles that were caused by physical impressions such as wet feet or a blow, might be greatly helped by mental action in conjunction with the necessary medicines.

But Dr. Dods was evidently sensible that his theory of mind-cure might be carried to absurd limits, as has been done in the case of Christian

Science, and so he is careful to state just how much he really claims for it. He says:—

“I do not mean that a cure can be effected by the electro-nervous force, through mental impressions, if there be any organic destruction of the parts diseased. Consumption, for instance, could not be cured if the lungs were ulcerated; sight could not be restored if the optic nerve were destroyed; nor could deafness be removed if the auditory nerve were gone. In these cases, even medical remedies, it must be granted, would be of no avail, because there is no foundation on which to build.

“Nor do I mean to be understood that this science alone can at all times cure. It may require medicines to co-operate with it. As diseases are produced through mental and physical impressions, so through mental and physical impressions they must be cured.”

But while thus recommending the use of material medicines, he pointed out very distinctly that the restorative or healing principle was not in the medicine, but in the recuperative power of the system:—

“The sanative power is in the individual and not in medicine. Medicine and mental impressions only call that sanative principle to the right spot in the system so as to enable it to do its work.”

As we have seen, the invitation addressed to Dr. Dods by the members of the Senate, among whom were Henry Clay and Daniel Webster, was based upon the widespread public interest that had been manifested in the Doctor's lectures. Mrs. Eddy, at that time, was twenty-nine years of age, having been born near Concord in New Hampshire in 1821. And although, as Josephine Curtice Woodbury remarks, the first fifty years of Mrs. Eddy's life were lived in obscurity; the mental atmosphere of the period was rife with the ideas that she later turned to such financial advantage. Dr. Dods professed to have taught his science of disease to more than a thousand individuals, whose course of tuition entitled them to become teachers, and to charge the same fees as their instructor, which was ten dollars for gentlemen and five dollars for ladies. His theories of disease, too, seem to have given the cue to a lot of charlatans, who are ever ready to exploit a new idea. He had to complain, in the first edition of his published lectures, of “hundreds of individuals who had undertaken to lecture upon, and even to teach, this science, who had never received any instruction from him, either verbal or written.” Some of these individuals had even changed the name of the science to that of “Electro Biology,” and claimed authorship as to its discovery.

The first wave of mental science, animal magnetism, and clairvoyance, says Georgine Milmine in her *Life of Mrs. Eddy*, swept over New England in the '30's; the atmosphere was charged with the occult, the movement ranging all the way from phrenology and mind-reading to German transcendentalism. The period that followed was prolific in all sorts of mystery and quackery, and remarkable for a newly-awakened interest in mental and psychic phenomena, especially in their bearing upon disease and its treatment. Mesmerism was one of the subjects that excited considerable public attention. Charles Poyen, a French disciple of Mesmer, had travelled through New England, lecturing and performing marvels of mesmeric power in the same towns in which Mrs. Eddy then lived. Poyen used the term “Animal Magnetism” in connection with his demonstrations, and called it a “great Truth,” “The Power of Mind over Matter,” “a discovery given by God,” and also a “science.” And although there is no evidence that Mrs. Eddy ever heard Poyen, or read his book, the fact that “Animal Magnetism” has been given an important place in Christian Science literature, and that there is a chapter devoted to it in *Science and Health*, would seem to indicate that Mrs. Eddy was not unacquainted with Poyen's theories.

It was through witnessing the wonderful feats of Charles Poyen that P. P. Quimby was led to interest himself in mental phenomena and their relation to disease. He made Poyen's acquaintance, and fol-

lowed him from town to town. But Quimby, too, developed mesmeric power, and easily repeated the performance of Poyen and other exhibitors. And from becoming their imitator he became their rival, and abandoning his trade as a clock-maker, he started out as a professional mesmerist. By-and-bye, however, Quimby came to see that all his mesmeric paraphernalia had nothing whatever to do with the cure of the patients; that the patients, in fact, cured themselves. In 1859, he opened an office in Portland for the treatment of disease by mental means alone. And it was here that Mrs. Eddy first visited "Dr." Quimby, although she had been in communication with him for some time previous. It was Julius A. Dresser who received Mrs. Eddy on her arrival, and introduced her to Quimby; and the extent to which she has plagiarised the ideas and phraseology of her benefactor is clearly shown by Mr. Dresser in the famous controversy.

Another prominent character of the period, and whose theories of life and disease were akin to Quimby's was Andrew Jackson Davis, who afterwards became a celebrated Spiritualist. His chief work, *The Great Harmonia*, was published in 1850. According to the philosophy of Davis, disease is not a part of the "Great Harmonia." It is a discord, and originates in a want of equilibrium in the circulation of the spiritual Principle throughout the organism. "There is but one Principle," he states, "one united attribute of Goodness and Truth." "Truth is positive Principle; error is a negative principle, and as Truth is positive and eternal, it must subdue error, which is only temporal and artificial." The similarity between the phraseology of Christian Science and that of the Davis philosophy is somewhat instructive in view of Mrs. Eddy's claim to originality. Davis and Mrs. Eddy were alike in this, that neither had any respect for book-learning. But it is a curious commentary on her alleged "inspiration" that while the total literary output of Andrew Jackson Davis numbered thirty six pretentious volumes, she struggled painfully on with her ill-defined ideas for eight long years after Quimby's death, writing and rewriting the manuscripts of her book.

It was, then, amid such a mental atmosphere as we have depicted that Mrs. Eddy lived and moved for more than fifty years, before the publication of her book. She first visited Quimby as a patient in 1862, which was only four years before he died; but it was not until 1875 that the first edition of *Science and Health* made its appearance. The title of the book was an adaptation of the name Quimby gave to his healing system, "The Science of Health." Whether or not it was that the country had been surfeited with metaphysical theories of disease, certain it is that the first edition of *Science and Health*, consisting of a thousand copies, fell flat on the market, and had to be personally peddled by Daniel Spoffard, Mrs. Eddy's assistant. Her claim to have been divinely inspired, or her title to originality, may best be judged by a comparison of her peculiar metaphysics with the ideas that had been assiduously propagated in New England from her earliest years, and which are chiefly associated with the names of Dr. Dods, Charles Poyen, Andrew Jackson Davis, and P. P. Quimby. And whatever truth there may be in the theories of disease and their cure which these pioneers of curative mental science advocated, there can be little question that the absurd extremity to which Mrs. Eddy carried their ideas has tended to bring discredit upon them and to retard the progress of a sane view of the mental aspect of disease. The absurdity of her "divine" claim is only equalled by the credulity of her disciples in accepting the pretensions of one of the biggest charlatans of modern times.

JOSEPH BRYCE.

Old Testament History.—XI.

(Continued from p. 316.)

In the last table of succession there appeared the name of Hezekiah king of Judah, who commenced to reign two years before the capture of Samaria by Sargon; but all the important events of that king's reign having occurred after the taking of that city, I set his name down again in the following table:—

B. C.	JUDAH.	Years.	B. C.	ISRAEL.
724	... Hezekiah	... 29	701	... Menahem II.
695	... Manasseh	... 53	676	... Abi-baal
642	... Amon	... 2	668	... Abi-baal

According to the Bible "history," Hezekiah ascended the throne in the 3rd year of Hoshea (*i.e.*, 730 B.C.); the capture of Samaria (722 B.C.) was in the 6th year of Hezekiah; and the invasion of Judah by Sennacherib (701 B.C.) was in the 14th year of Hezekiah. The three dates here given are fixed by the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III., Sargon, and Sennacherib, kings of Assyria: the problem is to reconcile them with the Bible statements. I have given it up myself, and have placed Hezekiah where, in his 14th year, a king of Assyria *did* invade Judea, but that king was not Sennacherib. Any reader is, of course, at liberty to try his hand on the problem.

Nothing of any consequence occurred in the reign of Hezekiah until his fourteenth year (711 B.C.). In the latter year Sargon, the conqueror of Samaria, suddenly appeared in the south of Palestine, and, leaving a portion of his army under his Tartan or commander-in-chief to invest Ashdod, he over-ran with the rest of his forces the land of Judah, and captured all the cities save its capital, Jerusalem. "This conquest of Judah by Sargon," says Professor Sayce, "explains prophecies of Isaiah which have hitherto been unsolved mysteries. In chapter x. the Assyrian army is described as marching along the high road.....and as halting at Nob, only an hour's journey distant from Jerusalem." The latter statement is evidently correct, for Isa. x. 5—11 and 28—32 refer to Sargon, in whose time Isaiah is said to have lived.

The year of Sargon's campaign in Judea would seem to have been used as a date to reckon later events by. Thus we read:—

Isa. xx. 1.—"In the year that Tartan came unto Ashdod, when Sargon the king of Assyria sent him, and he fought against Ashdod and took it; at that time ——" etc.

It was in this year, Isaiah tells us, that at the command of "the Lord" he commenced to walk through the land "naked and barefoot, for three years, as a sign and a wonder." This action on the part of that mad prophet, I can readily believe, was both "a sign and a wonder"—more especially to the women and children who had never seen a nude prophet before.

The long account in 2 Kings (xviii. 13—xix. 37), though placed in the 14th year of Hezekiah, instead of the 24th, refers mainly to the campaign of the Assyrian king Sennacherib (701 B.C.). Respecting the conquests of Sargon the "history" in 2 Kings is silent, and it is only in the passages just noticed in the book of Isaiah that that king is referred to at all. It would, perhaps, be more correct to say that the campaigns of the two kings are mixed up together, though only Sennacherib is named in it. This account commences:—

2 Kings xviii. 13.—"Now in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah did Sennacherib king of Assyria come up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them."

The last three words are the most important statement in the whole account. All the strongest and best fortified cities of Judah were captured by Sennacherib: there remained, then, to be taken but the royal city of Jerusalem, in which Hezekiah and many fugitives from other cities had taken refuge.

In the next verse we are told that Hezekiah sent to Sennacherib, who was then at Lachish, tendering

his submission, and offering to pay whatever tribute might be exacted. "And the king of Assyria appointed unto Hezekiah.....three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold." To find this sum Hezekiah took all the silver stored in the temple and in his own house, and cut off the gold overlaying the doors and pillars of the temple, and gave the whole to Sennacherib. The payment of this tribute, however, appeared to have no effect; for "the king of Assyria sent Tartan and Rabsaris and Rabshakeh from Lachish to king Hezekiah with a great army unto Jerusalem" (verse 17). Here it may be noted that these were not proper names, but titles: Tartan meant "commander-in-chief"; Rabshakeh, "chief officer"; and Rabsaris, "chief of the eunuchs." This part of the account certainly refers to Sennacherib.

According to the Bible account, Rabshakeh made a very sensible speech, though the language in one verse appears to be unspeakably vulgar. Such ideas, however, were common to the age, and we find similar language used by David and the prophet Ezekiel. Rabshakeh said (in effect) to the officers of Hezekiah who came out to hear his message: Tell Hezekiah that the king of Assyria asks "On whom does Hezekiah trust, that he rebels against me?" If his trust be on the king of Egypt, he will find him a "bruised reed"; if upon Yahveh, is not that the god whose "high places" and altars Hezekiah has pulled down, leaving him but one—the altar in Jerusalem? Try to persuade Hezekiah to "give pledges to my lord the king of Assyria." Let not Hezekiah deceive you by saying that "Yahveh will surely deliver you." Ask yourself "Hath any of the gods of the nations ever delivered his land out of the hand of the king of Assyria?" Not one. "Where are the gods of Hamath and of Arpad? where are the gods of Sepharvaim, Hena, and Ivvah? Have they delivered Samaria out of his hand?" Why, then, should Yahveh deliver Jerusalem out of his hand?

The cities and provinces named were all reduced to submission by Sargon, not by Sennacherib: this portion therefore refers to the campaign of Sargon. After reading Rabshakeh's harangue, the question arises, Why, or for what purpose, was an Assyrian army sent to blockade Jerusalem? Hezekiah had sent and signified his willingness to submit; Sennacherib had named the amount of tribute; this Hezekiah had collected, and sent on to the king of Assyria. Why, then, was an Assyrian force sent to invest Jerusalem? The answer is obvious. Hezekiah had *not* paid tribute to Sennacherib, as stated. Being the best king "in the sight of the Lord" that had yet reigned in Judah, "Yahveh was with him; whithersoever he went forth he prospered: and he rebelled against the king of Assyria, and served him not" (verse 7). Hezekiah had not yet submitted. The gold and silver raked together, as described, had been given to Sargon, for that king records having received "tribute and presents" from Judah.

How long the blockade of Jerusalem by the Assyrian army continued is not stated; but the reason given for raising it is thus recorded:—

2 Kings xix. 35.—"And it came to pass that night, that the angel of Yahveh went forth, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred and four score and five thousand: and when they arose early in the morning, behold they were all dead corpses."

This is real jam. That 185,000 Assyrians should wake up in the morning and find themselves "all dead corpses" is truly wonderful. This story is, perhaps, even more wonderful than that of the angel in the reign of David, who with a drawn sword in his hand smote 70,000 men with pestilence. It is needless to say that both stories are of the same character. Moreover, one need only read the paragraph 2 Kings xix. 32—37—omitting verse 35—to see that the latter verse is a later interpolation. Isaiah had told Hezekiah that Sennacherib should make no attempt to take the city, but "by the way that he came, by the same shall he return" to Assyria. There was no promise that any of the Assyrian army should be slain. Hence, in fulfilment of Isaiah's prediction, verse 36 goes on to say: "So Sennacherib

king of Assyria departed," etc.—his whole army being clearly implied to be with him. And, as a simple matter of fact, if any disaster had befallen his army, Sennacherib would never have been able to get back to Nineveh.

ABRACADABRA.

(To be continued.)

The "Real Thing."

IN the pretty village in which I have the good fortune to reside there are some half-dozen churches, representing as many denominations. They are officered by gentlemen of widely divergent culture and position, from the clergyman of the Established Church to the noisy Salvation Army corporal who exerts his energies outside my house in alternately punishing a very loose drum and endeavoring to blow the indentations out of a battered cornet. The worst that can be said of the Church of England parson (I use this term because I really haven't taken the trouble to find out whether he is a rector or a vicar, and if I employed the wrong expression he might be annoyed) is that he has written a book, and the best that can be said of him is that its fame is entirely unknown beyond the two thousand or so of his parishioners. As for the Salvation Army enthusiast, I permit him to disturb my baby's sleep, not because I like it, but because I know it gives him pleasure. He has to work hard for a living, he hasn't enough spare coins to pay for many enjoyments, and he gets this one for nothing. Besides, I am very well aware that he, being a Christian, would show the same toleration to me if I chose to express my views in the manner in which he expresses his.

The other day a gentleman of some local standing stopped me in our main thoroughfare and asked, quite suddenly and bluntly, if I would help him and "a few friends" to establish a Congregational Church. It happens that Congregationalism is one of the denominations unrepresented among us, and the eye of faith can foresee wondrous happenings in our quiet village when the new sect is duly established. The unsanctified have noticed, however, that the half-dozen buildings already existing for the salvation of sinners are never more than one quarter full, and it would seem that in setting up another the most elementary features of the law of supply and demand are being overlooked. However, I did not say this, for I scented humor in the conversation that was to follow, and accordingly made a mild reply.

"I am afraid," I said, "that my views on religion would not meet with the approval of your friends."

"But I understand," said he, "that you have been engaged in Christian work."

"Yes, but not recently. I was once an enthusiastic Church worker, but I gave that up years ago."

"Then what a good opportunity there is here for starting again."

"My opinions," I said, "have undergone considerable modification of late years, and I fear they will never again coincide with those of official Christianity."

"Not when it is the *real thing*?" he said.

My anticipation of humor had not been disappointed. My friend had got the great secret up his sleeve, as it were, and in recommending Congregationalism as the "real thing" he had the insinuating manner of a salesman pushing a new soap or jam. Moreover, his remark did not strike me as one of brilliant originality. I seemed to have recollections of hearing it before, and it is not, I fancy, the exclusive property of Congregationalists. The temptation to laugh was almost irresistible, but I permitted my mirth no greater indulgence than a smile as I replied, somewhat enigmatically:—

"In religion, soap, and jam, there is only one 'real thing'—and every man has it!"

He gave me a queer look of uncertainty and suspicion, and shook a head which, I fear, had become a little confused.

"You'll have to come back to it some day," he remarked dolefully, "you'll have to come back to it." I noted his typical Christian self-assurance, and muttered under my breath:—

"Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven."

"I beg your pardon?" said my friend.

"I was merely regretting," I said, "that I cannot be of any use to you. Good morning." R. NORTH.

UBI ERAT DEUS?

Was God enjoying a banquet too,
As were the captain and the crew?
Was he also toasting with luscious drink
The ship *Titanic* that could not sink?
Or had he asked his kin to see
A grand and gruesome tragedy?
And after the play did he retire
Unmoved by the performance dire?
Oh, where was God that awful night
When Life and Death were called to fight?

Why, *why*, were sixteen hundred braves
Fod to the cold and hungry waves?
Why were heroic hearts and true
Stilled in the deepest depths of blue?
Why were the parent, child, and bride
Made to do battle with the tide?
Oh, does it mollify our woe
That we can never, never know!
Can faith and hope, belief and prayer,
Do aught but mock our mad despair?
And shall we fold our hands and say,
His will works in a wondrous way?
Ugh! where was God that awful night
When Life and Death were called to fight?

If he looked down on such a scene
Omnipotent and yet serene;
If men among the choicest born
Were sacrificed, from loved ones torn—
If they were suffered to do and die
Ignored by his all-seeing eye;
If God viewed all this—ay, more—
And still his vaunted grace forebore.

What shall we say? Why, that the skies
Hold naught but hell-fiends in disguise,
And all our writhings here below
For them are but a passing show.
I'd rather believe in chance for aye
Than kneel to such as these and pray.
If life's worth while and not a dream,
If all our love is what 'twould seem,
Oh, where was God that awful night
When Life and Death were called to fight!

—*Truthseeker* (New York).

Oliver Opp-Dyke.

SHAKESPEARE AND RELIGION.

The Headmaster of Eton, in his sermon at the Commemoration Service of the Stratford Festival, took the unexpected line that Shakespeare was not a religious poet; and in doing so very likely shocked some of his hearers. Books have been written about Shakespeare's religion; an effort has been made to prove that he was a Roman Catholic; his idolaters start with the assumption that he was everything a man ought to be, and if they think that he ought to have been religious, they use every scrap of religious allusion in his plays to make their point. The negative method employed by Mr. Lytton is much safer and does more honor to the genius of the poet. We may be sure that, if religion had been one of Shakespeare's chief interests, he would have expressed it, not merely in occasional passages dramatically appropriate, but in the choice of his characters and the very structure of his plots. Nobody can pretend that he did so. Not one of his chief characters, either of those who seem to be drawn from his own experience or from the closest and keenest observation, is religious; nor is religion a main interest in any of his plots. We can see that he had a morality of his own; and the chief point in it seems to have been the very Christian virtue of forgiveness; but that virtue in his case appears to have been based rather upon a passionate desire to do the will of God.—*The Times*, April 30, 1912.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF WHIPPING.

Editor Barry of the *Star* (San Francisco) published a burning editorial article on the whipping-post, or man-whipping, as practised in Delaware. He declared that the relic of barbarism should be abolished, but two other California papers, the *Sacramento Bee* and the *Stockton Mail*, took issue with him as to the universal condemnation of the whipping-post, and insisted that an exception should be made in the case of wife-beaters—an amendment which Mr. Barry accepts, with apologies for overlooking it. We think Mr. Barry was right in the first place. No wife-beater should be permitted to drag the State to his own level of brutality. The matter of deserts, and the fitting the punishment to the crime, cannot be brought in. If told that he deserves whipping because he has beaten his wife, the culprit may say that she deserved a beating because she had whipped her child, the logic of which is an unanswerable indictment of the practice. We condemn wife-beating without inquiring whether or not the victim merited the punishment, and may adopt the same attitude toward beating the husband. When we read of the cutting out of the tongues of prisoners and dragging them asunder with horses, we do not ask what they had done; we condemn the perpetrators unheard, as an increasing number do the employers of the whipping-post in Delaware. There are wives and mothers who are brutal, made so by the same conditions that produce the brutal husband; they let loose their tempers on the defenceless children, being thereby guilty of an act as reprehensible as that of the men who in turn vent their ill humor on the female of their species. The lash cannot be more effective as a civiliser of the one sex than of the other. It will not civilise either, and its effect on those who wield it is other than refining. Mr. Barry's first impulse was the better one.—*George Macdonald*, "*Truthseeker*" (*New York*).

MADE A HIT WITH HIM.

A clergyman who was passing his vacation in a remote country district met an old farmer who declared that he was "Church of England."

"To what parish do you belong?" asked the clergyman.

"Don't know nawthin' 'bout any parish," was the answer.

"Who confirmed you, then?" was the next question.

"Nobody," answered the farmer.

"Then how are you 'Church of England'?" asked the clergyman.

"Well," was the reply, "you see, it's this way: Last winter I went down to Sussex a-visitin', an' while I was there I went to church an' I heard them say that they left undone the things what they'd oughter done and they'd done some things what they oughter done, and I says to myself, says I: 'That's my fix exactly,' and ever since then I've been 'Church of England.'"

MERRY EDITH.

Edith's mother had invited a very serious young parson to dinner, and he was placed next the daughter. All went well until she asked him:

"You speak of everybody having a mission. What is yours?"

"My mission," said the parson, "is to save young men."

"Good," replied the girl. "I'm glad to meet you. I wish you'd save one for me."

Correspondence

OUR WIDE CIRCULATION.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE FREETHINKER."

SIR,—Seeing a letter in the *Freethinker* from a foreign reader, I thought I would take the opportunity of letting you know how far your paper travels. Junin is a camp town about 160 miles west of Buenos Aires, and I receive my *Freethinker* every week with pleasure and also hand it on to my friends who take an interest in it. I have tried several times to buy it in Buenos Aires, but have never been successful. I always make a point of asking for it at every newspaper shop. Wishing you every success and an increase in sales.

Junin, Prov. de Buenos Ays.

S. CALLOWAY.

P.S.—I am from Birmingham and have heard you speak in the Town Hall there on several occasions.—S. C.

SUNDAY LECTURE NOTICES, Etc.

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

LONDON.

OUTDOOR.

BETHNAL GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Victoria Park, near the Bandstand): 3.15 and 6.15, Mr. Darby, Lectures.

CAMBERWELL BRANCH N. S. S. (Brockwell Park): 3.15, W. Davidson, a Lecture.

ISLINGTON BRANCH N. S. S. (Finsbury Park): 11.15, a Lecture.

NORTH LONDON BRANCH N. S. S. (Parliament Hill Fields): 3.15, a Lecture.

WEST HAM BRANCH N. S. S. (outside Maryland Point Station, Stratford, E.): 7, R. H. Rosetti, "The Sabbath."

WOOD GREEN BRANCH N. S. S. (Jolly Butchers Hill, opposite Public Library): 7.30, Mr. Burke, "The Bankruptcy of Jesus Christ."

COUNTRY.

INDOOR.

LEEDS (Assembly Rooms, Briggate): 7, Public Demonstration. Speakers: Messrs. G. W. Foote, C. Cohen, J. T. Lloyd, F. A. Davies, A. B. Moss, W. Heaford, John Grange, and Miss Kough.

OUTDOOR.

HULL (Paragon Square): Joseph A. E. Bates—Monday, May 27, at 8, "Broken Fetters"; Tuesday, 28, at 8, "Materialism in the Nineteenth Century"; Wednesday, 29, at 8, "Day-dreams"; Thursday, 30, at 8, "In the Valley of the Shadow"; Friday, 31, at 8, "The Paradox of Christian Socialism"; Saturday, June 1, at 8, "An Old Story and a New Interpretation."

LAINDON, ESSEX (opposite Luff's Hairdressing Saloon): Saturday, May 25, at 7, R. H. Rosetti, "The Will of God."

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

NOW READY.

The Trial and Imprisonment of J. W. GOTT FOR BLASPHEMY.

CHAPTERS:—Blasphemy: What is it?—How the Trouble Commenced—At the Assizes—Gaol—Prison Experiences—The Agitation—The Home Secretary and Justice Horridge—Death of Mrs. J. W. Gott—The Parsons *plus* the Police—The Press—John Grange—Some Character Sketches, with Portraits.

Paper, 1s. 3d. Cloth, 2s. 3d. Post free.

FREETHOUGHT SOCIALIST LEAGUE, 28 Church Bank, Bradford.

Do You Want a Suit?

If so, you will allow me to submit Self-measurement form and Patterns of my Pure Wool Suitings at 50s., Made to Measure, Fit Guaranteed. Ordinary price £3 to £5. A post card with your name and address will bring samples by return of post.

J. W. GOTT, 28 Church Bank, Bradford.

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.

THE SECULAR SOCIETY

(LIMITED)

Company Limited by Guarantee.

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

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

Secretary—MISS E. M. VANCE.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Society's solicitors are Messrs. Harper and Batcock, 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.

	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 6
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 8d.	2 4
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 8
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 8
REMINISCENCES OF CHARLES BRADLAUGH	post 1d.	0 6
ROME OR ATHEISM? The Great Alternative	post 1d.	0 8
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 8
WHO WAS THE FATHER OF JESUS?	post ½d.	0 2
WILL CHRIST SAVE US?	post 1d.	0 6

WORKS BY COL. INGERSOLL

	s.	d.
A CHRISTIAN CATECHISM	post 1d.	0 6
A WOODEN GOD	post ½d.	0 1
CHRISTIAN RELIGION, THE... ..	post ½d.	0 8
CREEDS AND SPIRITUALITY... ..	post ½d.	0 1
CRIMES AGAINST CRIMINALS	post ½d.	0 8
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 8
ORATION ON THE GODS	post 1d.	0 6
ORATION ON VOLTAIRE	post ½d.	0 8
ORATION ON WALT WHITMAN	post 1d.	0 8
REPLY TO GLADSTONE	post 1d.	0 4
ROME OR REASON?	post 1d.	0 8
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
THREE PHILANTHROPISTS, THE	post ½d.	0 2
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.

PAMPHLETS by C. COHEN.

An Outline of Evolutionary Ethics	6d.
Principles of ethics, based on the doctrine of Evolution.	
Socialism, Atheism, and Christianity..	1d.
Christianity and Social Ethics	1d.
Pain and Providence	1d.

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

THE BOOK THAT WAS WANTED. 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.

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Mr. Cohen has written just the book that Rationalists have long been inquiring for."—*Literary Guide*.

"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."—*Morning Leader*.

"Written with ability."—*Times*.

"The author states his case well."—*Athenaeum*.

"The first seven chapters state the case for Determinism with clearness and fullness.....There is probably no better popular summary than this of Mr. Cohen's.....Mr. Cohen has some excellent passages on the nature and extent of the psychic whole, which is constructed out of the accumulated experiences of the race."—*Ethical World*.

PRICE ONE SHILLING NET.
(POSTAGE 2d.)

PUBLISHED BY THE WALTER SCOTT COMPANY.

Also on Sale by

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

An Important New Book for Freethinkers.

Penalties Upon Opinion. Some Records of the Laws of Heresy and Blasphemy.

BROUGHT TOGETHER BY

HYPATIA BRADLAUGH BONNER.*Issued by the Rationalist Press Association.*

PRICE SIXPENCE NET.
BOUND IN CLOTH ONE SHILLING NET.
(POSTAGE 2d.)

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

THE POPULAR EDITION
(Revised and Enlarged)

OF

"BIBLE ROMANCES"

BY

G. W. FOOTE.

With a Portrait of the Author

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

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

SIXPENCE—NET

(POSTAGE 2d.)

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