

The Dilemma of Theology and Science AN OPEN LETTER TO THE REV. CHARLES STRONG, D.D.
MINISTER OF THE "AUSTRALIAN CHURCH," AND EDITOR OF "THE AUSTRALIAN HERALD,"
BY J. S. Melbourne: J. C. Stephens, Printer 146 Elizabeth Street 1903

Psychic Phenomena.

A reprint from "the Australian herald," August, 1903, edited by Rev. Charles Strong, D.D.

Psychic Phenomena.

Reprint from the "Australian Herald."

Psychic Phenomena masthead

"PSYCHIC PHENOMENA: A Narrative of Facts," by T. W. Stanford. (Bruce and Davies, Melbourne).—This pamphlet purports to be an account of lectures on ancient history by Professor Robinson, of Southington Connecticut, U.S., born 1797, died 1864. His name, of course, is known to all biblical students. Professor Robinson has selected, according to Mr. Stanford, an uncultured and obscure man in Melbourne as a "medium," through whom he delivers lectures to a select audience of ladies and gentlemen on ancient history. The special course of lectures reported in this pamphlet, occupying about five minutes each for the ordinary reader, though probably taking the medium very much longer to deliver, is upon Mexican and other ancient forms of religion. These lectures are delivered in a dim light, or in the dark, and are varied by recitations and dramatic exhibitions, when the medium is declared to be under the control of the late Mr. Creswick, the actor, and others. The late Professor Denton lectures occasionally on geology, and the late Rev. Julian Woods discourses on religion and theology. The interludes consist, we believe, of sacred songs sung by the company, such as "Sweet By-and-Bye" and "The Holy City." The proceedings are opened with prayer.

But most remarkable of all, ornithological specimens are brought from distant lands—live birds sitting on eggs, also rocks dripping with seaweed from distant seas, and tablets dug from ancient ruins. Wonderful kinetic energy is thus displayed by the denizens of the "other world," and time and space are annihilated. Some of these "tablets" have been sent on to Stanford University, but the editor of this pamphlet does not tell us with what result.

We believe Mr. Stanford to be an honourable man, and that he is thoroughly convinced that the "psychic phenomena" he describes are perfectly genuine. He is believed to spend much money on these investigations. But the reader is bound to have his doubts. No attempt is made at scientific proof. No proof whatever is offered of these astounding allegations, and no method of verification is even suggested. The reader is asked to receive these things first on Mr. Stanford's word, for which we have every respect, but which in itself is no *proof*; then on the supposition that the "medium" is genuine, and is not "cramming," a supposition for which we have only Mr. Stanford's assurances; and, finally, on the supposition that, even if the "medium" is no trickster, these lecturettes must be from the discarnate Robinson. Mr. Myers, in his notable book on "Human Personality," attributes many wonderful psychic phenomena to the uprush of the "subliminal mind," and many more to telepathy, and a certain clairvoyant instinct possessed by some people, although Mr. Myers does not deny the possibility of discarnate spirits impressing the living.

There seems to us to be nothing in these lecturettes that might not be accounted for in this way, even if we have to abandon the supposition that the "medium" has coached himself up for a five minutes' discourse on subjects about which his audience are utterly ignorant, and on which the majority of people can be easily mystified. There is nothing, as far as we can see, in this medium's utterances which an uncultured man, with the aid of books and of other men who do know something, and, it may be, of a somnambule self-induced trance, might not easily "communicate." And there is no reason to believe that we are in the presence of a learned professor. The "medium" referred to is not unknown in spiritist "circles," and the opinion of some who have witnessed his performances is not favourable to Mr. Stanford's construction of his powers.

and no method of verification is even suggested" by the unknown and purely conjectural writer of that "canonical" book. Now the transport through the air for a distance of many miles, of a substantial human being is surely quite as wonderful as that of the objects enumerated in Mr. Stanford's pamphlet; and yet P believe the narrative of Philip's flight is accepted by some hundred of millions of Christian men and women as perfectly authentic, although unsupported by a single tittle of evidence! Do you, Sir, reject it on that account? If so, I presume you refuse to receive as worthy of credence, the narratives contained within the Four Gospels, of all the "miracles" alleged to have been performed by the Founder of Christianity. For they must be, in your view of the matter, "astounding allegations" which are absolutely destitute and quite incapable of scientific proof.

Surely this is a very anomalous position for a minister of the Christian religion to occupy. And just note the remarkable superiority of the position which poor deluded Spiritualists like myself have taken up in comparison with that of both orthodox and rationalistic preachers of the Gospel. I, for one, regard as credible almost every one of the so-called "miracles" recorded in the New Testament, for each of them is being paralleled among Spiritualists at this very hour. Even the Transfiguration on the Mount has its counterpart in those modern materializations which have taken place, and are still taking place under such rigorously scientific conditions as place their reality high above contestation; of which you have an impressive example in the article contributed to, and the experiments described in, the *Quarterly Journal of Science* for July, 1870, by Sir William Crookes, F.R.S.; in the *Miracles and Modern Spiritualism* of Alfred Russel Wallace, D.C.L., LL.D., and F.R.S.; and in the *Animisme et Spiritisme* of the late Alexander Aksakof, in which the whole question is investigated from a purely scientific stand-point, and is accompanied by five reproductions of as many materialized figures of the departed, obtained by Dr. Wagner, Professor of Zoology, in the University of St. Petersburg.

I might likewise refer you to the *Au Pays de l'Ombre*, by Madame d'Esperance, a lady who, like her compatriot, the Princess Karadji, has studied these phenomena in the interests of science and humanity, and whose book is illustrated by thirteen photographs of spirits who have materialized in her presence.

From this digression, however, I will now return to your article in the *Australian Herald*, which I will proceed to dissect. Of the covert sneers which run through it all, I will say nothing, except to point out their inconsistency with that divine charity which Paul tells us "thinketh no evil;" the whole of the "Notice" being based upon the assumption that Mr. Stanford is a credulous fool, that Mr. Bailey is a fraud, and that the twenty or thirty ladies and gentlemen who have witnessed these remarkable phenomena, night after night, for weeks together, are mostly silly dupes, with a sprinkling among them of knavish confederates, who are assisting Bailey to carry out a subtle scheme of imposture, which not one of those present has intelligence enough to detect; or, if so, courage enough to expose and denounce. Now, I would not dream of anything so daringly audacious as to compare their intellectual attainments with your own: for there is an air of omniscience and infallibility in the review, before which, I, for one, bow my head in abasement if not in awe. But I venture with the utmost humility, to suggest, from my own observation of those ladies and gentlemen, on various occasions, that they are for the most part, level-headed, unemotional and earnest truth-seekers, gifted with plenty of common sense, and not exactly the sort of persons who would be predisposed to become the ready victims of an accomplished impostor. And Mr. Bailey is *not* accomplished in any sense of the word. He is not what could be called an educated man; and this is not his fault but his misfortune. He is not a schemer; indeed he is the very reverse; and he has a singularly unretentive memory; yet it would be indispensable that he should possess this, together with histrionic powers of a really remarkable character, in order to qualify him to recite in one unbroken flow—as I have heard him do, for two hours at a stretch—dramatic dialogues, scenes and poems, both tragical and comic, with appropriate gestures, intonation and action, so as to extort from an experienced theatrical critic the declaration that, if he could go through the same performances in his normal condition, he would achieve both fame and fortune on the stage. Not only, however, does he, when in trance, and controlled by discarnate intelligences, exhibit all the rare qualities of a veteran actor; but he delivers lectures on the antiquities of Assyria, Mexico and Palestine; upon moral philosophy, religion and metaphysics; deciphers Hieratic and Hieroglyphic characters upon old Egyptian manuscripts; defines the date of very ancient coins; interprets cuneiform inscriptions upon tablets from Nineveh and Babylon; chaunts hymns in Hindu; and intones passages in Arabic from the Koran. And all this, you suggest, may be "cramming" or the "uprush of the subliminal mind!" "O, Dr. Strong, is it a little Scottish humour you are treating us to? Produce any man in all Australia who can achieve the results by "cramming" which Mr. Bailey does, as you hint, by this method, and I will place him in the hands of an agent who will exploit him so profitably that you will be able to pay off the debt on your Church out of what shall be your share of the profits.

But there is an alternative explanation. Let me not forget that. These phenomena may be "the uprush of the subliminal mind!" Fancy a mental eructation, from somewhere beneath the *septum lucidum*, I suppose, compounded of archæology, histrionics, numismatics, chronology, palæography, the Koran, and the Vedic hymns! How was it generated? By what surreptitious methods was access obtained to Mr. Bailey's underground mentality, so to speak, and all these stores of miscellaneous knowledge deposited there, in order that he might delude Mr. Stanford, practise on the credulity of his friends, deceive men of science in Sydney, and afford yourself an opportunity of dilating on the "credulous dogmatism" to which some poor ignorant and deluded students of psychic science, or what they may believe to be such, are prone! Shall I be considered presumptuous if I venture to hint that there is such a thing as the superstition of incredulity, under the influence of which, even very learned people deliberately shut their eyes to the most palpable of facts, and close their ears to the most veracious of statements, because they are in dread of being called upon to sacrifice their dearest prejudices and to relinquish their most cherished prepossessions? In your case, I take it, those prepossessions are in favour of believing in the utter impossibility of the impact of the invisible upon the visible world; while

your prejudices apparently cause you to feel irritated and annoyed upon finding yourself brought face to face with certain phenomena which go to prove that this impact is actually taking place, and is a thing of daily occurrence, through the intermediation of "sensitives," gifted with a peculiar temperament or faculty, which renders them amenable to control by spirits. Can it be that you have forgotten how the diversity of forms taken by the gifts imparted to these sensitives is accurately described by the Apostle Paul, perhaps the most remarkable "medium" of his day? To one, he says, "the word of wisdom (inspirational speaking) is given through the spirit (simply *pneumatous*, be it observed); to another the word of knowledge (receptiveness of it from spirits); but to another faith by the same spirit (conviction of the truth of spiritual communications, as tested by experience); to another the gifts of healings (now being everywhere practised with the greatest success); to another discernings of spirits (clairvoyance); and, to another, kinds of tongues (as in the case of mediums who, under control, speak and write foreign languages, of which they themselves in their normal conditions do not know a single word); and to another interpretation of tongues "(as is taking place through Mr. Bailey). "But," adds Paul, "one and the same energy (*energeia*, and not Spirit, as rendered in the New Testament), worketh all these things, dividing to each one separately as he wisheth."The Scriptures, upon which, I presume, you base your teachings, as a minister of religion, are full of Spiritualism. Of the Most High it is written "that he maketh his angels (literally messengers) spirits"; the Master himself said to his disciples "the spirits are subject unto you"; and John addressed this injunction to his co-religionists, "Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but try the spirits, if they are from God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world"; just as, at the present day, there are plenty of evil or earth-bound spirits haunting the world, seizing upon weak-minded, wrong thinking and badly disposed sensitives, whom they often obsess. In fact our lunatic asylums are full of their victims; and these are quite capable of being cured by judicious treatment but too frequently become raving maniacs when exposed to the maddening influences of those terrible places of torment to deranged minds.

Thus Spiritualism is no new phenomenon in the history of mankind; but its manifestations, both mental and physical, were never so numerous and never so extraordinary as in our own epoch. And this is strictly in accordance with the declarations of the greatest medium, or Mediator, the world has ever seen. For did he not promise that "greater things" should be witnessed than those which he had shown the people of his day, and did he not aver that he had many things to say to his disciples but that "they could not bear them" then? The world was not ripe for what is being revealed to it now: only unfortunately the superstition of incredulity obstructs their acceptance; and I am sorry to say that, as in the times of Christ, the most obstinate opponents of the light that is once more streaming upon the world from the realms of the Unseen, are to be found among the high priests and the elders—among the very men who should be the first to welcome that which alone contains within itself "the substance of things hoped for and the evidence of things unseen."

Now, surely, there can be no more convincing testimony to the reality of the after life, which all Christians hope for, than the communications that are everywhere being opened up between those who have actually passed into that life, and those who are still abiding in the present one; no more conclusive "evidence of things unseen" than that which is furnished by the phenomena, upon the spiritual origin of which, you attempt to throw so much discredit. For, if weighty objects can be transported almost instantaneously from the heart of Asia and Africa, to a room in Melbourne, without human agency, and if living creatures like tropical birds and sea-fish can be passed through the walls or the ceiling of a house, then some unseen intelligence or intelligences must be operating to bring about such results; and if those intelligences, taking possession of a human being who is in a state of trance, and controlling his brain and organs of speech, solemnly assure us that they are spirits who have once lived upon the earth; and if there is no other reasonable or scientific method of accounting for the phenomena, then, I submit, we are justified in accepting their statements as trustworthy.

But, you insinuate, the tablets may have been moulded or prepared in Melbourne. Let us analyse this hypothesis. Before me lie four sheets of photographs, containing the representations of thirty-two tablets and ten cylinders, each of them differing in some degree from all the others. Twenty-eight of them contain figures in bas-relief: and the others are entirely covered with cuneiform inscriptions, numbering as many as one hundred characters, in one instance. They are professedly brought from the mounds of Babylonia, and are covered, when they first arrive, with closely agglutinated particles of sand, which have to be carefully and patiently deterged, before the figures are visible or the ancient lettering is legible. Now just consider what the fabrication of moulds in which to cast these tablets would imply. They would require to be 42 in number, and, as all the inscriptions are incised, each character would have to be raised or embossed: and each figure—generally full of detail—would have to be sunk in the mould as in the die of a medal. Consider the cost and labour of these processes! Consider likewise the intimate knowledge of Assyrian history and antiquities which Mr. Bailey would be obliged to have acquired—and he knows nothing about either—and next consider the perfect familiarity with the religion of the Aztecs of old Mexico, which he must possess, in order to qualify him to interpret the prayers formerly offered up in their temples! Surely the supposition that the tablets have

been modelled in Melbourne, and that Mr. Bailey is an expert in Assyriology and in the archæology of Mexico, is too preposterous for serious entertainment, whether by your super-liminal or your subliminal mind, unless the latter acts independently of the former.

But, you ask in one place for scientific proof, and assert that no attempt has been made to sustain "these astounding allegations" by such proof or to "suggest any method of verification." Unfortunately for this hasty and groundless assertion, the phenomena referred to *have been* subjected to a rigorously scientific examination in Sydney, by a professional gentleman whose scientific attainments and experience are unquestionable, and to whom Mr. Bailey cheerfully submitted himself for examination, having been sent for from Melbourne at the expense of a few gentlemen interested in psychic inquiries. Before each sitting he was searched by two or three, mostly sceptical, individuals in the manner thus described:—"The coat pockets were first overhauled, the lining was felt all over, then the coat was folded, placed on a chair beside me, and left there during the sitting. The control meanwhile separated the arms, so that the arm-pits could be searched by sight and touch; the hands, including the spaces between the fingers, being also examined by at least two pairs of eyes and hands. Then, while the arms were still extended outwards, the clothes were searched, the pockets turned out, the linings examined, the non-possibility of secret pockets or receptacles noted, and every inch of the body from head to foot felt, pressed hard, and stroked down deliberately and systematically, somewhat after the manner of massage. As one of the more sceptical searchers remarked, when asked if he was satisfied: 'Satisfied! Why, not a threepenny bit could have escaped.'" After this process, the sensitive was enveloped in a bag, secured beyond the possibility of opening without detection.

Under these circumstances, the following objects were brought into the room on various occasions:—Ten coins of the reigns of the Ptolemys, 3 ancient Roman coins, 1 of Antiochus, 1 Egyptian scarabæus, 20 precious stones, 3 live Indian jungle sparrows, 1 bird's nest, eight tablets, 1 newspaper in Arabic, 1 shovel-nosed shark a foot long, some dripping sea-weed, a half-baked chupatty cake, and a terracotta cylinder, weighing upwards of two pounds.

The following hypotheses were carefully considered :—

- The hypothesis of fraud.
- The hypothesis of occult physical power of the double and multiple personality of the Sensitive, plus, in the mental phases, hypnotic suggestion, telepathy, etc., these latter agents acting on his "subliminal mind."
- The hypothesis of occult physical power in the entranced Sensitive, plus the abstraction of ideas by his "subliminal mind" from thought repositories in space.
- The hypothesis of occult phenomena produced from a distance by adepts in the flesh, these adepts using the hypnotised Sensitive as their instrument.
- The hypothesis of occult action through the instrumentality of elementals and nature-spirits.
- The hypothesis of ex-carnate spiritual entities controlling the Sensitive and manifesting, intellectually and physically, by means of his psychic powers, plus any psychic aid, derived from the sitters.

Now the result of these investigations, systematically pursued by scientific methods, with a steadfast determination on the part of two scientists, father and son, to probe the phenomena to the very bottom, and to exhaust all possible means of accounting for them before arriving at a final and definite conclusion was this, that they admitted of but one explanation only; namely that of the sixth and last hypothesis.

Having settled the question of how the translation of the objects enumerated had been effected, there remained that of their genuineness. Upon this point, the Sydney scientist, whom I myself know to be a man of eminence in the profession which he adorns, makes the following explicit statements :—

"As regards the nature of the articles brought occultly into the seance room, I have been satisfied, on expert evidence, that the jewels, coins, and scarabæus are unmistakably genuine. I have not yet been able to get expert opinion on the tablets, cylinder, and alleged cuneiform writings and hieroglyphic figurings; nor have I yet had opportunity to test the statements made in regard to an alleged gold mine, but I hope eventually to satisfy myself on all these points. In regard to the cuneiform lettering, I may mention, however, that two educated Syrian gentlemen to whom I showed the cylinder and tablets, and to whom I gave no hint whatever of their nature, at once pronounced the writing to be in the old Syro-Chaldaic characters. On this point they expressed themselves as positively certain."

Will this scientific evidence satisfy you, Dr. Strong ? And need I remind you of the great antiquity and rarity of lapidary inscriptions in the Syro-Chaldaic character ? Could you point out any possible means of procuring a tablet of this kind in Melbourne or Sydney, even by the most lavish outlay of money for the purpose ?

Next with respect to the coins, one of which I am credibly informed was eagerly purchased for the sum of ten pounds, by a numismatist in Sydney, the subjoined information is furnished by the gentleman who conducted the scientific investigation :—

"The ancient coins have undoubtedly upon them the impress of age. Their surfaces show a condition that could not possibly be the result of artificial friction or corrosion with acid, the latter giving an unmistakeable look not easily confounded with that which age alone can impart. In the case of those not verdigrised, there is that dull, dark, distinctive colouring of age; an appearance which no known process can simulate. I notice the following points with regard to the coins: (1) No two of the thirteen produced are alike in detail (making due allowance for the effacing effects of attrition and corrosion, whether natural or artificial), though certain of them possess general characteristics in common, as, for instance, the double or single eagle, the head of Zeus, etc. Notwithstanding partial effacement, it is easily seen that the fashioning of the eagles and of the Zeus profile differs in detail in those coins described as of different reigns (as nearly all have been, there being only two sets of duplicates). Such details, for instance, as certain strands of hair on the Zeus profile, are quite dissimilar in direction and method of waving. The general proportions and the measurements between certain points also differ. If we suppose the coins to be mere replicas, or else imitations, then, in order to produce them, thirteen separate moulds should have been employed. It is far more likely that spurious coins would be multiplied from one die, or two at the utmost, whether such coins be on the market, or whether Mr. Bailey himself is such an adept at producing moulds, mixing and liquifying in his special furnace the necessary alloy, whether of bronze or "electron," and successfully casting such diverse and excellent imitations, that, after further manipulation by him, with the object of giving them the appearance of great age, he actually succeeds in deceiving experts who unhesitatingly pronounce upon their genuineness. If, on the other hand, Mr. Bailey, not being able to manufacture these coins, is in touch with a dealer in them, one would naturally wonder that he would subject himself to such evident risk of detection as the constant purchase of these articles would entail. Then, if neither self-manufactured nor purchased, and if museums or coin fanciers cannot be robbed at will, where does he get them?"

To pass from the objects translated to the lectureries. You say, there seems to you to be "nothing in this medium's utterances which an uncultured man, with the aid of books and of other men who do know something 'might not coach himself up for a five minutes discourse upon' to an audience utterly ignorant of the subject," etc. Upon this latter point I will only say that the supercilious sneer involves a covert insult to some at least of those present at the sittings. As to the medium's utterances, I will quote the words of his Sydney examiner-in-chief:—

"In the intellectual phases, fraud on the part of the Sensitive can only be judged by a comparison between his normal intellectual capabilities and the mental capacity displayed by the alleged controlling intelligence. A mis-statement, or even a deliberate deception on the part of the control would be no evidence of deception on the part of the hypnotised sensitive. That Mr. Bailey during "control" is in the lucid stage of hypnotism, and absolutely unconscious, I have no doubt, judging by not alone well marked physical signs of his removal from the normal condition, but also by the complete and striking transformation in his mentality. Reference to the pronouncements, already given, of Mr. R. and my son, supplemented by my own remarks, on specially intellectual treats which we enjoyed at sittings with Mr. Bailey under control, in daylight, in my house, will show the opinion we formed of the mental lucidity then shown by the controlling intelligence, and should at once set at rest the question of distinct personality. The evidences of educational culture shown by the control on these occasions were, to say the least, startling, and could not have been the result of any mere smattering of knowledge derived, for instance, from the study of an encyclopedia, but were indicative of that precise, particularised knowledge derived, as my son remarks, "from a long course of specialised study." In fact, the faultless language and perfect method of expression of the controls at these special sittings, transcended Mr. Bailey in his normal capacity in as great a degree as the soaring eagle would eclipse in flight the diminutive wren."

Let me add to this—speaking from my own experience—that when Dr. Robinson and others have been speaking, I have interjected questions or comments and that these have been instantaneously replied to, even when, as has sometimes happened, the replies I received referred to correlative or unrelated subjects, and proved that the mind of the speaker was literally overflowing with information on the subject, whether it was the history or religion of the ancient Assyrians, the sun-worship of the early Mexicans, the cosmogony of the Hindus, or the manners and customs of the primitive Egyptians. To assume that Mr. Bailey could have stored his memory with all this information upon the off-chance of its being asked for by some inquisitive sitter, or that he knows where to look for it when it is wanted, is to credit him with scholarly habits, and a gift for research which I am sure he would be the first to ridicule and repudiate.

What is most remarkable in your own comments upon Mr. Stanford's "Narrative of Facts," is the disposition to prejudge, to depreciate, discredit and disbelieve, every statement made with respect to the occurrence of psychic phenomena, such as are herein described as having been witnessed by a number of sane, intelligent and reputable persons. You will read a book of travel through a previously unexplored country, and although the narrative may contain much that is startling and even astounding, you do not, I imagine, set the

writer down as a liar or ati impostor. Yet directly men and women begin to explore the spiritual world with the assistance of an exceptionally gifted "psychic," and report what they have discovered, they are sneered at as ignorant dupes, and as the possible confederates of a very remarkable fraud: and the readers of the pamphlet are admonished that the facts it relates are destitute of scientific proof. They have been witnessed, described and attested by scores of educated and well informed men and women, but these are given to understand that their testimony is utterly valueless, because they may have been imposed upon, times out of number, by an accomplished "trickster," and because they are "utterly ignorant" of the subjects upon which the aforesaid "trickster" is in the habit of addressing them.

It may be that all wisdom is comprehended within the profound intellect of the Rev. Dr. Strong; but the sea of Truth is quite fathomless; and therefore it is just possible that the students of psychic science, as they wander along its shores, may succeed in picking up a few shells worthy of preservation in the Museum of Psychology.

With the greatest humility, I subscribe myself, Your very obedient servant,

J. S.

Order of Proceedings

At United Memorial Service Held at Wellington, New Zealand, on the day of the funeral of his late Most Gracious Majesty King Edward the Seventh, In Parliament Buildings Grounds, On Friday, 20th May, 1910. Chairman Of Committee REV. J. Kennedy Elliott, B.A. Hon. Secretary REV. J. R. Clark. Conductor of Choir MR. Robert Parker. Bandmaster Lieut. Herd. Secretary of Choir MR. Ernest Dawson. Wellington, New Zealand Friday, 20th May, 1910

Order of Proceedings.

In each case the band will play over one verse before the choir and congregation begin to sing the hymn.

1. Hymn. Rev. J. Kennedy Elliott, B. A.

O God, our help in Ages Past.

O God help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come;
Our shelter from the stormy blast,
And our eternal home.

Under the shadow of Thy throne
Thy saints have dwelt secure;
Sufficient is Thine arm alone,
And our defence is sure.

Before the hills in order stood,
Or earth received her frame;
From everlasting Thou art God,
To endless years the same.

A thousand ages in Thy sight
Are like an evening gone;

Short as the watch that ends the night
Before the rising sun.

Time, like an ever-rolling stream,
Bears all its sons away;
They fly forgotten as a dream
Dies at the opening day.

O God, our help in ages past,
Our hope for years to come;
Be Thou our guard while life shall last,
And our eternal home.

AMEN.

2. Opening Sentences of Burial Service. Rev. J. Dawson.

3. Scripture: Psalm 90. Rev. Thos. Fee.

4. Hymn. Rev. W. A. Evans, M.A.

When our Heads are Bowed with Woe.

When our heads are bowed with woe,
When our bitter tears o'erflow,
When we mourn the lost, the dear—
Jesus, Son of David, hear!

Thou our feeble flesh hast worn;
Thou our mortal griefs hast borne;
Thou hast shed the human tear:
Jesus, Son of David, hear!

When the heart is sad within,
With the thought of all its sin;
When the spirit shrinks with fear,
Jesus, Son of David, hear!

Thou the shame, the grief hast known;
Though the sins were not Thine own,
Thou hast deigned their load to bear:

Jesus, Son of David, hear!

When our eyes grow dim in death,
When we heave the parting breath,
When our solemn doom is near—
Jesus, Son of David, hear!

Thou hast bowed the dying head;
Thou the blood of life hast shed;
Thou hast filled a mortal bier:
Jesus, Son of David, hear!

AMEN.

5. Scripture: Psalm 39. Rev. H. Van Staveren.

6. Hymn. Mr. J. Moore.

Rock of Ages.

Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee;
Let the water and the blood,
From Thy riven side which flowed,
Be of sin the double cure,
Cleanse me from its guilt and power.

Not the labour of my hands .
Can fulfil Thy law's demands;
Could my zeal no respite know;
Could my tears for ever flow;
All for sin could not atone—
Thou must save, and Thou alone.

Nothing in my hand I bring;
Simply to Thy cross I cling:
Naked, come to Thee for dress;
Helpless, look to Thee for grace;
Foul, I to the fountain fly;
Wash me, Saviour, or I die.

While I draw this fleeting breath,
When my eyelids close in death;
When I soar to worlds unknown,
See Thee on Thy judgment throne,
Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee.

AMEN.

7. Lesson : 1 Cor., Xv, 35-58. Rev. W. Shirer.

8. Hymn. Rev. J. Reed Glasson.

Nearer, my god, to Thee.

Nearer, my God, to Thee,
Nearer to Thee;
E'en though it be a cross
That raiseth me;
Still all my song shall be,
Nearer, my God, to Thee,
Nearer to Thee.

Though, like the wanderer,
The sun gone down,
Darkness comes over me.
My rest a stone;
Yet in my dreams I'd be
Nearer, my God, to Thee,
Nearer to Thee.

There let my way appear
Steps unto Heaven;
All that Thou sendest me
In mercy given,
Angels to beckon me
Nearer, my God, to Thee,
Nearer to Thee.

Then, with my waking thoughts
Bright with Thy praise,
Out of my stony griefs
Beth-el I'll raise;
So by my woes to be
Nearer, my God, to Thee,

Nearer to Thee.

AMEN.

9. Address. Rev. J. Kennedy Elliott, B.A.

10. Prayer. Rev. J. J. North.

11. Hymn. Adj. Gunn (Salvation Army.)

Abide with me.

Abide with me; fast falls the eventide;
The darkness deepens; Lord, with me abide;
When other helpers fail, and comforts flee,
Help of the helpless, O abide with me.

Swift to its close ebbs out life's little day;
Earth's joys grow dim, its glories pass away;
Change and decay in all around I see;
O Thou, Who changest not, abide with me.

I need Thy presence every passing hour;
What but Thy grace can foil the tempter's power ?
Who like Thyself my guide and stay can be ?
Through cloud and sunshine, Lord, abide with me.

I fear no foe with Thee at hand to bless;
Ills have no weight, and tears no bitterness;
Where is death's sting ? Where Grave, thy victory ?
I triumph still, if Thou abide with me.

Hold Thou Thy Cross before my closing eyes;
Shine through the gloom, and point me to the skies;
Heaven's morning breaks, and earth's vain shadows flee:
In life, in death, O Lord, abide with me.

AMEN.

12. The Lord's Prayer. Prayer for the King. Benediction. Rev. T. H. Sprott, M.A.

13. The Dead March. Garrison Band.

JOHN MACKAY, Government Printer, Wellington,—20,000/5/10—6I
Church Lotteries and 'Gambling' I. Church Lotteries
A Reply to the Wellington 'Council of the Churches'
By the Rev. H W. Cleary, Editor of the 'New Zealand Tablet'
II. 'Gambling' By the Rev. E. J. Masterson, S.J. Denudin THE N.Z. TABLET PRINTING AND PUBLISHING
CO., LTD. 1906

I. Church Lotteries

Reply to the Wellington 'Council of the Churches'

By the Rev. H. W. Cleary

Reprinted, with some slight verbal alterations, from the 'New Zealand Tablet,' May 10, 1906.

WWe Catholics are a highly favored generation. We have our own pastors to guide us in the, way that leads to Life. And we have, besides, a variegated multitude of leisured clergy of some hundreds of other Christian creeds who weep over us, and beat us to the best of their ability with their shepherds' crooks, and go into hysterics over us whenever we are—or seem to them to be—obstreperous and chuckleheaded. Their zeal for our souls manifests itself on all sorts of occasions. But it usually achieves its highest glow when substantial sums of money have been raised by us, at bazaars, to further some new branch of Catholic devotion, or education, or charity. A foremost place among our self-constituted Mentors is taken by a mainly or exclusively Nonconformist body that, for some recondite reason, calls itself The Council of 'The' Churches. Last week the organisation of that name in Wellington discussed the following resolution (or, rather, indictment)—

'That the Council of Churches deeply deploras the fact that the Roman Catholic Church should continue to identify itself with the gambling habits of the community, and in view of the unanimity of moralists and the attitude of other sections of the Christian church, the council urges on the responsible authorities of the Roman Catholic Church the need, in the interests of the public, of a renunciation of gambling for religions ends.'

Some of the saner and more moderate speakers succeeded, in the face of much opposition, in carrying an amendment substituting the words 'certain Churches' for 'the Roman Catholic Church.' But on what we may call the side for the prosecution, controversial temperatures rose high. And the lava-flow of oratory (to use the words of 'Junius') consisted of 'assertion without proof, declamation without argument, and violent censure without dignity or moderation.'

Ballast and Sail

'Men of solid and sober nature,' says Bacon, 'have more of the ballast than of the sail.' In the discussion of moral subjects, principles are of more value than wind-power; and an ounce of exposition is worth more than a ton of declamation. The Wahhabee Arabs (according to Lane) regard smoking as the next worst crime to wilful murder. Some of the Councils of the Churches seem to put art-unions in the same place in the moral order as the puritannical Moslems place the witching weed. That is their own affair. But it becomes our affair when they begin to set up a barrier to our liberty in regard to this or any such point of human conduct. We are then entitled to demand by what authority they paint up 'No Thoroughfare' upon a road which the vast majority of Christians regard as free and open. We could respect the Council of the Churches—even though we might not agree with them—if they showed their parchments; if they quoted chapter and verse of the divine law which (they say) bars our way; if they set forth in plain terms, and defended by fact and argument, the moral principles which (they contend) damn the church lottery as a 'vicious practice' and a deadly sin. Such a course would be a fair appeal to intellect and conscience. But it is precisely the course which has not commended itself to the Wellington Council of Churches—nor, so far as we are aware, to any cognate body of 'reformers' in New Zealand. We could even understand and appreciate their position if they recommended or exhorted us, in a Christian and fraternal way, to refrain from lotteries as a counsel of perfection—just as they might urge their congregations to refrain from flesh-meat or barley-bree. Even to delinquents—and much more to accused who

are not conscious of any delinquency—kind words are as 'apples of gold on beds of silver,' or as 'a concert of music in a banquet of wine.' But the Wellington 'councillors' made it deplorably clear that their object was not to conciliate or convince, but to exasperate; not to appeal to reason and conscience, but to religious passion. Hence their ready resort to hard names, and question-begging epithets, and unproved assumptions—crowned by a preposterous falsehood as to the 'unanimity of moralists' of other sections of the Christian Church 'in their favor. Why, they were not even able to secure 'unanimity' at their own little meeting! By necessary inference, too, they claim acquaintance with the works of all those 'moralists'—a feat which alone would merit them a monument lofty enough to rake the stars out of the sky. The methods of our Wellington critics are those of the brawler, not of the reformer.

'So Enchantingly Shy'

There are some men so constituted mentally that they seem incapable of seeing that circumstances alter cases. But they are not the men that sensible people choose for spiritual 'guides. Is the Wellington Council of the Churches unaware that the term 'gambling' is one 'of protean meanings? Know they not that 'gamming' 'may be looked upon both as a sport, a pastime, a recreation, and as a serious business, a passion' ('Baldwin, 'Diet, of Philosophy and Psychology,' vol. I., p. 403)? Are they not aware that it covers actions as widely divergent in their moral nature and in their effects as (on the one hand) playing for pins or wax vestas, and (on the other hand) welshing, the gambling orgies of Jubilee Juggins or Hogarth's rake, and the staking of fortunes on the Derby or on the trembling chances of rouge-et-noir at Monte Carlo? Can any good cause be served by those vague and confused denunciations of 'gambling' sans phrase—by indiscriminately damning all its possible phases to the same deep pit of Tophet?

And why, oh, why
So enchantingly shy

about stating and establishing the reflex principles (if any) on which these denunciations are based? Are church lotteries, in their minds, sinful and 'vicious' in themselves, or because of some circumstance or circumstances that are not inherent to them? (1) Do our Wellington 'moralists,' for instance, maintain that the casting of lots—whether by straws, bones, numbered cubes, colored stones, or otherwise—is in itself sinful? Or (2) does the alleged violation of divine law consist essentially in risking a coin (say a threepenny piece) for a prize, such as a painted plaque or picture? Or (3) do they hold that the asserted deordination consists in the profit or the hope of gain? Or (4) do they demand the total abolition of church and charitable lotteries, as 'vicious practices,' because, like all things human, they are liable to abuse? Heaven only knows! The Council of the Churches finds oratory cheaper than exposition. It has left us to inference and random guesses. But so far as one may gather up ideas amidst the din of clamorous declamation, it would seem as if some of its members hold, with Dr. Horton, that lotteries and wagers of every kind are always and in all circumstances sinful.

Is This their Theory?

(1) Do they maintain that the casting of lots is in itself sinful? If so, let them (a) point out wherein the sin or 'vice' or deordination consists, (b) In the second place, Let them establish their contention by a resort to the only moral authority to which they can ultimately appeal. That authority (according to their theology) is the Sacred Scripture, which—interpreted by their own individual private judgment—they claim to be the all-sufficient and 'only rule of faith and practice.' Now, in the last resort, this private judgment or personal opinion is all they have to offer us. But what is the admittedly fallible individual opinion of the Rev. Dr. Gibb or the Rev. J. J. North to us? It has no more weight with us than the tiniest speck of fluff from a hawk-moth's wing. The whole burden of proof rests on the shoulders of the Council of the Churches. Let them take it up—if they can. We, for our part, hereby notify them that we shall pin them fast to the strict logic of their position. They cannot find in all the Bible either 'text or margin' that would give so much as a moment's countenance to the theory which we are considering here. But if on this or on any other point they appeal to the Inspired Record, we take the liberty of reminding; them that they must first catch their hare—they must first get hold of their Inspired Scriptures. And they must, moreover, get hold of them by their unaided individual judgment, and not *by* any resort to authority, whether of the Jewish or the Christian Church. They must either stick consistently to their principle, or squarely abandon it as erroneous.

*

(c) Having secured their Scriptures—if they can—it will then become their duty to reconcile their theory (if

this) is their theory) with the fact that the Almighty God commanded and sanctioned and permitted the use of the lot ('goral'). The Jewish people, as everybody is 'aware, decided numerous questions by lottery—criminal cases; appointments to office; the order of the attendance of the priests in the Temple; and sundry other things. And in most cases the lotteries were under the direct sanction of the Jewish Church. (See, for instance, Schaff's 'Religious Encyclopaedia,' vol. ii, p. 1353; Hastings' 'Dictionary of the Bible,' vol. iii, pp. 152-3; Chene and Sutherland's 'Encyclopaedia Biblica,' vol. i, col. 1118; vol. iv, cols. 5236-7). And was not the Land of Promise parcelled out among the various tribes, at God's express command, by the greatest land-lottery ever witnessed upon this grey old earth? Moreover, the lottery was a religious service, for the ceremony was performed by Josue 'before the Lord in Shiloh' (Jos., xviii, 10). Now, if our Wellington 'moralists' look upon a resort to lottery as in itself sinful, how in it that they have not placed the Almighty in the pillory? And why have they not clapped the gyves upon the Apostles of the New Dispensation for having selected by lot the one that was to fill the place of Judas (Acts, i, 26)? And will they 'urge' the adherents of their various faiths throughout New Zealand to abandon the farms and runs and mining leases acquired by lottery under our legalised ballot-systems? And if not, why not? And will they scornfully reject, as contaminated money, the Sunday threepenny pieces that are raised on property so obtained? And if not, why not? And where among 'all the moralists' will they find any that hold so bizarre a theory as that with which we have dealt in these two paragraphs?

Or This?

(2) But perhaps our very dogmatic Northern 'moralists' maintain that the sin and 'vice' of church lotteries consists essentially in risking a valuable consideration of one kind (to wit, a coin) for the marketable chance of winning a valuable consideration of another kind (to wit, a painted plaque or picture)? But wherein precisely do the sin and deordination lie? And by all means let us have—for we are entitled to it—chapter and verse of the divine law which sends us to the Bottomless Pit for indulging in a threepenny raffle at a charity bazaar. (We are, of course, entitled to assume that the lottery is fairly conducted; that the coin which purchases the chance is absolutely ours, to dispose of as we please; and that we can well afford to spend it). We are free to make an unconditional gift of our coin to the art union, or to spend it upon our amusement in any other way. On what principle may we not also give it with a condition attached, which at the same time affords us recreation, the hope of winning what the others interested are willing we should win, and the chance of losing what we are, in every, event, ready to lose with a happy heart? Or, in these dollar-worshipping days, have silver coins become so sacrosanct that they must not be risked? Soldiers, footballers, explorers, and pioneers expose something vastly more precious—life and health and strength—for love of country or for amusement, or for profit, or for mere adventure. Shall they, merely because of the risks they run, be ranked with scallywags and suicides? And do the Wellington 'moralists' desire the end of all speculative trade?

The Profit Question

Our oratorical Wellington friends are eager in denunciation, coy in enunciation of principles. Hence, like Little Bo-Peep, we don't know where to find them—on this question of church lotteries—and have to search for them all over the controversial landscape. (3) Perhaps they maintain that the 'viciousness' and the deordination consist in purchase or sale of lottery tickets with a view to profit? (a) In this case we have once more to urge them to point out precisely wherein the sin consists, and—having found the Scriptures—to give chapter and verse therefrom in support of their theory. (b) Do they, perchance, maintain that the pursuit of gain has now become in itself unlawful? If so, 'carte in tavola' ! down with their proofs. Or (c) shall we be treated to the fine old wheeze that holders of church lottery tickets outrage the divine law by 'coveting their neighbors' goods'—to wit, the painted poppies and lilies and daffydowndillies on the stalls? Well, in that case, too, it becomes the duty of the apostles of the New Morality to prove—again 'from the Scriptures—that the 'rosies red and posies fair' are desired by the ticket-holders in a way that is forbidden by the law of God. For the rest, it is well to remember that the lottery which we are here—and for some time further—contemplating presents all the conditions of a free contract between absolute owners. And 'scienti et volenti non fit injuria.' So runs the old legal maxim: No injury is done to him who knowingly embarks in, and freely assents to, a measure, (c) For the rest, it is our experience—an experience extending over eighteen years—that the vast bulk of those who attend our bazaars and art unions do so principally for the purpose of aiding a cause that appeals to their hearts. Others have had a similar experience. About the middle of 1896, for instance, the noted Protestant writer and divine, Dr. Blair (reported in the 4 Scotsman '), said in the course of a sermon:—

'One could hardly imagine anyone speculating in raffle tickets at a bazaar with the mercenary spirit of making gain. It was generally done because the purchaser desired to help the object in view, or to oblige a

friend, and he seldom cared whether the article subscribed for came to him or not.'

The late Dr. Grace, of Wellington, summed up the Catholic feeling on this subject in the following felicitous way:—

'As to raffles, let us try and be reasonable with each other. Who 'goes to a bazaar with the expectation of making a profit? . . . Why do we go to bazaars? Just out of sympathy and good nature. We are living together in a small town, and we help each other in a kindly spirit. For my own part, I never once saw anything in a bazaar I would like to take home with me except a lot of pretty girls. As no single one of them would pick an old fellow like me, even if I were unattached, I just take a ticket in a raffle from every girl who asks me, till my pocket is empty. And I purpose to continue to do so, not caring a brass farthing for the Anti-Gambling League or Mrs. Grundy.'

And such, in effect, was likewise the manly and defiant utterance of the Rev. Mr. Thompson at the meeting of the Wellington Council of the Churches.

How Anti-Gamblers 'Gamble'

The chairman of the Council (Rev. Dr. Gibb—Presbyterian) thanked the Lord that in this matter of church lotteries, the creeds there represented had not even a mote in their eye. And yet in one way or another—directly or indirectly—they are to this hour, and long have been, sadly implicated in such-like 'vicious practices.' In his famous work, 'Traite de Jeu,' the French Calvinist, Barbeyrac, allows a wide freedom in lotteries and games of chance; and many of his quotations and arguments are taken from old Scottish Puritan writers ('Book of Days,' vol. i, p. 374). The Presbyterian 'Larger Catechism' (Q. 142) demands reverence for the Biblical use of lots. And it forbids, not lotteries generally, but only, as we do, 'sinful' ones (Q. 113), and 'wasteful gaming' (Q. 142). We look up our Sydney Smith (new ed. 1850, p. 241), and there we find Fearon's eye-witnessing record of the Presbyterian church which was built with lottery money in the United States. And did not the Rev. Dr. Gibb's brethren of the Kirk for a long period—up to 1826—draw stipends that were paid out of funds derived in part from State lotteries? Moreover we are not aware that admonition, suspension, or excommunication was visited upon the prominent members of their congregations that were associated with the notorious Glasgow lotteries. Here is a table of lottery permits that ought to wring the withers of the over-confident Dr. Gibb. It is compiled from the 'New Zealand Year-Book' for 1900 (p. 412) and for 1902 (p. 487):—

'The Presbyterians used to sin in this matter,' said the Rev. Mr. North. 'Oh, no!' exclaimed Dr. Gibb. 'But not more than once or twice,' explained the Rev. Mr. North. Yet here we have a record of sixteen Presbyterian church lotteries in four years ! But this is not all. You can fairly credit men who bear witness against themselves. One straightforward speaker at the Council's meeting testified that, 'not more than two years ago' he 'was asked to take a ticket' in an illegal lottery—one for which no permit had been obtained—at 'a Wesleyan bazaar.' Is this an isolated 'instance, or the outcropping of a practice? 'I am a Wesleyan myself,' the speaker added, 'and we are not too clean, and we ought to shun the appearance of evil in ourselves before we begin to pick holes in other people's coats' ('Evening Post,' May 1, 1906). And then there is the great Nonconformist bran-tub lottery, in which you buy a chance for sixpence, dip, and perhaps draw out of a tangle of mummy-wrappings—a ha'porth of pins ! 'The element of chance,' said another fair-minded speaker, 'was as wrong in the case of the bran-tub as in an art union conducted by the Roman Catholic Church' ('Post' report). But' (said the Rev. J. J. North) the Presbyterians 'had since repented in sackcloth and ashes.' Not a bit, Brother North ! Bran-tub, 'dredge,' and 'fishpond' lotteries are carried on under the eyes of reverend Nonconformist moralists of every hue. And to this day numbers of our Nonconformist friends, instead of wearing sackcloth and ashes, kneel en benches, and teach in Sunday-schools, and worship in churches, and live in manses that were in part paid for by what (according to the Wellington rigorists) are the proceeds of sin and; 'vice.' This is emphatically a case in which (on their theory) the receivers, users, and beneficiaries are as bad as the original thieves. Let the Council of the Churches insist that (bonfires or smithereens be made of those parts of church and school and manse for which (according to their notion) the contractors were the devil and his angels. When they have done this with sufficient frequency and fervor, we shall believe in the sincerity of their convictions. But not before. In the meantime, their indecent public exhibitions of Pharisical cant only move us to scorn and ridicule. One of the precious privileges left to us Catholics is a capacity for diaphragm-shaking laughter at the smug inconsistency that puts on airs—whether they be the airs of a Pecksniff, or of a Stiggins, or of a Chadband, or of a Bumble in gown and bands.

More 'Gambling'

Our Northern censors strain at a gnat and swallow a camel. Why have they no word of censure for the colossal volume of operations that tire designated 'gambling' by 'all the moralists'—and they are many and

mostly non-Catholic—that we have been able to consult? We refer to Stock Exchange gambling—time—bargains, deals in options and futures, 'cover' speculations, and the rest of the myriad ways that brokers and their clients know. Do no members of the Council dabble on the Stock Exchange? And are not portions of the incomes or stipends of some among them derived directly or indirectly from the profits of this form of gambling? And what about the Star-Bowkett Society's lotteries? And insurance? If we were a-wagering bent, we would lay Lombard Street to a China orange that every man among our Wellington censors has a 'gamble' in life and fire insurance. A few years ago the Rev. Dr. Gibb sounded the praises of Provost Salmon (of Trinity College, Dublin) in the course of a fog-horn letter to the Dunedin secular press. Well, here is an extract in point from a letter of that witty Protestant Provost in MacDonnell's 'Life of Archbishop McGee':—

'One form of betting is recognised as a prudential duty. I mean life assurance. You bet with an assurance company that you will die; they bet that you will live—and you are well] leased to lose your bet. Betting is, you say, buying a chance; but suppose that each would rather have the chance than the price to be paid for it, why not? Two boys want to see a show. Each has only 'half the price of admission. If they toss up, one of them has his wish; if they don't, neither. If people take tickets at a bazaar, no one feels the loss of a shilling for a ticket, but if the object to be rattled for is pretty, the winner may feel the gain as much. A clergyman once at a bazaar, when I professed to be shocked at his having a raffle, declared that he did it on the highest moral grounds'. Without a raffle, none but rich people had the chance of obtaining; the really valuable articles. By a raffle he accomplished the Christian duty of putting rich and poor on terms of perfect equality.'

'Good, and very Salmonian !' was the comment of the Protestant Archbishop McGee. Men taken in the mass offer a sound actuarial basis for life insurance. But for the individual it is always a sheer lottery.

Use and Abuse

But (4) perhaps the Wellington Council of the Churches contends that church lotteries should be abolished because they are liable to abuse, or have been abused? In their condemnation of the abuses of church lotteries we are with them with all our hearts. And our principles in regard to the subject are, unlike theirs, well known and clearly expounded (see pp. 3-4). Stated in the most summary terms: (1) Church lotteries are in themselves harmless; (2) they are perfectly permissible provided certain conditions are fulfilled: (a) the object must be good, or at least (as our theologians say) indifferent; (b) the money risked must belong to him who risks it, he must have the free disposal of it, and the amount staked must not exceed what he may in justice to himself or others spend; (c) the lottery must be free, from fraud and deceit; and (d) there must be a fair equality of chance for all. The moment any one of these guiding principles is violated, the lottery—in so far as the violation extends—becomes at once immoral. 'And we abhor it to the full extent of the abuse. If our Wellington accusers assert any abuse, it becomes their duty to prove and not assume it. Even the civil courts decline to condemn the forger or the footpad unheard, or on hearsay report, or on ex-parte evidence. So do we. And least of all shall we condemn any individual, or any body of people on such evidence when tendered by men so abounding in theological bitterness and so rec' 1 ss in assertion as are some of the members of the Wellington Council of the Churches. The Rev. Dr. Blair (already quoted) said:

'He should be heartily sorry to countenance anything that would tend to lead anyone astray; but he could hardly conceive of such a trifling matter as a bazaar raffle doing so. Excess in everything led to disaster, and the most legitimate pursuit might be abused by excess. But to reason against the legitimate use because of the excess of some, would lead in many things to extraordinary consequences.'

Does the Council of the Churches stand for the principle of the abolition, as a 'vicious practice,' of everything that has been, or is liable to be, abused? Well, what gift of God has been more grossly abused by many ill-conditioned persons (the Disciples of Free Love, for instance) than the Bible? Is the Bible, then, to be abolished? And what about the bran-tub—and the Stock Exchange? All manner of sport has been abused. Does the the Council propose to abolish football and golf and cycling; and the rest? And look at the senseless extravagance of many in the matter of dress. Do the 'councillors' therefore propose to march habitually about—as the Canadian Dukhoubors sometimes do—'mit nodings on'? Or do they propose to eat no more because so many 'dig their graves with their teeth'? It is a bad principle that will not bear being pushed to its logical conclusion.

Rabelais' Witches

Rabelais' witches hid their eyes in their slippers when at home, and clapped them in their sockets when they went among their neighbors. A happy figure of the busybody and the meddler ! We recommend our Wellington critics to take their eyes out of their slippers and cast a glance around their own spiritual households!. They may possibly find things there that matter a good deal. What, for instance, about the spreading indifferentism and

infidelity and divorce and race-suicide that are eating like rodent ulcers into faith and family life? And what about that shocking Parliamentary return of November 2, 1903, which exhibits so relatively overwhelming numbers, of the clergy of the Council-of-the-Churches creeds as too indolent to break the bread of life to Christ's little ones in the schools? If the Wellington Council of the Churches attends to its own business, it will be too tired when night comes to dance any more unseemly theological can-cans on the violated hearthstones of its neighbors.

II. 'Gambling'

By the Rev. E. T. Masterson, S.J.

In the 'Austral Light' (Melbourne) for November, 1901.

No one will deny, writes Father Masterson, that gambling is often a sin or the occasion of sin. It is sinful for the father of a family to gamble away the money which ought to be spent on his children's education. It is sinful for the shop assistant to risk in betting or gaming the money which he has filched from his master's till. It is sinful for the bank clerk to stake money which he has embezzled from his bank. Also gambling is to be condemned whenever it leads to the breach of a law which the gambler is bound to observe; whenever it is the occasion of drunkenness, or quarrelling, or blasphemy, or causes him to violate the precept of hearing Mass on Sunday.

Of these and other sins gambling is often the occasion. Indeed, gambling may be attended with be many and such serious evils that the reformer who would successfully cope with them would deserve the gratitude of his country. We are not without reformers, who try to cope with them. They abound in our midst, and their greatest enemies cannot charge them with any lack of zeal. Certainly, they cry aloud and spare not. But so small is the measure of success which rewards their efforts that they would be very well advised to pause and ask themselves whether, after all, there may not be something wrong in their methods. For myself, I cannot help thinking that their want of success is largely due to the headlong intemperance of their zeal. You cannot hector or bully men into becoming virtuous. Especially, if you wish men to give up a practice the propensity to which is deeply rooted in their nature, wisdom, as I should have thought, ought to suggest other weapons than the scalping-knife and the tomahawk. Our reformers are never tired of bearing witness to the keenness and prevalence of the gambling spirit. If the disease is so prevalent and so inveterate, surely there is all the greater call on the physician to proceed with great caution and prudence: yet our physicians apply probe and knife as ruthlessly as if the use of these instruments were their dear delight. No distinction is drawn between gambling and gambling. The practice is condemned as absolutely and as roundly as if the reformers themselves believed, and as if they wished to convey the impression to their hearers, that all gambling is always and essentially wicked. I hope, then, that it may be useful if, walking soberly in the light which Catholic moralists have shed on my path, I briefly investigate the question whether, independently of the restrictive measures which may have been passed from time to time by our rightful legislators, and of the sins which gambling may occasion, there is anything in the practice which antecedently condemns it, or makes it intrinsically and essentially wrong.

Necessary Relaxation.

I suppose I may take it for granted that at the present day there is no one so puritanic as not to allow that men and women have a right to seek necessary or useful relaxation in a game of cards or chess, or in any other game that is innocent or harmless. The adage, 'all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy,' is equally verified in children of a larger growth. This, I may take for granted. It will be questioned either by none or only by the very few who would not believe Moses or the Prophets if they were to return from, the dead.

Moreover, games in which the players have no hope of gain and run no risk of loss are very liable to languish and to fail to attain the end above indicated—the affording of necessary or useful recreation. Occasionally, perhaps, we may meet with two who are so attached or so sentimental as to find recreation in a game of cards played for love, but I think that, as a very general rule, a small money stake must be added to give zest to the game. This seems to me so lawful that if I were not combating the contention that gambling is intrinsically wrong, I should feel a call on me to apologise to my readers for offering proof of a fact which is in itself so evident. The sternest moralist will admit that I may make my friend a present of a sum of money. How then can it be wrong for me to make his getting an equal sum dependent on the condition that he shall be the winner in the game in which he and I are going to engage? If I have such dominion over my money that I may make a free gift of it to my neighbor, surely I may give it to him through the medium of a contract which, in addition to giving me recreation, offers the hope of gain. It is clear, then, that there is nothing immoral in the

loser making over his stake to the victor in the game. It is equally clear that there is nothing immoral in the victor's accepting it. Again, if I may accept money from my friend as a free gift, why may I not receive it as the result of a contract which gave him an equal hope of winning and exposed me to an equal risk of losing? The risk that I ran is a marketable quantity, and is the equivalent of the money which I won.

It may occur to my readers to ask does gambling become sinful if the gambler, instead of seeking relaxation or recreation, makes profit his primary end or object? So long; as the gambler does not positively exclude every higher end, he may without sin make gain or profit the primary end of his gambling. First, the gambling contract is not in itself unlawful, as I have shown; Secondly, the pursuit of gain is not in itself unlawful. That is to say, neither end nor means is unlawful; and, since it cannot be sinful to pursue a lawful end by lawful means, it is not sinful to intend gambling as a means to the increasing of our wealth.

The more rigorous moralists object to this position. They say the tenth Commandment forbids us to covet our neighbor's goods, and that the gambler who makes profit his primary end necessarily covets his neighbor's goods, and therefore necessarily breaks the tenth Commandment. The answer to this objection seems to me to be very plain and altogether satisfactory. What such a man directly intends is, not his neighbor's loss, but his own gain, and a man may without sin prefer his own gain to the equal gain of his neighbor. Or, if this way of putting the case looks too much of a refinement, I will put the same answer in a somewhat different form. Such a man does not desire his neighbor's goods in a way that is forbidden by the tenth Commandment; he merely wishes that his neighbor's goods should be transferred to himself through the medium of a contract into which both he and his opponent freely enter, a contract in which each has a more or less equal hope of gain, and each runs a more or less equal risk of loss.

Certain Conditions Necessary.

But for gambling to be conformable to the requirements of justice, certain well known conditions must be verified.

First, the gambler must be in a position to justly alienate the stake which he exposes in the game. A game is a contract in which the players stipulate or agree that something shall be ceded to the winner as a prize. It is quite clear that I am not at liberty to bargain to cede that which I have no right to alienate. Hence a man has no right to risk in gaming or betting that which is not his own. The shop assistant may not expose his master's money; nor the bank clerk the money of his bank. It is not enough, however, that the gambler be the owner of the money which he stakes. He must also have the free administration or disposal of it. And even if one be the owner and have the administration of money, still one is not free to risk it in betting or gambling if justice already claims it for other purposes, as, for example, "if it should be required for the paying of one's just debts.

In the second place the game ought to be freely entered into. If anyone by force or fear induces another to gamble, he does him an injury and is guilty of sin. So far, I think, all theologians are agreed. But it is one thing to say that he is guilty of sin, and quite another thing to say that he is bound to restitution. We may therefore ask the further question: If he who coerced his opponent to play should happen to win, is he bound to make restitution? Cardinal Lugo and others hold that he is. They say that he is responsible not only for the injury done to his adversary, but for the entire loss which results from it, that therefore he is bound to make good the entire loss; and that this he can do only by making restitution. Many eminent theologians take an opposite view. Among them, even so great an authority as St. Alphonsus. They deny that the loss sustained is the effect of the injury. They hold that it is to be attributed to the ill-luck of the loser, or to the superior skill of the winner. Though the argument, as drawn out by St. Alphonsus, very much commends itself to my mind, I need not develop it here. St. Alphonsus admits that the loser has a right to rescind or cancel the contract which he made while under the influence of fear, and that, consequently, if he demands restitution, the winner is bound to make it. Consequently, when determining obligations, Lugo and he arrive at practically the same result.

Free from Cheating.

The third condition is that our gambling should be free from cheating. 'A clear fire, a clean hearth, and the rigor of the game,' was Sarah Battle's idea of whist. As I am treating the question from a moral and not from an aesthetic standpoint, I may omit to say anything about the necessity or becomingness of a clean fireside; but the rigors of the game are necessary, at least to the extent that we shall not violate the recognised rules which govern the particular game which we may be playing. However, just as there are recognised rules which all are supposed to abide by, so there are recognised wiles and stratagems which may be practised without any violation of justice. If Bret Harte's Heathen Chinee 'had been content' to smile as he sat at the table with a smile that was child-like and bland,' and to deceive his opponents by talking of the game 'he did not understand,' I should hesitate about compelling him to make restitution. When the Heathen Chinee pretended to understand

euchre only imperfectly, he did nothing more than your conscientious Christian does every day. He, too, not unfrequently affects an imperfect knowledge of the game in order to lure his opponents to play for heavy stakes; but such affectation of ignorance does not, and ought not to deceive anyone. But assuredly the evidence contained in the following two verses would constrain me to make the wily Oriental disgorge:

But the hands that were played
By that heathen Chinee,
And the points that he made
Were quite frightful to see—
Till at last he put down a right bower,
Which the same Nye had dealt unto me.
In his sleeves, which were long,
He had twenty-four jacks—
Which was coming it strong,
Yet I state but the facts;
And we found on his nails, which were taper,
What is frequent in tapers—that's wax.

These lines disclose enormities which are obviously opposed to all recognised rules. And he who violates the recognised rules and thereby wins, makes himself liable to restitution. He must restore not only the stakes which he has fraudulently won from his opponent, but he must also compensate his opponent for the hope of winning which he would have had if the game had been fairly played. That hope had a money value. It was filched or stolen, as I may say, by the fraud of the winner; and, therefore, he has through his own malice saddled himself with the duty of making compensation.

Equality.

The last condition which I shall mention is the necessity of equality. Each of the players should have a hope of winning, and each should run a risk of losing. As writers on morals are themselves at variance as to what constitutes or destroys this equality, I will not discuss the matter at any length. One important point I will mention. Cardinal Lugo and others hold that if a man who is conscious of his notable superiority wins from one who is notably his inferior, this destroys the necessary equality and the winner is bound to restitution. On the other hand, Father Ballerini (Ballerini-Palmieri, n. 599) and others deny any such obligation. They argue that either the loser knew or did not know beforehand the notable superiority of his adversary. If he knew it, we are to presume that he willingly took the risk of losing; and, therefore, deprived himself of the right of claiming restitution. If he did not know his adversary's notable superiority, and yet entered into the game, he ought to attribute his loss to his own rashness.

These stated with what clearness I could command, are the conclusions 'which I have arrived at in investigating the question whether gambling is intrinsically and essentially wicked. I can hardly hope that those who object to May-poles and Morris-dances, and who unconditionally condemn gambling as in itself wrong, will accept my conclusions. Well, I may be permitted to say in self defence that, though I have not always given chapter and verse, I have never once lost sight of my guides. So far as I am aware, my paper contains nothing which has not the sanction of the most eminent theologians in the Catholic Church.

At the beginning I stated many of the dangers to which gambling exposes its votaries. Everybody will admit that a man may sin by excess in gaming. It is no less true that a man may sin, though not so easily, by defect. As it is against urbanity to show ourselves morose and churlish towards others, so it is an exercise of urbanity to show ourselves compliant and bland, if only we can do so without violating some higher virtue.

I should never have thought of writing on the morality of gambling if I had not been requested to do so by one whose request I deemed as equal to a command. At the same time I am glad of the opportunity, of stating the substance of what Catholic theologians teach us in this matter. In this, as in everything which relates to legitimate freedom and recreation, their humane breadth of view is in marked contrast with the costive and bilious asceticism of many of our social reformers.' What I have written applies not only to games, but also, in due proportion, to betting on horse races, boat races, and other such more or less fortuitous events.

I have not attempted to determine the point where gambling becomes excessive. This depends on quite a variety of circumstances, as, for example, on the opulence of the man who indulges in these practices. But speaking generally, so long as a man devotes to gambling only a part of his superfluous wealth, and so long as he does not expose himself to the neglecting of any duty, I see nothing in the gambling contract to merit the

unmeasured condemnation with which it is so often visited. Though I have not dealt in detail with the many objections against gambling, I hope and believe that I have given such principles, culled from Catholic theologians, 'as will enable my readers to find for themselves an easy and satisfactory solution of those objections. They do not prove that gambling is intrinsically and essentially wicked, but only that gambling is unjustifiable whenever it is carried to excess. But there is no fear that it shall be carried to excess if the limitations and conditions set forth by Catholic moralists are faithfully adhered to.

Graphic Border

A Postscript.

Schaff's 'Religious Encyclopedia' is a work that enjoys a very considerable reputation among Nonconformists, and especially among Presbyterians. In the second volume (pp. 1353-4) it contains an article on 'The Use of the Lot among the Hebrews.' The author says in part:—

Faith in a special Providence underlay the practice. The decision of the lot was ordered of God. The following classes of cases in which it was resorted to are recorded in the Bible: (1) Partitions.—(a) That of the land of Israel (Num., xxvi, 55; Josh., xviii, 10). According to Jewish tradition, the process was carried out by means of two urns, in one of which were the names of the different families of the Israelites, in the other the lots, upon which the portions of territory were described. Presiding over the drawing was the High Priest, with Urim and Thummim. (b) That of the cities for the Levites (Josh., xxi, 4 sqq.). (C) That of the families returned from the exile, so that one in ten might dwell in Jerusalem (Neh., xi, 1). (d) That of the spoil, also of the prisoners, and of the clothing of condemned persons among the executioners (Joel, iii, 3; Obad., 11; Nah., iii, 10; Matt., xxvii, 35; John, xix, 23). (2) Selection of Persons.—(a) The choice of men for an invading force ('Judg., xx, 9). (b) The choice of a person to fill an office—Saul (1 Sam., x, 19-21), Matthias (Acts, i, 26); but these were quite exceptional cases. (c) The choice of priests to fill the twenty-four courses and perform various duties (1 Chron., xxiv, 5; Luke, i, 9; Neh., x, 34 sqq.). (d) The choice of the scapegoat on the Day of Atonement (Lev., xvi, 8). (3) The Decision of Doubtful Questions?—(Josh., vii, 14 sqq.; 1 Sam., xiv, 14 sqq.; Prov., xvi, 33, xviii, 18). The lot was either thrown from an urn, or into the bosom: of an outer garment.'

It is, of course, obvious that the principle of the lottery is the same, whether the practice was or as not based upon 'faith in a special Providence' or whether it was or was not 'ordered of God.'

'The New Zealand Tablet'

Sole Organ of the Catholic Body in New Zealand.

Under the Approval of the Catholic Hierarchy of New Zealand in Synod Assembled.

The Great Expositor and Defender of Catholic Truth and Catholic Rights and Interests.

Should be in Every Catholic Home.

About to be Enlarged to 40 Pages.

Graphic Border

Sample Copy Free on Application.

Graphic Border

C. Columb, Jun., *Manager*.

P.O. Box 98, Dunedin. Telephone 386.

Printed at the 'N.Z. TABLET' Office, Dunedin.

Defence of The Secular Solution Our National System of Education. (BY Professor Mackenzie)

Wellington Printed by Blundell Bros., Ltd., Willis Street. 1911

CONTENTS:

"Truth, in the great practical concerns of life, is so much a question of reconciling and combining of opposites, that very few have minds sufficiently capacious and impartial to make the adjustment with an approach to correctness, and it has to be made by the rough process of a struggle between combatants fighting under hostile banners." ... "It can do truth no service to blink the fact known to all who have the most ordinary

acquaintance with literary history that a large portion of the noblest and most valuable moral teaching has been the work, not only of men who did not know, but of men who knew and rejected, the Christian faith."—J. S. Mill (on "Liberty," chap. II.)

"When people wonder what we can find to object to in 'simple Bible teaching,' they do not take in the fundamental difference between Catholicism and Protestantism, using these words in their widest sense. Catholicism is the religion of a society. Protestantism is the religion of a Book. Just as no consistent Protestant would consent to have his children taught even doctrines which he himself believes, if they are bidden believe them on the authority of the Catholic Church, so no consistent Catholic can consent to have his children taught even doctrines which he himself believes if they are bidden believe them on the authority of the Bible. Catholicism holds that Jesus Christ came upon earth to found a church. Protestantism holds that He came to commend to His disciples the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Catholics may be quite wrong in thinking as they do, but so long as they do think it they will object to be rated for the teaching of the religion of the Book while they have to rate themselves for the teaching of the religion of the society,"—D. C. Lathbury (High Churchman), in "Westminster Gazette."

Introduction

The following addresses were delivered under the profound conviction that in the best interests of religion and education, as also of pupils and teachers, our national system of education should continue free, secular, and compulsory.

It is the duty of the State to provide for its citizens a sound scientific and civic education, based on such natural ethic as experience and practice, rather than tradition or authority, warrant. It is the business of the Churches to indicate the divine implications of what the social conscience and an enlightened consensus of opinion pronounce good, true, and beautiful.

While recognising the expediency and necessity of providing specific instruction in morality and religion for our children, the writer of these addresses is absolutely satisfied that such instruction can be most effectively and economically imparted by the Churches arranging with the educational authorities for the use of class-rooms, during non-school hours, for the specific purpose of imparting definite religious instruction, on the distinct understanding that the services of teachers connected with the work of the secular syllabus would not be available in connection with the teaching of religion.

To impose the duty of imparting religious instruction to the children attending our State schools on servants of the State would be little short of a political and national crime.

To impose the duty of imparting religious instruction on teachers in the State schools really involves the establishment of a State Church for children; and if, as Nonconformists are perpetually reminding us, it is wrong and unjust to use public money in teaching religion to adults (in a State Church), it is difficult to understand how it can be right or just to use public money for imparting religious instruction to the children in our State schools. If, on the other hand, it is right that the nation should endow any form of religion in our public schools, it cannot be wrong that it should endow it in the Church. "If," as Mr. Harry Snell, the able and energetic Secretary of the British Secular Education League puts it, "a State religion is admissible for the child, why not also for the man? If not for the man, why for the child? A hackneyed reply to objections is that the objecting parent can take advantage of the conscience clause and withdraw his child from religious education. Granted the willingness of any parent to place his children in a juvenile pillory, the financial imposition still remains. If there be any conscience clause whereby the payment for religious teaching may be avoided, tens of thousands of people in this country would be glad to hear of it."

—H.M.

Graphic Border

The Secularisation of National Education.

My Friends,—

It can afford no real pleasure to you and me, to whom what are known as The Bible and The Church count for so very much, to find that the complete secularisation of national education is inevitable. We neither profess nor entertain any hostility to religion or to the Bible. Those of us who, in our modest way, are students of

history—ancient and modern, sacred and secular—know something of the normal course of events in connection with the rise, progress, and triumph, as well as the decline, disintegration, and fall of human institutions. No man of any standing in the world of thought, science, or letters, to-day, regards the Church as anything other than a purely human institution. History makes it abundantly manifest that the story of the pre-Christian, Christian, and other Churches, is but the story, for the most part, of the work, influence, and legislation of humanly accredited priesthoods. All priesthoods began their career as servants of families, tribes, communities, or nations, and gradually, under the pressure and influence of social and political circumstances, acquired such prestige and power that they became too often, not merely tribal and national "masters," but tribal and national tyrants. All churches or priesthoods were originally founded to supply a social or spiritual need and demand. Slowly, but surely, what was meant to be a servant, became a master—and a very exacting master, too. The history of the Christian Church is no exception to the rule. An institution that began in the service of the State gradually acquired such power and influence that it eventually employed the State in its service. The servant became master and vice versa! It is easy enough to understand how this came about. The influence of genuinely righteous and Christian priesthoods is necessarily at its very highest and best when the social, civic, and political fortunes of the nation or people to whom it ministers are at their lowest and darkest. The misfortunes of empires and emperors have always furnished priesthoods with opportunities for both good and evil—for the good of ministering comfort and consolation in times of personal and national loss or disaster; for the evil of self-aggrandisement and the acquisition of undue power. We know that the Christian Church acquired during the past 1900 years such enormous influence that it at times completely dominated the States (Catholic and Protestant alike) of the Western world. It was the fact that the Churches (Catholic and Protestant alike) seemed to have succeeded in reducing "thrones, dominations, principedoms," as well as the general body of the people, to a state of abject servitude in a virtual theocracy, that seems to have roused the modern democracy to a consciousness of the injustice and irrationality of their humiliating predicament. The secularisation of education, my friends, is then but one-phase of the modern revolt against ecclesiastical tyranny and self-aggrandisement.

Not so very many years ago, not a few of our Churches acquitted themselves with considerable distinction in connection with the education of their people—though, unfortunately, their idea was that real learning and knowledge were to be got from books and the older the books the better. Too often the Churches set to work as though all that was of real value to men was, not equipment for this life, but preparation for the life-to-come. Man's chief end was to save his soul and to provide modest luxuries for those saintly guides who showed him how to do it. His next duty was to be humbly and thankfully content with whatever lowly lot God had assigned him. In fact, the Churches at no time in their history (notwithstanding laudable efforts, according to their light, in certain educational directions) can be said to have made a serious effort to impart, as part of their educational system, the results of accredited knowledge, science, and research. They were, and are, pre-occupied with their old ideas and methods, with the inevitable result that the State itself has found it necessary, in the interests both of justice and education proper, to undertake the task of providing that part of education concerned with our life and prospects here. The State, too, virtually asks the Churches to confine their attention to what the modern world has come to regard as their legitimate sphere—that of the claims and interests of the spiritual life and the world-to-come. The process of secularisation has been quite phenomenally rapid and drastic in certain parts of the world. Even in Great Britain what is virtually secularisation has made enormous progress during the past few years.

The (English) Northern Counties League met for its annual meeting at Leeds on the 14th November last, and its Secretary (Rev. C. Peach) submitted some remarkable statistics bearing on the transference of Church, or voluntary, schools to the State (as represented by Provincial Councils).

Since 1903 (that is, in seven years) voluntary schools in England have decreased in number by very nearly 1200, and the number of pupils on their registers by over half a million. On the other hand, during the same period the number of Council (or State) schools has increased by over 1700, and the number of pupils on the register by over three-quarters of a million. In 1903 the pupils in the voluntary or Church schools outnumbered those in the Council schools by 650,000; in 1910 the pupils in the Council schools outnumbered those in the voluntary schools by 600,000. In other words, the Council schools have 1,250,000 more pupils than they had seven years ago, while the voluntary or Church schools have more than half a million fewer than they had seven years ago. Of course, it must not be supposed that there is no Bible-reading or religious instruction in these Council (or State) schools. There is; but it is of the order known as non-sectarian—an order virtually secular, though apparently more objectionable to Catholics and High Church Anglicans than a purely secular system. In fact, Catholics and High Churchmen regard this system as the endowment of Nonconformity. They sometimes nickname it "School-Board religion!" Well, one thing is clear: that this non-sectarian use of the Bible in State, or "Provided" schools as they are called, is but one remove from what must inevitably become very shortly the complete secularisation of national education. Examination of the relative strength and educational service of

voluntary and Council schools indicates what their respective futures are to be:—

Council and Voluntary Schools in 1908-9 (In England).

Analysis of these figures discloses the fact that it takes very nearly twice as many voluntary schools, as State schools, to supply the educational needs of nearly one million fewer children than are attending the State schools. It is, therefore, obvious that the voluntary schools cannot hold out against the State system. The State can do the work much more economically and efficiently.

Until the process of secularisation is completed, there will inevitably be sectarian friction, jobbery, and intrigue in connection with the administration of the Education Act, and more especially in connection with the appointment of teachers. The rampant evils of sectarianism account very largely, I cannot doubt, for the remarkable shortage in the supply of candidates for the teaching profession in England. In three years (between 1907 and 1910) the number of candidates has decreased by no fewer than 30 per cent., and this fact is occasioning considerable anxiety in educational circles.

NOTE.—Entered as teachers:—1906-7, 11,018; 1907-8, 10,352; 1908-9, 8,718; 1909-1910, 7,115.

Of course, this phenomenal shortage is partly due to the fact that the State is more exacting in its expectation of the educational competency of its teachers than was the Church. The whole thing is, however, but an incident in, or a phase of, the gradual secularisation of national education. It is becoming increasingly obvious to statesmen and leaders of thought, as well as to accredited educationists in Britain, that secular education is the only logical solution of the great problem. Not a few, too, of the great Nonconformist ecclesiastics have affirmed their conviction that the secular solution is inevitable.

"The whole drift," said Sir William Robertson Nicoll, in "The British Weekly," a year or two ago, of Liberal opinion seems steadily settling in this direction (that of secular education). It is the one solution of the problem. All the rest are makeshifts. We are quite willing to accept the penultimate solution of the problem, if it can be arrived at. No doubt, many earnest Nonconformists are still very much opposed to the abandonment of State religious instruction; and they are, in all probability, strong enough to enforce a temporary and not a lasting settlement. Be it so; but the temporary settlement will not give satisfaction, and there will be unrest till the inevitable goal (that of secular education) is attained." The late Drs. Dale and Parker were also satisfied that secular education was the only solution. Dr. Clifford, the eminent Baptist clergyman, has also given expression to similar views.

A League has been formed in England to promote the cause of secular education. Among its members are to be found some of the best-known men of letters of the day, as well as distinguished Anglican and Nonconformist divines. Its platform is indicated thus:—"Recognising that the sole responsibility for religious education rests with parents and churches, the League expresses its conviction that there can be no final solution of the religious difficulty in the national schools until the Education Act is amended so as to secure that there shall be no teaching of religion in State-supported elementary schools in school hours or at the public expense." As early as 1869 that genial man of letters and large-hearted Anglican divine, Charles Kingsley, recognised the inevitability of the secular solution in national education. "It is the duty of the State," he then expressed himself, "to educate all alike in those matters which are common to them as citizens, that is, in all secular matters which concern their duties to each other as defined by law. Those higher duties which the law cannot command and enforce, they must learn elsewhere, and the clergy of all denominations will find work enough, and noble work enough, in teaching them." The late Mr. Gladstone, too, on not a few occasions, made it clear that in his opinion the secular State should have nothing whatever to do with the religious side of education. From the second volume (p. 300) of Morley's "Life of Gladstone," we learn that during the Cabinet discussions which preceded the introduction of the Education Bill of 1869, Gladstone wrote to Lord de Grey (more recently known as Lord Ripon):—"Why not adopt frankly the principle that the State or the local community should provide the secular teaching, and either leave the option to the ratepayers to go beyond this sine qua non, if they think fit, within the limits of the conscience clause; or else leave the parties themselves to find Bible and other religious education from voluntary sources." According to Mr. Alfred Illingworth, a leader in the secular movement, Mr. Gladstone wrote on the back of the draft Bill, when it was being circulated, the memorandum: "Why cannot we confine ourselves to secular education?" In a letter to John Bright in 1870 Mr. Gladstone wrote:—"The fact is, it seems to me, that the Nonconformists have not yet as a body made up their minds whether they want unsectarian religion or simply secular teaching, so far as the application of the rate is concerned. I have never been strong against the latter of these two. It seems to me impartial, and not, if fairly worked, in any degree unfriendly to religion."

Mr. Chamberlain, we know, has been all his life an enthusiastic Secularist. So have Lord Morley and Lord Rosebery. The late Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman, speaking at the Alexandra Palace in 1902, observed:—"If we had our way there would be no religious difficulty at all. We would confine ourselves (I believe nine-tenths

of Liberals would confine themselves) to secular education, and to such moral precepts as would not be obnoxious to people who do not come within the range of Christianity."

In 1902 the Congregational Union, assembled in Glasgow, affirmed:—There can be no final solution of the religious difficulty in national education until the State lays aside all claims to interfere, either by support or control, with religious education, and freely leaves to parents and Christian churches the responsibility and opportunities for the provision of the same."

It is a well-known fact that the present British Cabinet, though it has through force of circumstance been using every endeavour to arrive at a working compromise in connection with the problem of religious instruction, is abundantly satisfied that no compromise can have any real stability, permanency, or finality about it; and that the complete secularisation of national education will be achieved in a very few years. There is no disputing the fact that the leading scholars, statesmen, and men of letters in the Empire, are all but unanimous in the conviction that (unfortunate though not a few of them regard the necessity for it) complete secularisation of our national system of education is the only possible solution. If, when complete secularisation is achieved, morality and national character will be detrimentally affected, it will be a standing disgrace and discredit to the Christian clergy and the Christian Church. For if they are inspired with high Christian ideals, and prompted by a genuine Christian altruism, they can find better and ampler opportunities than ever for providing specific instruction in morality and religion, by co-operating with the State to the extent of providing such instruction, at their own expense and by teachers duly accredited by themselves. The idea of a return to the haphazard method of denominational schools is out of the question. No denominational system has ever, or ever can, achieve national efficiency, or any claim whatever to the title or attribute "national." There are, of course, ecclesiastics who have such faith in themselves, and in the problematic theocracy to which they belong, that they honestly believe that human beings and human souls are mere pawns in a theological game of chance, and that they, and they alone, have a right to pose as experts in the game. Such ecclesiastics are either clamouring for what is known as "concurrent endowment," which would mean a return to denominationalism in an aggravated form—a State-subsidised denominationalism; or they refuse to differentiate secular from religious education, and insist that, with or without a State subsidy, education must be directly under the control of the clergy and the Church. They tell us that they have conscientious scruples against any and every attempt to separate religious and secular education. They belong to the no-compromise order. They keep discrediting the State secular system as Godless, etc., etc. This, of course, is nothing short of ecclesiastical clap-trap. The State does not profess to deal with the whole of education in what we may call the secular "schooling." It recognises that the parents and churches have duties and responsibilities in connection with the more specific elements in the moral and religious side of education; and the parents and churches that cannot be brought to realise their duties and responsibilities in this connection are scarcely deserving the name of Christian, even in its most attenuated form. One would have thought that, even in Catholic schools, it would be found, not merely expedient, but even absolutely necessary to recognise the economic value of division of labour, to the extent of (for convenience and efficiency sake) separating the secular and religious. Perhaps, however, there are theological and non-theological, Galileon and non-Galileon ways of teaching astronomy, mathematics, and the other subjects found in a secular course. Under our existing secular system of education, Catholics have absolutely no grievance whatever. Were you and I snobs enough, socially or religiously, to think that our children would be, socially or morally, disadvantaged by consorting with the children at the State schools, we would have quite as just and reasonable a claim for "relief" in the shape of a Government subsidy for private schools, as have our Catholic fellow-subjects. Aristocrats in religion and in what is known as Society have to pay for the privilege of exclusiveness. The Catholics of New Zealand are at present unable to provide any education at all for one-half the children belonging to their own Church? Where would they be but for our State schools? If it was made obligatory, as the State might reasonably insist, that their teachers be duly trained, and remunerated for their services on the same scale as our State teachers, probably not one-fifth of the Catholic children in New Zealand could be educated in Catholic schools. In fact, it is high time, I venture to suggest, that various Catholic institutions were made subject to our Labour laws. There is no justification whatever for leaving any part of the work of education or of social amelioration to private charity. Mendicancy, the handmaid of such charity, is almost invariably demoralising—demoralising in its influence both on the giver and the receiver. We, who defend our free, secular, and compulsory system of education, are secularists only to the extent of believing that it is no part of the duty of the State to provide for, much less endow, specific religious instruction in our schools or churches. We are—most of us—strongly opposed to what is known as Secularism in the wider and wilder acceptation of the term. We are fully conscious of the ethical as well as the literary merits of the Bible. We believe that specific moral and religious instruction is desirable—even necessary—but we believe that it is the business of the State to confine itself exclusively to the secular side of education.

According to our Education Act, all "children must be instructed in secular knowledge." Parents are under

no obligation to send their own children to the State schools, but whether they do so or not, they are as citizens of the State, justly enough, required to contribute to the support and maintenance of the national system. Since the State insists on every child receiving a modicum of education, the State has to provide institutions for the purpose. So that no parent can have reasonable excuse for failure to educate, and so that no child need go uneducated the State has established the public school at the public expense. All can, and may, use it. If parents think they can do better for their own children by sending them to private institutions, their doing so in no way relieves them of general responsibility in connection with the State system, which is quite as much in the public interest as the maintenance of our Army and Navy. Where would we be as a nation and empire if those who are conscientiously opposed to war were to be allowed a remission of rates or taxation on the ground of conscientious scruples? The idea of such relief" is absurd—childish.

Of course, if Bible-reading is introduced into our schools as part of the State system, there can be no disputing the justice of the Catholic claims. The Catholics would then be justly entitled to a subsidy, such as they now receive in Scotland.

All systematic teaching has ethical and disciplinary value. A secular education which extends our knowledge, which trains our senses and mental faculties, is in itself of considerable moral value. All in education that tends to develop self-restraint, self-control, and self-direction exercises a healthful moral influence. What is called, or rather miscalled, secular education, does not ignore, nor yet discount, the moral needs of the pupil. What is, or can be, the value of a moral education based on superstitious dogmas or defective knowledge? Moral education must be determined very largely by sound knowledge. Why should we continue to teach our children what we have ceased to believe ourselves? It is surely no longer necessary to draw upon bogey-men in teaching morality either in the nursery or the schoolroom? The State, at any rate, cannot, in these days of accredited knowledge and exact science, find any justification for a return to the utterly discredited educational methods of a less enlightened age. If there was good reason to believe that the Churches had kept in the van of progress in knowledge and education, there might be some justice in their desire and demand to control education; but have they? Is it not notorious that the majority even of our great Churches are using their best endeavour to discredit modern knowledge and science, and making it uncomfortable for their members and adherents of modernist sympathies? If the Churches are to retain their hold on the masses, it must be by having a learned clergy, whose mental furnishings and educational acquisitions entitle them to the respect of educated, as well as of indifferently educated, men and women. Literature and the Press are fast emptying our churches. Men and women are not going to waste time and money on the luxury of divine service" if they are convinced that they can get sounder and more valuable knowledge at their own fireside from a book or a newspaper. A year or two ago a distinguished Oxford professor informed the world that it was impossible to find twelve men of educational distinction worshipping (of a Sunday) in all the Oxford churches—and this in a city where there must be several hundred men of eminence in scholarship! It can be only when the Churches have realised the necessity of having a soundly and thoroughly educated and cultured clergy that they can recover lost ground, and once more be a real leaven of righteousness in communities and nations.

It is the business of the State to provide a sound scientific and civic education. If the Churches can supplement that education by specific instruction in morality and religion, they can be of very great service to the State. If, on the other hand, they fail to do this, they assuredly may be said to fail in justifying their own existence.

We know that civic, political, social, and educational progress has been the greater and more marked wherever the State has recovered its lost rights and superseded the Churches in the control and organisation of education. The Churches must henceforth be content to regard themselves as the servants of the State. It is, and has always been, their duty (no matter how indifferently discharged) to strengthen and support the natural ethic of the State as tested in the crucible of experience and practice, by indicating its divine implications. By confining themselves to this task, they can always be of the very greatest help and service to the State. Why should they go beyond their own specific province, and keep agitating to be allowed to do for the State what the State can do far more effectively for itself?

The best minds in England to-day are, in the interests both of religion and education, aspiring to achieve such freedom as we in New Zealand have already achieved under our secular system. We have received from the distinguished statesmen and educationists who inaugurated our secular national system, a priceless heritage, and we would be traitors to the best interests of education and religion, if we failed to come forth as its defenders and champions.

There is one reassuring circumstance in connection with the defence of our New Zealand secular system. The Minister of Education and Leader of the Opposition have made it absolutely clear that they will be no party to any tinkering or tampering with our free, secular, and compulsory system. There is, however, one possible danger—that is, that our Government may be foolish enough, and illogical enough, to recognise the right of the people to determine such a question as this, involving religious and sectarian issues, by means of a referendum.

Strict neutrality is the only attitude which the State can justly assume to the various religions professed by its subjects. To determine the question of Bible-reading in Schools by means of a referendum is absolutely incompatible with the neutrality of the State. We are not quite out of the wood yet. Let us therefore be ever ready to come forth in defence of a system that cannot justly be regarded as unfair to any individuals or churches. Let us remember that:

"Eternal Vigilance is the Price of Liberty."

Some Aspects of the Roman Catholic Attitude towards our State System or Education.

MY FRIENDS,—

I cannot doubt that you are all aware of the fact that attacks are being made on our State system of education from various ecclesiastical coigns of vantage, and that there is, too, very considerable danger of our tamely acquiescing, under the influence of ecclesiastical combines, in the supersession of our free, secular, and compulsory system. Can we contemplate with equanimity the introduction into our State schools of elements and influences making for sectarian friction and conflict?

The Archbishop of Wellington is credited in the local press with having expressed himself the other day thus:—

"An education which does not extend to the whole man is lopsided and insufficient. An education which extends only to this world is insufficient. Hence the Catholic Church sets much store by Christian education, in order that we may be taught to fulfil all our duties. There is only one true basis of sound education, and that is religion. Separate one from the other, and you destroy real education. If you eliminate God from education, our boasted civilisation will end in failure." Now, these are weighty sentences. In fact, I am honestly of opinion that 99 per cent, of non-Catholics would readily assent to the Archbishop's view. Few, if any, non-Catholics would dispute the propriety and necessity of conducting the secular and religious side of education contemporaneously. But is there a single sound reason for suggesting that such subjects as reading, writing, arithmetic, Latin, French, or any of the subjects ordinarily taught in our primary or secondary schools, cannot be taught soundly or efficiently unless sandwiched in between lessons specifically dealing with morality and Christian doctrine? If, in suggesting that education and religion should go coupled and inseparable, the Archbishop means that the secular and religious elements of education ought to be taught at the same time, in the same place, and by the same individuals, his suggestion must appear little other than consummate nonsense to unbiassed minds. If, on the other hand, he means that the spiritual and purely intellectual side of the pupils' nature should be trained and developed contemporaneously, no one is likely to challenge his statement.

Now the fact that the State makes adequate and effective provision for imparting such secular knowledge, as almost all religious organisations approve of, and under conditions necessitating very considerable moral discipline, should be of the greatest service to all the Churches—Catholic as well as Protestant. All that remains for them to do is to supplement the State secular system to the extent of providing specific moral and religious teaching at their own expense and by teachers accredited by themselves. This specific moral and religious instruction can be most economically imparted by the various Churches arranging with the Education Department for the use of the State schools (for the purpose suggested) during non-school hours.

Our existing secular system is unfair to no Church—Catholic or Protestant. There is no suggestion that our State system provides for "the whole man." The State, presumably, as well as non-Catholics, are as conscious as Catholics themselves of the necessity of imparting definite moral and religious instruction to our youth, but it (the State) is abundantly satisfied that, considering the painful differences of opinion obtaining among us as to the nature and source of moral sanctions, it is its duty to observe benevolent neutrality in the matter of religion.

Of course, some Churches are like "spoilt children": unless they get all they want they will take nothing. They must have "an atmosphere"—in fact, a hot-house—for their plants! Such people, naturally, suffer for their "cussedness" and spiritual exclusiveness. Politics and religion, it would seem, must always beget martyrs and superior persons. This is an age of enlightened give and take—compromise—in religion, as in other matters; and the religious body that fails to recognise this fact cannot possibly hold its own (not to speak of making headway) under the pressure of the social forces and intellectual influences at work in our age. We, non-Catholics, are sorry that our Catholic fellow subjects cannot see their way to take as full advantage of our State system as non-Catholics do. There is not, or at least ought not to be, anything taught in our State schools

that could cause either injustice or offence to Catholics. No Church has ever been able to make adequate provision for imparting an efficient education to its own members, not to speak of making adequate provision for a national system. In fact, such a thing as efficiency in national education was unknown until the State superseded the Churches in controlling, directing, and organising education. If the State insisted, as it might reasonably insist, that any religious body declining to take advantage of the State system so far as the purely secular part of education is concerned, be required to provide a thoroughly efficient secular education for the children belonging to that denomination at schools run by themselves, and in every district where (say) some twenty children belonging to the denomination were to be found, could our Catholic friends, or any other religious body in the Dominion, make adequate provision for the purpose? If, again, our Catholic friends were required to train their teachers (as the State might reasonably insist) on modern and scientific lines, as also to remunerate them on the same scale as State teachers, could they carry on the work of education efficiently even with a very considerable subsidy from the Government? I am satisfied that they could not. I am firmly convinced that the Catholic Church and not a few other Churches, too, are positively sweating their teachers and clergy in the name of religion, and using wealth acquired from exploited labour for doubtful political and ecclesiastical purposes. It is high time that educational institutions run by Catholic and other Churches were subject to our Labour laws. I do not think it could possibly be regarded as unreasonable that this should be insisted on. We live in an age when it is absolutely unnecessary—aye, a positive scandal—that any part of education should be left to private charity or exploited labour. The days of charity and its handmaid mendicancy in religion and education are tapering to a close. It is beyond the pale of controversy that where Churches have attempted to control and organise education the great majority of the people have been very indifferently educated or hopelessly illiterate.

Under our existing secular system our Catholic friends have no reasonable cause for complaint. They cannot possibly provide an adequate and efficient substitute for the State system for the children belonging to their own denomination throughout the Dominion. Why, then, should they not be grateful to the State for relieving them of the purely secular part of education, and provide (as they could do most economically and efficiently) for specific instruction in morality and religion, by taking advantage (as other religious denominations are beginning to do) of the State organisation. The State schools can be made available for the purpose, during non-school hours, at a merely nominal cost.

It is really amusing to find the learned Archbishop declaring that it is a matter of conscience with Catholics to object to our so-called secular system, while it is not a question of conscience with non-Catholics. One would like to know what claim he can have to diagnose the non-Catholic conscience. Non-Catholics, while recognising the propriety of educating the whole man, spiritually as well as intellectually, have the commonsense to see that in the divided state of Christendom as to the sources of moral and religious sanctions, specific instruction in morality and religion had better be left to the parents and the Churches. This seems an eminently reasonable and fair arrangement, yet our Catholic friends keep crying: "No compromise. It is a matter of conscience with us." Catholics, and what are called Churchmen, often laugh at the tender thing known as "the Nonconformist conscience." To non-Catholics, I fear that what Catholics call conscience is but the acquired moral sense of theologically spoiled children.

I have no hesitation in stating that Catholics have for many years been accorded exceptionally favourable and considerate treatment in almost every part of the British Empire, and I think that it is high time that they showed a disposition to help our statesmen towards a solution of such problems as that of education, where judicious and reasonable compromise would be of exceptional value. However, Catholics, presumably, know their own business; but if they keep on in New Zealand and elsewhere demanding everything (in their own way) in education and religion, they will probably find that even British patience will soon be exhausted.

We have heard somewhat ominous threats of an impending political combine on the part of Catholics. Unfortunately, Catholics have never been able to benefit appreciably by their past experience. The most obvious lessons of history seem lost upon them. Presumably, they are calculating on some miraculous intervention of Providence to save the situation for them. One thing is, however, clear to every student of history and sociology, that when Catholics take to political intrigue a politico-religious Nemesis dogs them to their eventual doom. The Continent of Europe is teaching us how to deal with irreconcilables in politics and religion. The State is founded on a natural and rational ethic (the product and resultant of an ever widening and developing social and civic experience). When the interests of a religious cult go counter to the State ethic, sooner or later the religious cult comes to grief. When ecclesiastical bodies, Catholic or non-Catholic, take to ways that are dark in political manipulation, it may be necessary for the State, from a sense of self-preservation, to ask ecclesiastical intriguers, not merely to take up their beds, but to take up their schools and churches, and walk. The New Zealand Government cannot well conduct such intriguers over our frontiers, as had to be done elsewhere not long ago, yet I am confident that it could solve the problem without resorting to such expedients as the Noyades (Carlyle's Drownages) of the French devolution. Perhaps it would meet the case if the Napoleon

of the would-be ecclesiastico-political intriguers—our worthy fellow-citizen, Mr. Martin Kennedy—could be confined for a term of years to some such St. Helena as Soames Island!

One thing, at any rate, is beyond dispute—history witnesses to it at every turn—when ecclesiastical organisations meddle in politics or identify themselves with a political party their social and religious influence is seriously prejudiced, and their very existence in jeopardy.

The State has for a long time been seriously handicapped by injudicious interference on the part of the clergy and denominationalists in matters that lie beyond their legitimate domain. Personally, I think the State should rate all ecclesiastical property in the same way as other property. There is no justification whatever for its exemption. The State accords the Churches various privileges and exemptions, and the Churches too often show their gratitude by ecclesiastical intrigue in politics. This sort of thing cannot go on indefinitely.

Well, as I have already said, the present secular education system is unfair to no one—Catholic or Protestant. But were our Government foolish enough to permit what are known as Bible-lessons to be conducted in our public schools during ordinary school hours, the position would be completely changed. The Catholics would have a real grievance. Their claim to a subsidy or capitation for the secular part of their work—if efficiently done—would under such altered circumstances be eminently reasonable. It would be a gross injustice to deny them their claim. If, however, Catholics are foolish enough to help a Protestant combine to get its way in the matter of Bible-reading, etc., in schools, it is not at all likely that this combine will be generous enough to concede what may be regarded as the reasonable claims of Catholics as to capitation or a subsidy. The Catholics have recently fallen between two stools in Australia, and they have since then been shouting themselves hoarse in a demand for justice. If our Catholic friends here come by the same fate as they seem likely to do—we non-Catholics, who are Secularists purely from expediency, and from a consciousness under existing circumstances of the necessity for compromise, may well pity them, while conceding that they heartily deserve their fate, inasmuch as they seem to be deliberately engineering a grievance.

I do not think that I do the Archbishop of Wellington an injustice when I infer from his address that he is of opinion that religion and education are absolutely separated in, and God eliminated from, our national system of education. Is this really so? Three-fourths of all rational religion is concerned with morality. To say that the moral discipline in vogue in our State schools is not of the very essence of a truly catholic or universal ethic and religion, but indicates a very antediluvian conception of both ethics and religion. Is there any reasonable warrant for suggesting that God, or the name of God, is eliminated from our national education? I have no hesitation in saying that there is none whatever. The Israelites could be profoundly religious, and yet not give articulate expression to the name of their God. We have Jesus' words: "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven." If it is desirable that our young people should receive more definite instruction in the phenomena of morality and religion than is provided in the home and the secular class-room, the individual churches can make ample provision for this laudable purpose without dragging the State or its teachers into what is inevitably a sectarian arena. "There must," as Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman would put it, be no statutory foothold for sectarian privilege in our public school system." I am confident that our Government will never allow themselves or us to be dragged at the chariot wheels of sectarians.

It was never contemplated by the State that our national system of education should relieve parents or churches of all responsibility in connection with education. The State recognises that it is the duty of parents and the Churches to co-operate with the State in equipping our youth for the work of life, and disciplining them into making the most and best of their lives from the points of view of education and religion as well as of social service.

No doubt we have to exercise great charity and forbearance in dealing with the Catholic conscience. We know that every human conscience is very largely the product of training and education. Catholics are taught from infancy to regard the moral law as imposed from without, and not, directly or indirectly, by their own moral judgment. The Church is for them the custodian of a special revelation, in which even what is called *The Bible* is but an item or incident. Reluctant obedience," as Professor Herrmann, of Marburg, puts it, "passes for morality with Rome; but we (Protestants) call it sin." Morality to our Catholic friends is but another name for obedience to law in a theocracy. The older Protestants regarded the moral law as derived directly from the Bible, Catholics regard the moral law as only indirectly (through a specially commissioned priesthood) derived from the Bible. I need scarcely say that no professor or accredited authority on moral philosophy in any free university in the world to-day considers that the Bible, or any Church, has anything whatever to do with the ultimate basis or sanctions of morality. Right is right and good is good in the very nature of things, and not by virtue of any revelation or Bible or Church. Experience alone determines in its personal, family, civic, and social implications, what morality really is, and so leads to the codification of moral and other law. The great leaders in the world of thought to-day—the moving spirits in what we may call the New Protestantism—are abundantly satisfied that, while the moral law is derived from the nature of things, and so is rightly called the Law of God, it must yet assert itself from within the individual consciousness. In other words, our own moral

sense must recognise its value and validity, and our moral judgment pronounce it good and true. While, however, Catholics and Protestants of the old school, keep educating our youth into accepting a supernaturalistic basis for morality, we are bound to have great and painful differences of opinion as to what constitutes religion and morality, and also as to how to deal most effectively with the moral and religious training of the young.

We must, therefore, exercise great patience and forbearance in dealing with the Churches and their attitudes in this connection, conscious as we are that modern science and modern knowledge are slowly but surely making against their point of view. Many of our Churches (Protestant as well as Catholic) have yet to learn that there can be no virtue in believing what is incredible or self-contradictory; as, also, that in religion and morality nothing can be of real value to us unless it appeals directly to our intelligence and moral judgment.

Our difficulties in regard to what is of value in religion and morality arise mainly from the fact that our clergy (Catholic and Protestant) have their heads stuffed from infancy with primitive ideas as to religion and morality, and long before they can have acquired minds of their own (as we say) they commit themselves to various irrational ideas in theology; and even take solemn vows to devote their whole life to the promulgation of these irrational ideas. Jesus had not the presumption to take to teaching or preaching until He knew His own and His Father's mind, and acquired adult experience. If no man was allowed to take holy orders until he was thirty years of age (the age when Jesus began His ministry), we would very soon have a rational theology, and with it a system of education rational in its secular and religious implications.

Graphic Border

[Appendix I.]

The Secular Education League 1907.

President—Lord Weardale of Stanhope.

Secretary—MR. H. SNELL,

19, BUCKINGHAM STREET, STRAND, LONDON, W.C.

Bankers—THE LONDON AND SOUTH-WESTERN BANK, LTD., STRAND BRANCH

General Council.

- Rev. Dr. K. C. Anderson
- An asterisk denotes Members of the Executive Committee.
- R. Applegarth
- Miss Florence Balgarnie
- Professor E. S. Beesly
- Maj.-Gen. Elphinstone Begbie
- Rev. J. H. Belcher
- Richard Bell, M.P.
- Rev. W. G. Bloomfield
- Mrs. Bradlaugh Bonner
- C. W. Bowerman, M.P.
- Herbert Burrows
- "The Rt. Hon. T. Burt, M.P.
- Professor J. B. Bury
- Charles Roden Buxton
- Rev. R. J. Campbell
- Chapman Cohen
- Edward Clodd
- The Hon. John Collier
- Mrs. C. A. V. Conybeare
- Sir Henry Cotton M.P.
- Pete Curran, M.P.
- Rev. Dr. W. Evans Darby
- Rev. H. R. Didcock
- Sir Arthur Conan Doble
- Havelock Ellis
- Rev. Rowland Evans

- C. Fenwick, M.P.
- G. W. Foote
- Dr. F. J. Furnivall
- Rev. T. Gasquoine
- Sydney Gimson
- E. D. Girdlestone
- Rev. Dr. John Glasse
- F. J. Could
- George Greenwood, M.P.
- A. Vernon Harcourt
- Rev. Dr. J. Rendell Harris
- Frederic Harrison
- Rev. S. D. Headlam
- Arthur Henderson, M.P.
- Vice-Admiral W. H. Henderson
- Dennis Hird
- J. A. Hobson
- Silas K. Hocking
- John Hodge, M.P.
- The Rev. Geo. R. Hogg
- Rev. Donald Hole
- Rev. J. Page Hopps
- W. Johnson, M.P.
- Rev. D. M. Jones
- Rev. L. Jenkins Jones
- F. W. Jowett, M.P.
- E. J. Kibble white
- Charles F. Knight, M.D.
- Holford Knight
- Edmund G. Lamb, M.P.
- Hugh Cecil Lea, M.P.
- Rev. E. W. Lewis
- Sir Maurice Levy, M.P.
- H. F. Luttrell, M.P.
- J. R. Macdonald, M.P.
- Professor J. S. Mackenzie
- C. F. G. Masterman, M.P.
- Aylmer Maude
- John McCallum, M.P.
- George Meredith
- The Right Rev. Bishop Mitchinson
- Rev. W. E. Moll
- J. Llovd Morgan, M.P.
- Rev. J. C. Nesbitt
- Rev. J. E. S. Otty
- Rev. Charles Peach
- Eden Phillpotts
- J. Allanson Picton, M.A.
- Rev. W. W. Chynoweth Pope
- J. A. Price
- Dr. G. Archdall Reid
- T. F. Richards, M.P.
- G. H. Roberts, M.P.
- Rev. R. Roberts
- John M. Robertson, M.P.
- Rev. Charles S. Rose
- W. M. Rossetti
- Earl Russell

- Countess Russell
- Dr. V. H. Rutherford, M.P.
- Rev. A. Ryland
- Dr. C. W. Saleeby
- H. S. Salt
- A. H. Scott, M.P.
- A. M. Scott
- D. J. Shackleton, M.P.
- Rev. H. Bodell-Smith
- Mrs. Miall Smith
- H. Snell
- P. Snowden, M.P.
- Halley Stewart, M.P.
- Rev. Dr. J. Strauss
- Rev. C. J. Street
- S. H. Swinny
- D. A. Thomas, M.P.
- Rev. John Day-Thompson
- Stanley Udale
- F. Verinder
- J. Wadsworth, M.P.
- Rev. Hugh C. Wallace
- Graham Wallas
- Rev. Walter Walsh
- George J. Wardle, M.P.
- Rev. Dr. J. Warschauer
- H. G. Wells
- Rev. J. T. Whittaker
- Rev. G. N. Whittinoham
- Alexander Wilkie, M.P.
- Rev T. Rhondda Williams
- Rev. F. Haydn Williams
- W. Llewellyn Williams, M.P.
- Rev. J. Barstow Wilson
- Israel Zangwill

Manifesto.

(Issued April, 1907)

Every attempt made to settle the education question in England and Wales has conspicuously failed. The reason of this failure is that partial and partisan lines have been followed. The Act of 1902 erred in one direction; the Bill of 1906 erred as badly in another direction. Everyone sees that, a further attempt, to be successful, must proceed upon fresh lines altogether; and it is with a view to this new departure that the Secular Education League has come into being.

The Secular Education League aims at binding together in one effective organisation all who favour the "Secular Solution" of the Education problem, without reference to any other convictions—political, social, or religious—that they may entertain.

The fundamental principle of the League is expressed in the resolution that was carried at the crowded inaugural meeting, which took place at the "Tribune" Rendezvous on Monday evening, 4th February, under the chairmanship of Mr. George Greenwood, M.P.:—

"That this meeting, recognising that the sole responsibility for religious education rests with parents and Churches, expresses its conviction that there can be no final solution of the religious difficulty in National Education until the Education Act is amended so as to secure that there shall be no teaching of religion in State-supported Elementary Schools in school hours or at the public expense."

According to this resolution, religion must not be taught in the National Elementary Schools either at the public expense or by means of public machinery. Upon this basis a wise and just educational system could be established, which would necessarily prevent religious tests being imposed upon teachers, give absolute security to religious rights of parents, and infuse serenity and efficiency into the intellectual and moral atmosphere of the school looms.

The wisdom and equity of confining the teaching in public elementary schools to secular subjects were admitted by the late Mr. Gladstone. They have also been admitted by various political leaders still living—such as Lord Rosebery, Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, and Mr. John Morley. But many who recognise that Secular Education is ideally light declare that it is impracticable. They assert that the nation will not have it. Yet they offer no proof of this extraordinary statement. The truth is that the people have never had a clear issue laid before them. Only at Trade Union Congresses has a popular vote been taken, and on every occasion the skilled workmen, through their official representatives, have registered overwhelming majorities in favour of Secular Education.

It cannot be questioned that the religious controversy has been a serious hindrance to national education. England will never take her proper place in the van of educational progress until the State hands religion over to those who should care for it, and organises education on a scientific and civic basis.

Certainly the religious controversy shows no sign of abating. Passive resistance, pursued by Nonconformists, is now being threatened by Anglicans and Catholics. Even if a majority were to agree upon a compromise, it would still excite the passionate resentment of the minority. There is, indeed, but one way of peace—the way of Secular Education.

The Secular Education League neither professes nor entertains any hostility to religion. It simply regards religion as a personal and private matter, which all should be free to promote in voluntary associations, but which should never come under the control of the State. The League takes its stand on the principle of citizenship—with freedom and equality for all in matters that lie beyond.

It is with confidence that the Secular Education League appeals for moral and financial support. A number of distinguished names are already included on its General Council, and more will assuredly be added in the immediate future. What is now sought is a great accession of members, who give the motive power to every organisation. The way into the League is easy. Only the essential points of principle and policy are insisted upon; and the members' contribution is purely voluntary, each being left to subscribe according to interest and opportunity.

With the issue of this first Manifesto the general work of the Secular Education League begins, and the battle opens for the victory of "the Secular Solution."

[Appendix II.]

Tract 14.

The Secular Education League.

President—Lord Weardale of Stanhope.

Secretary—MR. H. SNELL,

19, BUCKINGHAM STREET, LONDON, W.C.

Bankers—London and South Western Bank, Strand Branch, London, W.C.

An Appeal by Churchmen to Churchmen.

The Secular Education League, without committing itself to the views expressed by the signatories of this Manifesto, issues it as a valuable contribution to the discussion of the principle of the education provided by the State in Elementary Schools.

Among the many forcible arguments which have been adduced in favour of the "Secular Solution" there would seem to be comparatively few which deal with the subject on distinctly Church lines. The object, therefore, of this appeal is to offer Churchmen a few reasons why they, before all others, should support the cause of the Secular Education League. And be it noted that the phrase "Secular Education" by no means implies hostility or indifference to religion, but simply restriction, on principle, to secular subjects in the education which is provided in schools supported by the State.

If there is one thing which differentiates a Churchman, it is surely the second of the three baptismal vows by which he is under obligation to "believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith." These, according to his Catechism, are summed up in the twelve clauses of the Apostles' Creed. He cannot, therefore, be satisfied with any religious instruction other than that which is based on these formulæ, and which obviously cannot be given in schools which are as much the property of those who do not believe them as of those who do.

"Simple Bible Teaching," as it is called, does not provide him with his religious knowledge, which is not derived primarily from the Bible, but from the teaching of the Church whose doctrine is anterior to the Books

of the New Testament, and was at first transmitted by "oral tradition." Cardinal Newman, in "The Arians of the Fourth Century" (written fourteen years before he left the English Church), says:—"Surely the Sacred Volume was not intended, and is not adapted, to teach us our Creed, however certain it is that we can prove our Creed from it when it has once been taught us, and in spite of individual producible exceptions to the general rule. From the very first that rule has been, as a matter of fact, that the Church should teach the truth, and then should appeal to Scripture in vindication of its own teaching."

The converse of this is likewise a necessary axiom; for, just as the Bible vindicates the teaching of the Church, so also the teaching of the Church interprets the Bible, which otherwise might be misunderstood, for "No prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation" (2 Pet. i. 20). Hence, for the Churchman, religious instruction is based upon the teaching of the Church plus the Bible—the two cannot be separated—for, according to the Articles, while (Art. VIII.) "The Church hath authority in controversies of Faith," yet (Art. XX.) "Whatsoever is not read—in Holy Scripture—nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an Article of Faith."

This being the case, it stands to reason that in education provided by a State which is bound to respect the convictions of those who adhere to all sorts of beliefs, and of those who adhere to none, a Churchman cannot recognise a pro rata system of religious instruction.

And, further, supposing that some contrivance could be discovered whereby the State might authorise the teaching of Church doctrine in all its fulness, he could not conscientiously be a party to it; for, according to his theory, there is only one body divinely commissioned to decide what is to be taught, and that body is not the State, but the Church; and there is only one set of persons qualified to teach it—viz., those who are duly authorised by the Church and are fully persuaded as to the truth of what they teach.

Ever since the divine command to "Go and teach all nations" there has been laid upon the Church the obligation of providing for the religious instruction of the people. It is an obligation which cannot be transferred to an external body like the State, which, although it may be composed of those who profess Christianity, yet may include those who do not, and which does not in any way assume itself to be ecclesiastical. To hand over the right of imparting religious instruction to such an institution is to surrender one of the most sacred trusts committed to its charge, and one which, from the first age of its existence, has ever been most jealously guarded. For the history of the methods employed by the leaders of the early Christian Church is an evidence of the extreme caution with which they proceeded in the matter of religious education.

It is sometimes asked "how the Church is to fulfil its obligation without being subsidised in some way by the State. The principal requisite is greater faith in its divine mission. If the bishops and clergy had a stronger conviction that what they are divinely commissioned to undertake they will be divinely assisted to fulfil, this question need not be suggested. The first teachers of the Christian religion performed their task without either rate-aid or State-aid, and the result of their labour is still to be seen. Whereas now the object of leaders of religion seems to be to get done for them what they ought to do for themselves. Apropos of this it may be well to quote an utterance of the Bishop of Birmingham (Dr. Gore). Speaking to the Society of the Catechism in the Church House, he said: "We are now, more or less, in the middle of a crisis. We are always in the middle of a crisis. This crisis is about the religious question in our day schools. I would ask you, then, to get at the root of our difficulty. What is it? The heart of our difficulty is partly that we have shifted on to the wrong shoulders the central function of teaching children; secondly, that we have so lost the idea of what the teaching of the Church is and the meaning of religious education that we are considered by the public to be unreasonable and uncompromising people if we are not disposed to admit that the County Councils can settle the standard of sufficient religious knowledge for everybody."

The difficulty as to means might be overcome to a considerable extent if the Church would mind its own business, and leave to the State what the latter can do so much more effectively—and there is historical precedent for this—pace those who assert that education of all kinds can only be given in "a Catholic atmosphere." "During the first three centuries the Christian parent justified himself in sending his sons to pagan schools on the ground of simple necessity; and while Christian doctrine was taught by Christians, secular knowledge was sought in the ordinary channels . . . and even the recognition of Christianity by the State does not appear to have produced any sudden change in these conditions. The 'Schools of the Empire,' as they were termed, not only continued to exist, but maintained their traditions of education unmodified" ("Dictionary of Christian Antiquities," Smith and Cheetham; Article "Schools," vol. ii., p. 1847).

It is not to be assumed that either Cardinal Newman or Bishop Gore would avowedly uphold the Secular Solution; but, both being men of integrity and sound common sense, they have made admissions which tell strongly in its favour.

Most assuredly, then, is it to the highest interest of Churchmen that they should unite with men of goodwill, who, although differing in their views of religion, are at one in their desire to promote peace and justice in the upbringing of the future generation.

W. BUSBY, M.A., Rector St. John's,

Maddermarket, Norwich.

G. K. CHESTERTON.

C. HALLETT, M.A., Vicar St.

Barnabas, Oxford.

STEWART D. HEADLAM, B.A., L.C.C.

GEORGE R. HOGG, M.A., St. Albans,

Holborn.

DONALD HOLE, A.K.C.

SELWYN IMAGE, M.A.

D. C. LATHBURY, M.A.

J. MITCHINSON, D.C.L., Bishop, Master of Pembroke College,

Oxford.

W. E. MOLL, M.A., Vicar St. Philip's,

Newcastle-on-Tyne.

CONRAD NOEL.

GEORGE W. E. RUSSELL, M.A.

W. A. SPENCE, M.A., Vicar St.

Frideroide, Oxford.

[Appendix III.]

Tract 13.

The Secular Education League.

President—LORD WEARDALE OF STANHOPE.

Secretary—MR. H. SNELL,

19, BUCKINGHAM STREET, LONDON, W.C.

Bankers—LONDON AND SOLTH WESTERN BANK, STRAND BRANCH, LONDON, W.C.

An Appeal by Nonconformists to Nonconformists.

The Secular Education League, without committing itself to the views expressed by the signatories of this Manifesto, issues it as a valuable contribution to the discussion of the principle of the education provided by the State in Elementary Schools.

1902—and After.

Ever since the passing of the Education Act of 1902 you, as Nonconformists, have had a burning grievance. By the provisions of that Act you are taxed and rated for the support of schools where the religious teaching is contrary to your beliefs. You have no effective control of the expenditure of your money in these schools, and, although you are taxed to pay the salaries of all the teachers, you and your children are debarred by a religious test from the highest posts in the teaching profession, so far as these schools are concerned.

Hope Deferred.

So keenly did you resent this unjust legislation that, when the time came for electing a new House of Commons, Nonconformist feeling throughout the country was undoubtedly one of the main factors among those which helped to return the present Government to power with a record majority. If anything might have been taken for granted, it was that within a twelvemonth at most of the General Election the grievance of Nonconformity would be redressed—that was the clear mandate with which you sent your representatives by hundreds to Westminster. If anyone could have prophesied that, after three years of Liberalism in office, the educational position would be still unchanged, that this issue would be as far from settlement as ever, that Passive Resistance would still remain as a tiling in being, the forecast would have been dismissed with angry derision. Yet the seemingly impossible has happened in this instance. The Government has brought in Bill after Bill, yet in each instance only to meet with failure. Mr. McKenna's Bill shared the fate of that of Mr. Birrell, Mr. Runciman's that of Mr. McKenna's, and that in spite of the fact that each of these attempts at a solution of the difficulty went further than its predecessor in the direction of concession to your opponents. "Right of entry" and "contracting out" could hardly be accepted by you without the most serious misgivings; yet they were accepted, not light-heartedly, but in the hope and for the sake of peace. And still the desired end remains unattained, concessions and sacrifices have proved unavailing, and Nonconformity finds itself in the humiliating position of being no nearer a just settlement with a majority than with a minority in Parliament. No doubt you feel sore and indignant at the actual state of affairs; is it too much to hope that on reflection Nonconformists will read the lesson of these three years of disappointment?

Compromise Impossible.

That lesson, to our mind, is a plain one. Free Churchmen were, in the first place, actuated by a sincere—but, as the results show, mistaken—belief that a compromise could be come to with the Anglicans, on the basis of what is called simple Bible-teaching. Such a plan was bound to fail, because it overlooked the repugnance to this form of religious instruction entertained by Catholics, both Roman and Anglican, whose attitude towards religion as a subject to be taught differs fundamentally from that of Protestants. It is really this stubborn fact which has frustrated all the well-intended attempts at conciliation; and it should be obvious, after the last of a series of fiascos hardly equalled in political history, that future attempts along similar lines will be no more successful than those made in the past. Surely by this time it must be clear to all who are prepared to learn from experience that a solution of the religious difficulty by means of a compromise is impossible—even if Anglicanism and Nonconformity were the only factors to be considered.

At this juncture, then, we venture to recall to the memory of Free Churchmen some truths which, in their desire for a settlement of a long, embittered, and calamitous conflict, have been too largely forgotten.

Equality and Equity.

(1) Free Churchmen believe in religious equality for all. They must therefore recognise that the issue does not rest solely between themselves and the Established Church, but that there are many others outside these particular communions who, as citizens and ratepayers, have a right to be considered. It is simply no use to legislate on the assumption that the community is made up of members of Christian Churches; still less can we imagine Free Churchmen arguing that non-Christians have, as such, no claim to elementary justice in matters affecting religious belief or disbelief. Since Christians and non-Christians alike are made to contribute to the cost of education, it is surely not to be tolerated that the latter should be penalised by having to pay for a kind of instruction which runs counter to their convictions. This is precisely the Nonconformist grievance. Is it conceivable that Nonconformists should be willing to inflict the same grievance upon others, simply because they may happen to be in a minority?

The State and Religion.

(2) Free Churchmen are such because of their fundamental principle that the State has no business to meddle with the religious faith of its members. For this conviction they have made immense sacrifices in the past—sacrifices which are the pride and glory of Nonconformity. But if the interference of the State with the religious opinions of the citizen is not to be tolerated from the Free Church point of view, how can it be tolerable that the same State should have the power to frame and impose a form of religious teaching upon its citizens in the making? And if the proper agency for the giving of religious instruction to adults is the Church to which they may belong, must not the same hold true of the religious instruction given to children?

The Policy of Justice.

Some among the most consistent and widely honoured Nonconformists of the past—men like Spurgeon, Parker, and Dale—held to the view which we are expressing; and among those Nonconformist leaders who utter the same conviction to-day it may suffice to point to Dr. Robertson Nicoll and Mr. Alfred E. Hutton, M.P. Do you not think, after all the failure and disappointment of these last three years—with the proved impossibility of establishing a form of religious teaching acceptable to all, and the obvious injustice of endowing some form unacceptable to any—you might yet once more consider the claims of the only policy which inflicts hardship on none, and which goes by the name of the Secular Solution?

Objections.

We have heard it often and glibly stated that, while this is no doubt the logical solution, "the world is not governed by logic"; but, since it is very evident that the world, in this instance, declines to be governed by compromise, would it not be as well if for once logic—which in practice means fair play for all and privilege for none—were given a chance? Again, we have heard it said with constant reiteration that "the time is not ripe" for the Secular Solution. The answer to this is that the time—as the recent vote of the Welsh Baptists shows—is rapidly ripening, and that it behoves earnest men and women, as distinct from mere political opportunists, to hasten this process. It is urged that the Secular Solution will mean that the children will grow up unacquainted with the Bible. We can only express our surprise that such a fear should fail to excite the liveliest indignation among the Churches, Free and Established alike, with their tens of thousands of Sunday Schools devoted to precisely this work; nor can we understand why the Churches should expect the State to fulfil one of their chief functions. Finally, a great deal of prejudice against the Secular Solution is due to an inexact habit of speech, which confuses Secular Education with Secularism. It should be plain, however, that the two things are absolutely different, Secular Education meaning solely that the teaching given in the public schools and at the public expense is to be confined to secular subjects. To imagine, say, Mr. Spurgeon in favour of propagating Secularism would be simply grotesque. The fact that he strongly urged the cause of Secular Education should save that cause from this particular misinterpretation.

In Conclusion.

Nonconformists, you have shown how great is the power you can wield. We appeal to you, precisely because of your historic principles, to wield that power effectively by throwing your immense influence in the scale of the Secular Solution. In so doing you will be true to your best traditions. Let the State confine its activity to the secular part of education, and let parents and Churches show the reality of their religious beliefs by providing the religious part of education themselves.

We plead, not on behalf of an abstract theory, but above all on behalf of the nation's children, who cannot but suffer educationally while the present state of warfare lasts. If the chapter of inglorious and wearing conflict is to close at last, and a new chapter of justice, peace, and educational efficiency is to open, the Secular Solution is "the only way."

W. J. HENDERSON, B.A. (Baptist),

Baptist College, Bristol.

E. E. COLEMAN, M.A. (Baptist),

37, Elbury Road, Sherwood Rise, Nottingham.

R. J. CAMPBELL, M.A. (Congregational),

City Temple, London, E.C.

J. WARSCHAUER, M.A., Dr. Phil. (Congregational),

Anerley Road, London, S.E.

HUGH C. WALLACE (Congregational),

Anerley Road, London, S.E.

ARCHIBALD DUFF, M.A., D.D., LL.D. (Congregational),

9, Selborne Terrace, Bradford.

JOSEPH WOOD (Unitarian),

Birmingham.

J. PAGE HOPPS (Unitarian),

The Roserie, Shepperton-on-Thames.

W. COPELAND BOWIE (Unitarian),

Essex Hall, Essex Street, Strand, London, W.C.

G. BICHENO (Primitive Methodist),

28, Birklands Road, Shipley, Yorks.

JOHN DAY THOMPSON (Primitive Methodist),

86, Palatine Road, Blackpool.

GEORGE W. KING (Primitive Methodist),

11 Summerseat Place, Bradford.

SILAS K. HOCKING (Free Methodist),

10, Avenue Road, Highgate, N.

[Appendix IV.]

Tract 5

The Secular Education League.

President—Lord Weardale of Stanhope.

Secretary—MR. H. SNELL,

19, BUCKINGHAM STREET, LONDON, W.C.

Views of Religious Leaders on Secular Education.

The Rev. Dr. Fairburn in the "Daily News" on January 11th, 1907:—

"I do believe that the grasp of any Church or clergy round the throat of the State is, in the highest degree, dangerous. If, therefore, we are faced by a multitude of men who threaten to lead our schools into ecclesiastical controversies, I, for my part, would see no option save adopting "the secular solution." The secular may be non-ecclesiastical: but it is not, and need not be, anti-religious. The State is, to me, a body little competent to legislate in religion. It may be more competent than any known Church: but this is a small matter compared with the awful impertinence of those who plead for intervention by the State between the man and his conscience, or the conscience and its God."

Principal Henderson, President of the Baptist Union, in his Presidential Address before the Spring Assembly Meetings, April, 1907 ("Baptist Times," April 26th), said:—

"It has never been held by us that majorities can righteously compel minorities to support common religious beliefs, and now that the Free Churches have become powerful, are they ready to repudiate those

principles of justice for which, when they were weak, they fought and suffered? It is irreligious to be unjust to any man. The Cross, I repeat, stands for righteousness. The Churches cannot wisely delegate their duties to the civic authorities. Even if all our resources were exhausted there would be the greatest objections to the principle that the State, as such, should determine what prayers are to be addressed to God, and what religious ideas are to be taught the people, old or young. We shall land ourselves in deeper and deeper bogs if there is persistence in the present course. It is in the interests of religion that the civil power should leave it entirely alone.

Non-interference is the best service that Parliament can render to the Christian cause, and the best service the Church can render to the nation is to be true to itself, to abide by its own ideas, and to discharge its own duties."

The Rev. J. H. Jowett, addressing the National Council of Free Churches, said:—

"The present attitude of the Episcopal Bench can have but one issue. The man in the street has a short and sharp way in matters of this kind. When he sees that there is this prolonged and growing contention, and that many vital things are suffering, he will tumble both denominationalism and un-denominationalism into the street. That is the present purpose and temper of the Labour Party—a party destined to exercise an increasing influence in the State. But there is an increasing body of enlightened judgment which believes that in the interest of truth and perfect fairness it would be better for the matter of controversy to be removed clean out of the public schools, and that religious instruction should be committed to the Churches, who are primarily responsible for it."

The Rev. J. Hirst Hollowell, "Daily News," April 15th, 1907:—

"The sooner the present sectarian system of education is broken down the better, so that the nation may be driven to the only sound policy. "The State school must be restricted to national and moral education, and religious teaching of all kinds must be thrown upon the Churches, in private hours, at their own cost, and by their own agents."

Words of Archbishop Temple, written when Headmaster of Rugby:—

"Secular schools would not be irreligious. I am by no means sure that on the whole they would not be more religious. ... I respect the feeling that makes England shrink from secular schools, but I cannot reverence what is so mere a sentiment. The sight of a secular system working by the side of the correlative religious system would dispel the whole feeling in a year."

What Dr. Parker thought about Secular Education (reprinted from the "Times," October 18th, 1894):—

"As a Nonconformist, I believe that no education can be complete which does not include thorough religious training; but I am a citizen, as well as a Nonconformist, and as a citizen I deny that it is the business of the State to furnish a complete education. That is a distinction which I hold to be vital. Under some circumstances the State may undertake to furnish an elementary education, which is a very different thing—so different, indeed, that it may include neither algebra nor theology. In such a matter as education it should be the business of the State not to see how far it can go, but how soon it can stop; and, for one, I venture to think that the State might very well stop when it has paid for a thorough knowledge of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Thus, I would not exclude religion, I simply would not include it. Why?"

"My reason for not including religion in rate-supported schools is simply the old Nonconformist reason, that religion is personal, sacred, varying its aspects and claims according to various convictions, and that to support it by rates and taxes, and thus by possible penalties, is to vex and offend its characteristic and essential spirit."

[Appendix V.]

[From "The Weekly Times" (London), December 30th, 1910.]

Bible Teaching in Schools.

At the second meeting of the Headmasters' Conference, held at Eton last Friday, a discussion took place on the teaching of the Bible in Public Schools.

Mr. Lowry (Tonbridge) said that the large majority of the young men who were set to teach the Bible had an uneasy feeling that they were expected, by their superiors and by the parents, to teach the Bible as if it were perfectly inspired and as if every word of it were absolutely true; and yet they knew that these were not their views.

The Rev. Dr. Flecker (Dean Close School, Cheltenham) thought that many honest and good men disliked the Scripture hour more than any other teaching they had to do. He could speak as to the depth of the ignorance of Scripture of boys who came to the public schools—even from the homes of the clergy, and especially of the country clergy. ("No!") He was quite certain that the state of things now was far worse than it was a quarter of a century ago.

After further discussion it was agreed that the subject should be referred to the Committee of the Conference, who should bring it forward in a definite form next year.

Graphic Border

Printed by BLUNDELL BROS., Commercial and General Printers.—36649.

Secular Education Defence League

Of New Zealand (Wellington).

Object.

The object of the League is to maintain a purely secular system of education in the State schools of the Dominion.

Methods.

The League proposes to attain its object by:—

- Educating public opinion in the principles of the League.
- Securing the co-operation of societies formed for the same purpose.
- Defending teachers when their position is unjustly rendered insecure by reason of religious difference or sectarian influence.

Membership.

Anyone can become a member of the League by paying a minimum annual subscription of one shilling.

The League's Affirmations.

The League affirms:—

- That it will resist any attempt to interfere with our purely secular system of State education.
- That in matters of religion strict neutrality is the only just attitude that a State can assume towards its citizens.
- That to introduce any form of religious instruction into our State system of education would be detrimental to the best interests of the schools, leading to sectarian strife among the children, and imposing a religious test upon the teachers.
- That to determine the question of religious instruction, or Bible-reading, in schools by means of a referendum would be absolutely subversive of the neutrality of the State in matters of religion.
- That the Nelson system, even if it be within the letter of the Education Act, is an ingenious evasion of its real spirit and intent, and that the League will oppose this innovation.
- That the League is strongly opposed to the introduction of the New South Wales text-book into the State schools of the Dominion.

Officers of the League.

- President: John Gammell, Esq., B.A., Seatoun Heights, Wellington.
- Secretaries: Dr. T. A. Black and Henry Joosten, Esq., Wellington.
- Treasurer: Professor Mackenzie, Wellington.

Is it History or Romance? The Book of the Acts of the Apostles:— "Free Lance" Office Panama Street, Wellington. 1910.

Being Four Addresses delivered to the Unitarian Church, Wellington, New Zealand, on the evenings of Sunday, March 27th, May 1st, May 16th, and May 22nd, 1910, By JOHN GAMMELL, B.A. (LOND.)

Author of the following Pamphlets:— "An Inquiry into the Origin of the Pentateuch;" "The Rational Theory of the Book of Daniel;" "Adam Kadmon, or the Pauline Christ;" "The New Testament Problem Solved;" etc.

"I LOVED WISDOM AND SOUGHT HER OUT PROM MY YOUTH. I DESIRED TO MARS HER MY SPOUSE AND I WAS A LOVER OF HER BEAUTY." —*Apocrypha*.

Inscribed Seatoun Hights, Wellington, N.Z. October 20, 1910.

WITH ALL AFFECTION AND RESPECT TO NEW COLLEGE, LONDON, Unforgotten!

Across Half the Globe And Half a Century of Time, With all its Profound Theological Revolutions.

"I LOVED WISDOM AND SOUGHT HER OUT PROM MY YOUTH. I DESIRED TO MARS HER MY SPOUSE AND I WAS A LOVER OF HER BEAUTY." —*Apocrypha*.

Is it History or Romance?

The Book of the Acts of the Apostles :—

Lecture 1. The Date of the Book.

BRETHREN AND SISTERS IN THE MONOTHEISTIC FAITH :—

A principal duty of Unitarians at the present time, as it seems to me, is to learn all they can about the Bible, to make themselves acquainted with the science of Biblical Criticism and, especially, with the criticism of the New Testament books. Other Churches, in spite of all the disadvantages under which they labour in this respect in consequence of their bondage to ancient creeds, are endeavouring to do this, as we know by the recent publication of a work on the Old Testament by a distinguished Anglican clergyman of this city; so that we shall soon lose our lead in this matter, and deservedly so, if we neglect this duty. The fact that the science of Biblical Criticism is an exceedingly interesting one only makes us the more culpable if we neglect it. I shall, therefore, assume at once, without any further words of introduction, that I have your sympathy to-night in my endeavour to set before you what seem to me the true facts of the case in reference to one of the most important books of the New Testament, the book of the Acts of the Apostles, certainly the most fascinating of all the writings of the New Testament canon.

Why, then, is this little writing so fascinating? I would ask. Even children delight in its pages, whilst, on the other hand, to the scholar and the antiquarian its narrative furnishes endless topics of study and research. The explanation is that it introduces us into the midst of the social life of the ancient Roman world of the time of the Cæsars. The curtain of the past is raised and we find ourselves making one amongst the actors in the drama of human life as that life was lived nearly 2000 years ago. Thus we ascend with the Apostles the steps of the Temple at Jerusalem at the hour of the evening sacrifice, or wander with Paul and Barnabas from city to city in Asia Minor in the days of its glory, long before the Turk had stifled its vitality with the benumbing hand of fanaticism and fatalism; or we stand by the side of the heroic Paul at the judgment bar of Cæsar where, not the prisoner in the dock, but the judge on the bench trembles and is dismayed as he listens to the mighty missionary discoursing of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come; or, finally, we take ship with the same unwearied servant of God on his voyage across the Mediterranean from Cæsarea to Rome and share with him, in all the privations and hardships that follow. We join in his bold protest to the captain when we get to the island of Crete against leaving harbour in view of the expected Euroclydon, and feel almost glad when the hurricane really comes and Paul triumphs over the captain with that aggravating phrase, "I told you so." Of course, we share in the shipwreck that follows, watching on deck through the long dark night by the side of the undaunted Apostle after the ship has struck; and, when at last the morning breaks, swimming to shore on the same plank with him. It is all a marvellous story and will remain so till the end of time, whatever view we as critics may take of the book to-night.

But certainly it is not the merely human interest excited in our minds by the narrative we are considering that gives it its chief significance in our eyes; very far indeed from that. We have in this book, as you know, or the church has hitherto thought we had, no less a phenomenon than the story of the origin of the Christian religion. If the book is really historical, as it professes to be, we know the events that constitute the infancy of the Christian church, nay, we know the story of its very babyhood and even of its birth. We are able to look back not only into its earliest years, but even into its earliest months, and weeks, and days; we know more about its beginning, I think I may say, than we do about that of any other human institution whatsoever, save perhaps such as date from our own lifetime; for example, the Mormon church or that of Mrs. Eddy. It is this that makes the work before us so interesting.

What, then, do we know or what can we know about this book? Well, as I have already said, it professes to be a history. Not an independent history, however, but only the second volume of the complete work. It is addressed to one Theophilus, a gentleman of whom we know nothing, except that the first volume also is elaborately dedicated to him. By the first volume I am referring, of course, to our third gospel—what we call the gospel according to Luke. Both these volumes claim to be by the same author, so that in any properly arranged New Testament the book of Acts ought to follow immediately after the gospel of Luke. Unfortunately, the author does not give us his name and we have only historical tradition, as indicated in the title of the gospel, for the suggestion that he was a disciple known to Christian antiquity as Luke, and perhaps Luke the beloved physician mentioned in the epistle to the Colossians. A very distinguished living church historian, Professor

Harnack of Berlin, has recently written an elaborate book to prove that the book of Acts was really written by this Luke, the beloved physician, and of this I may perhaps have something to say by and bye. All that I will say about it now is this : that, having to his own satisfaction proved Luke to be the author, Professor Harnack then goes on to demonstrate that Luke is the very worst historian in the New Testament.

It would be very helpful, of course, to know for certain, if we could, who was the author of this book of Acts, so we must certainly say a little more on the question. The most remarkable phenomenon about the book of Acts, possibly known to many of you already, is the change of person in the course of the narrative, the change from the third person to the first, from the pronoun "they" to the pronoun "we." This occurs for the first time in the 16th chapter, in the 8th verse of which we read, "*They* came down to Troas;" but in the 10th verse, "*We* endeavoured to go into Macedonia." What does that unusual change mean? Well, it has always been understood to mean that from this point onwards you have extracts from the journal of a personal companion of St. Paul throughout his missionary wanderings—that, and nothing less! Hence these extracts are usually called the *journal* sections, or the *we*-sections, and it is supposed you actually have here in these passages the testimony of an eye-witness to the facts narrated. These journal sections, you must notice, are not continuous throughout, but occur off and on from the 16th chapter till very near the end of the book; and, of course, they are a most significant phenomenon. Plainly it does seem at first sight, and, at all events, the author of the whole book wants us to believe, that he is here quoting from his own journal, and that for all that is said in these sections he himself is personally responsible. And this much at least we may admit at once : the incidents related in the *we* sections seem far more credible and trustworthy than those in the rest of the book, inasmuch as there is very little of the supernatural or miraculous element in them.

One thought more and then we shall be able to construct, and, perhaps, afterwards to demolish, the orthodox argument on behalf of the credibility of this most important work. More than one orthodox critic, of whom the chief is Professor Ramsay of Aberdeen, has been writing of late on the subject of the medical terms used in the composition of the book of Acts. It is said the author uses technical medical terms, like a doctor, or at all events, writes much more like a doctor than any other writer of the New Testament. The instances given of this are the Greek word *achlus*, a mist, for the darkness that came over the eyes of Elymas, the sorcerer, when he was struck blind (Acts 13-11), a word used nowhere else in the New Testament, but applied by the ancient physician Galen to cataract of the eyes. Then *sphura*, used for the ankle bones of the lame man at the Beautiful Gate of the Temple (Acts 3-7), and which is a recognised anatomical term. And, lastly, *ekpsuchei*, to expire, a purely medical word describing the sudden death of Ananias and Sapphira. There are other instances with which, however, I will not trouble you. It is argued by orthodox critics that we have in these peculiarities of phraseology a strong confirmation of the tradition that the author of the book of Acts was a medical man, and, therefore, Luke, the beloved physician. It is then said that the journal sections are extracts from Luke's own diary, *i.e.*, the diary of an eye-witness of all he there relates. Further, that the rest of the book, though not of the same value as his own personal experience, is yet thoroughly credible as the work of such a man, evidently highly educated, and so upright ethically as to be adopted by the Apostle Paul as his personal companion and friend; and, finally, that our third gospel, being avowedly composed by the same author as the book of Acts, must itself be accepted by all reasonable people as good evidence for the truth of the marvellous story of which it consists.

Those who adopt this view, which may be called the Traditional or Orthodox view of the Book of Acts, usually hold like-wise that St. Luke wrote it at Rome about the year 65 A.D. You see it cannot possibly be put much earlier than that by anyone because its last verses include a reference to Paul's two years' residence in the city of Rome, which, in any case, brings the narrative down to 63 A.D., the year before the destruction of the city by fire. It is supposed that St. Paul perished in the persecution of the Christians which followed, though, for some reason or other, the author of the book of Acts says nothing about Paul's death.

And now for the *other* side of the question. Rationalistic scholars are now almost unanimous in the conclusion that the book of Acts, so far from being written in the year 65 A.D., was not composed in the first century at all, but is a second century product, dating at the earliest from about the year 125 A.D., *i.e.*, as late as the fourth generation of Christians, according to the ordinary calculation, and when, not the wicked Nero, but the good Emperor Hadrian occupied the throne of the world. Perhaps there never was a time in the history of the world when the human race was happy, but all historians are agreed that, if there ever was such a time, it was in the second century A.D., the age of Hadrian and his immediate successors, the good Antonines; and I cannot help thinking that something of the spirit of peace and goodwill, which made that age so exceptional, breathes throughout the book of Acts and constitutes part of its charm. All the nations had long since been merged into one; with a single exception, civil war had everywhere ceased, and the *Pax Romana*, like the *Pax Britannica* in India during the reign of good Queen Victoria, turned men's attention to the pursuits of commerce and the study of philosophy. The philosophers were in great request in those years and the problems of religion greatly occupied men's minds. That gave Christianity a chance, a chance of making itself heard, and a book like

our book of Acts, which professed to give a history of the rise of the Christian religion and church in the preceding age, would be highly popular.

There are many reasons which may be urged in support of the suggestion here made that this book of Acts was written at least as late as the beginning of the second century. I will, however, only discuss one of them at any length, and that one is to this effect, *viz.*, that there is strong reason to believe the author was acquainted with the works of the Jewish historian Josephus, a fact, of course, which gives us an unassailable mark of time. This is a new argument in the discussion of the Acts, and so, one calling for the closest investigation. And what critics say is this : Let the writer have lived when he may, he cannot have been his own authority for much that he tells us; he must have fallen back on the usual sources of information, *viz.*, the historians of the period. He was not a Jew himself evidently, and so must have learnt his Jewish history and antiquities from some member of that nation. It is true he nowhere informs us who his authority is, but a close examination of the contents of his book makes it almost certain that he was a student of the writings of Josephus. For not only do we find in that author a good account of all the famous state officials and others mentioned in the Acts and the third gospel, but even the very phrases and words used in connection with them are often the same in both authors. Of course, it is impossible for me to show this fully here to-night, but I may at least give one or two instances of it by way of illustration. Thus, you all remember the speech which the author of Acts puts into the mouth of Rabbi Gamaliel in the Sanhedrin at the trial of the Apostles Peter and the rest. Gamaliel advises the council, you recollect, to show forbearance and toleration to the Christian teachers, and that on the ground that, if they are wrong, the Christian movement will soon come to an end, and he then attempts to prove his case by reference to two other revolutionary movements that did thus come to an end, *viz.*, the one led by a man of the name of Theudas, and that headed by Judas, the Galilean (Acts 5-86-87). Now, both these agitators are mentioned by Josephus, and, as far as we know, by Josephus alone (Ant 20/4/1-2 and Ant 18/1/1-6). It is necessary to suppose, therefore, that the Author of Acts is here making use of the Jewish historian.

Unfortunately for himself, however, the so-called Luke is here guilty of two outrageous chronological blunders. First, he is altogether wrong in making Gamaliel refer to Theudas at all, inasmuch as, according to Josephus, the rebellion of Theudas did not take place till about a dozen years after the date at which Gamaliel is supposed to be speaking. And, secondly, our author makes Gamaliel say that the rebellion of Judas of Galilee was subsequent to that of Theudas, whereas, as a matter of fact, it was just the other way about, Judas of Galilee having predeceased Theudas, and that by no less a period than forty years. But this last "howler," as schoolboys would call it, throws considerable light on the situation. For, although Josephus tells us in one place that Judas lived a long time before Theudas, it so happens that, in referring to the men afterwards, he mentions them in the reverse order, and our author, reading his authority carelessly, imagines the order of reference here to be the chronological order—a blunder which reveals to us the historian he was consulting. "Always verify your references," said the Cambridge Don to his pupil when bidding him a final adieu; the failure to do so, however, on the part of an author is sometimes very useful to his critics.

We all know how meagre and obscure the narrative of the New Testament would be, comparatively speaking, if we had not the works of Josephus to fall back upon for further information in respect to the historical characters mentioned in its pages. What should we know, for instance, of King Agrippa, or the procurators, Felix and Festus, as well as a host of other persons, if we could not look them all out, in the "Jewish War" and the "Antiquities" of Josephus? And this fact is to be specially observed, that scarcely a public character, save, of course some of the Christian leaders, referred to in the Acts of the Apostles or the third Gospel, but can be found mentioned likewise in the secular author I am referring to. Nay, so close is the connexion between the two books that a public man, introduced anonymously into the narrative of Josephus, is referred to in exactly the same obscure terms by the writer of the Acts, who evidently does not know the man's name because Josephus doesn't know it. I refer, of course, to the leader of banditti described as "the Egyptian." The Roman Tribune, Lycias, asks Paul, you remember, when he arrests him in a tumult of the people, whether he is not "that Egyptian" (Acts 21-88) who some time ago raised a political agitation in Jerusalem and marched away into the neighbouring desert with some 4000 followers pleasantly called "Sicarii," or "Assassins." (See Jo. Ant. 20/8/6, and B.J. 2/13/3-5). Now, Josephus gives much the same account of him, sometimes in the very same words, describing him as a false prophet from Egypt, but gives him no name, and consequently, the so-called Luke is in the very same dilemma; he can't go beyond his authority, and evidently Josephus is his authority.

A further confirmation of this theory may be seen in another small particular. In a speech put into the mouth of Paul at Pisidian Antioch, that great missionary is made to refer to the reign of his namesake, King Saul, which, he declares, extended over 40 years. (Acts 13/21). How does the writer of the Acts know that? There is no mention of it in the Old Testament anywhere, whence does the so-called Luke get that bit of information? Whence does he get it? Why, from the Antiquities of Josephus to be sure (6/14/9)—there is no other place from which he could get it—from the Antiquities of Josephus where that author says:—"Now Saul,

when he had reigned eighteen years while Samuel was alive and after his death two-and-twenty, ended his life in this manner." A debt, of course, may exist without acknowledgment and this seems to be an instance of it. Indeed, in one place our canonical author seems to have copied from Josephus almost word for word. Thus, where the latter writes:—"But Porcius Festus, having been sent by Nero in Felix's room" (Ant. 20/8/9), the corresponding passage in our sacred Unknown, as I may call him, is:—"But after two years Porcius Festus came in Felix's room." (Acts 24/27).

And, finally, as you all know, our third gospel, of which the Acts is a continuation, differs from all others in that it begins with a dedication, a dedication to the most excellent Theophilus. It is a dedication also that is expressed in very stilted language. What is the significance of that phenomenon? I should like to know. Why should Luke have a dedicatory preface when nobody else in the New Testament has? Why? Because his guide, philosopher and friend, Josephus, has got one, and that both for his *Antiquities* and his two treatises against Apion. Josephus writes "to the most excellent Epaphroditus" just as Luke writes "to the most excellent Theophilus;" the same epithet is common to both, you see. And more than that. About one-fourth the number of words used by Luke in his dedication are found also in that of Josephus. Nor must it pass unnoticed in addition that just as Luke renews his dedication at the beginning of his second volume, i.e., the Acts, saying, "The former treatise have I made, O Theophilus," so does Josephus renew his at the commencement of his second treatise against Apion, thus: "In the former book, most honored Epaphroditus, I have "so and so.

Looking back then on all these coincidences I will only say if we may not infer from them that this Christian writer of ours was cognisant of the works of our Jewish historian, then there is no validity in literary criticism at all. So certain does the matter appear to me, indeed, that I think we can now almost *see* this canonical writer of ours sitting in his study, probably at Rome, with his copy of Josephus lying open before him. I do not think the two authors can have conversed together, as Josephus must have died early in the second century, but the Christian writer, as a boy, may have seen the aged Josephus passing in and out at the imperial palace, which, we know, the old Jewish historian frequented, along with Tacitus and other great men.

But now you will see that, if I have established the dependence of this New Testament writer on Josephus, I have got firm standing-ground for determining the date at which the Acts of the Apostles was written. For we know absolutely the years in which the different works of Josephus were published; the "Jewish War" at any time between 75 and 79 A.D., the "Antiquities" (the work we are chiefly concerned with) in 93, the "Contra Apion" a year or two later than the "Antiquities," and the "Autobiography" subsequent to 100 A.D., because the author mentions in it the death of King Agrippa II, which happened in that year. It is plain therefore that the man who used these books, and especially the "Antiquities," as his authority, could not very well have written earlier than the first quarter of the second century, and *may* not have written till long afterwards. Hence the Acts of the Apostles, as a *whole*, could not have been composed by a contemporary of the Apostle Paul, either Luke or anybody else, though it is still possible that the Journal sections might have been.

Such an important point as this, however, ought not to be dependent on one line of evidence alone; we may ask therefore now, Are there any other reasons that can be adduced in *confirmation* of the late date to which we have here assigned the book? And in reply I would observe that every other indication of time presented in the work points in the same direction. We can, however, only touch very briefly on these confirmations. One of the most convincing of them is the idea the writer has of the Gift of Tongues amongst the first Christians. In the *Epistles*, you will remember, especially the Epistles to the Corinthians, the gift of tongues is just a morbid muttering on the part of disciples,—an incoherent, inarticulate noise, the result of the nervous excitement or ecstasy into which the disciples fell under the powerful appeals made to them by their preachers. There is nothing miraculous about it at all, and it sometimes occurs still at revival meetings. In the book of Acts, on the contrary, it would seem that these early excitements were all things of the past—the writer knows nothing about them at all. He has to fall back on his own imagination for his idea of the gift of tongues, and, consequently, he represents the gift as a miraculous affair, a supernatural knowledge of foreign languages, an altogether different thing, and, evidently, a much *later* development of thought. It is very plain, therefore, that the writer of Acts is far removed from the time of the first generation of Christians.

The same inference must be drawn too from another feature in the book, viz., the gross sacerdotalism the writer imputes to the Apostolic age. According to him, the Apostles are a unique order of men, almost divine, anyway possessed of magical powers peculiar to themselves. They had been endowed with the Holy Ghost and that to such an awlul degree that with a word they could strike the sinner dead on the spot, as we see in the case of Ananias and Sapphira. And the same superstitious sacerdotal ideas appear in the fact that whilst a mere evangelist like Philip could *convert* his hearers, it was necessary to send down the great Jerusalem Apostles to the scene of action before the converts could receive the gift of the Holy Ghost, and so speak with tongues. No common person, no mere preacher, could confer such sacerdotal unction. Just as at the present day in the Anglican church no ordinary clergyman can *confirm* young people, there is no unction in the imposition of his hands at all, nothing short of an episcopal blessing can convey any spiritual gift. But, for such ideas as these to

grow up in a community a long time must elapse; These ideas of sacerdotal power and pride are far removed from the primitive Christian simplicity as you see it in the Epistles. And that I am not misrepresenting the ideas of our author becomes still plainer when you notice the arrogant insolence of the words put into an Apostle's mouth on one occasion. I refer, of course, to what is called the first general council of the church at Jerusalem, the council that issued a decree to be binding on all the churches. This decree contains, as you know, the impious words : "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us"—the Apostles! (Acts 15/28.) Surely the Pope of Rome to-day hardly ventures nearer to blasphemy than that I Late, very late, in point of time, must be the document which so misrepresents the humble Galilean fishermen; the church must have been in existence a very long time before such a high order of ecclesiastics as that could have been manufactured even in imagination.

And those are not by any means the only confirmations of my contention. The writer *knows* far too much altogether to have belonged to the first century. He knows, for example, that the peace of the church is to be broken up by heretics; that Gnostic missionaries will make their way into it perverting the disciples and almost annihilating the Cause. Our author, you know, represents Paul as addressing the Elders of Ephesus in the words: "For I know this, that after my departing," (i.e., after my death) "shall grievous wolves" (i.e. Gnostic teachers) "enter in among you, not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." (Acts 20/28, 29). How, I ask, did the writer know that? There was little Gnosticism in the Christian church in the first century. Well, he knew it, not from any miraculous foresight, you may be sure,—miraculous foresight is all moonshine—he knew it because he lived and wrote in the second century, and so was acquainted with the ravages that Gnosticism was making then in the Christian church.

There are other points I should like to have dwelt upon in illustration of my assertion that the whole tenor of the book of Acts harmonises with the later date to which modern criticism assigns it, but we cannot spend more time on what is after all a minor branch of our subject; and in passing from it I will only observe that the first definite reference to the book by the early Christian Fathers occurs in a letter written by the churches in Vienne and Lyons, in France, as late as the year 177 A.D. That, at all events, is the statement made by Dr. Samuel Davidson on the subject in his famous volumes, entitled, "Introduction to the New Testament" (vol. ii, p. 270). We don't, of course, say that the book must have *originated* as late as 177 A.D., but only that the absence of any trustworthy earlier reference to it in the Fathers leaves us free to fix the date, as we have already done on internal evidence alone, at the year 125 or thereabouts. The orthodox date of 65 A.D. is simply absurd.

But now we have dwelt long enough for to-night on tedious details, but may, perhaps, say a few words more on the general subject. What is the use, some people may ask—some people *do* ask—of discussing at such length the *date* of an ancient book? Who cares about the date of it—whether it was produced in the first century or the second? And, in reply, I am ready to acknowledge that, except as a matter of literary curiosity, the date at which a book was written is of no great importance *in itself or for its own sake*. But in the case of a book that has exercised a vast influence on the human mind generally for more than one millennium, it is of very great importance indeed that we should know the intrinsic worth of its statements, whether the history it professes to relate to us is true history or not; in other words, that we should know the credibility or trustworthiness of the book. This is of the very last importance, and it is as one of the greatest helps towards determining this point that we ascertain, if we can, the year, or, at least, the generation, in which it first saw the light. As you know, the subject announced for my lecture to-night was, "Is the book of Acts History or Romance Now, I have not dealt directly with that subject to-night, though, of course, I have done so indirectly. More than one subsequent lecture will be necessary to decide the law-suit "History v. Romance" as applied to the book of Acts, and that, of course, is what we want to get at. But we have made some progress towards it even to-night, as you will see immediately.

The book goes, as you know, into the most minute particulars of the most obscure incidents. If, now, that book was written by a contemporary, as orthodox scholars claim, there is some chance that the writer may have been telling us of what was personally known to himself, and, therefore, that the statements he has made may be all true. If, on the other hand, it can be shown that the author did not live and write till nearly a century after the events of which he speaks his minute details at once awaken suspicion, and, unless he discloses to us his authorities, we attach very little credit to his words. We say in this case there is plainly plenty of room for the growth of legend and romance in this long interval of time, and we want to know that our author is not romancing. And with respect to this particular book there would be little difficulty in showing, had time allowed, that it is little better than a beautiful romance from end to end, that it is scarcely history at all, and that, save perhaps for a little biography contained in the journal sections, the whole of its contents, I might say, should be almost disregarded by every serious student of Christian origins. As far as this book is concerned, we know almost nothing of the rise of Christianity. It has simply deceived the world and the church for nearly 2000 years.

Although it may not appear so at first glance to many of you, as a matter of fact, there is a great appropriateness in the discussion of this subject at this particular time. The book of Acts is closely related to the gospels, especially to the third gospel, of which, as I mentioned before, it is simply a continuation by the same author, and, as those of you who read the Unitarian periodicals know, the gospels are now on their trial. Well, perhaps you will say, there is nothing very new in that, the gospels have been on their trial for the last 200 years at least; as early as the eighteenth century one writer, I think it was Dr. Samuel Johnson, complained, in view of the scores of controversial books on the origin of Christianity that were pouring from the press even then, that the twelve Apostles were now put on their trial once a week on the capital charge of forgery. Yes, but these same gospels were never so hard put to it as they are to-day. The question: Are they substantially fact or are they fiction pure and simple from end to end? is now being raised, and that in all seriousness, not by cold sceptics from the world, but by some of the most earnest and faithful ministers within the church itself. Was there ever a historical Jesus at all? Or has he ever been anything else than a mere mythical ideal existing in the imagination of the ancient world? That is the question that is being asked in your "Hibbert Journals" and your "Inquirers" to-day and echoed on all sides by the secular press too. As far as existing controversies are concerned, that question was first raised, I had almost said, by the Rev. Mr. Roberts, a Congregational minister, strange to say, in an article he wrote in the "Hibbert Journal" for January, 1909. But that, as some of you will remember, would not be quite correct. As a matter of fact, this question was raised before that in a sermon addressed to this very congregation by myself more than a twelvemonth earlier.

That sermon, entitled "The Pre-Christian Jesus, or the New Testament Problem Solved," was subsequently printed and distributed; and that, as far as I know, was the first effort made in the Unitarian denomination to re-open the question of the historicity of Jesus of Nazareth. Mr. Roberts' article, of course, attracted great attention and most adverse criticism—criticism which culminated last Christmas in the production of a supplementary volume to the "Hibbert Journal," entitled "Jesus or Christ," and consisting of some eighteen essays by as many of the most liberal theologians in England; the majority, I believe, admitting that *the Christ* was a mythical being, but all equally bent on establishing a human Jesus as an actual historical character, the real founder of the Christian faith. And so the controversy stood up till last January, when there fell a bolt from the blue in the shape of a "Hibbert Journal," issued that month, containing another contribution to this startling discussion, a contribution written not in defence but in attack, and again by a Congregational minister, this time the Rev. Dr. Anderson, of Dundee. You can judge of the significance of this article by its formidable title, "The Failure of Liberal Christianity," and that, remember, from a scholar hitherto known as a Liberal Christian. His article is a far more trenchant attack than Mr. Roberts', as you will see when I tell you that it claims that Liberal scholars have all along been pursuing an *ignis fatuus*, *i.e.*, that the historical human Jesus, whom they posit as the originator of Christianity and whom they think they find in the pages of the New Testament, is not there at all and never has been there. That what you really find in the New Testament is a god, a god surrounded by worshipping devotees from the very first, yes, even in the synoptic gospels. Thus, even in the synoptic gospels, Jesus is a being who forgives sins. "What sort of a *human* being is that?" Dr. Anderson asks. Who can forgive sins but God only?—as the Jews are reported to have said on the occasion. Can you mention any other *human* being known to history who thus usurps the function of Deity itself? "It is vain" Dr. Anderson declares, "to attempt to separate Jesus from Christ." If Christ is a mythical deity so is Jesus also, and there is no historical personality at the nucleus of the Christian religion.

As I said before, you will find this crucial question discussed in the current numbers of the "Inquirer," and that, too, with this strange feature, that the Unitarian writers generally are now on the conservative side; they are all trying to find a historical Jesus in the pages of the New Testament. The end of the controversy is, of course, not yet, but anyway you will now see what an important contribution to the decision of it is the discussion which we have initiated to-night—the question of the credibility of the Acts of the Apostles. If that book is really sober history, then there is some chance that the gospel that precedes it may be of the same character. If, on the other hand, and as I am prepared to maintain, "the Acts" is at best only a historical romance, then, *a fortiori*, such also must be the character of the gospel narrative, and the hero of whom it speaks must be, or at any rate may be, an ideal of the imagination only.

Plainly, brethren, we are living in stirring times, the clarion notes of battle joined are everywhere in the air around us. Christianity has come to its Waterloo. Does that announcement disturb you—you, the soldiers of truth? I know the flesh is sometimes weak; I know there are gentle souls amongst us who would gladly avoid all further change of opinion, all further controversy, who, having already renounced much instilled into them in early life and made sacrifices for their new convictions too, ask to be let alone in the future and conclude all their petitions to Heaven with the prayer, "Give peace in our time, O Lord!" As one also, who is himself now advanced in years and conscious of the infirmities and weaknesses of age, I can myself sympathise with that prayer, "Give peace in our time, O Lord!" Yet, dear as peace is to every right-minded man, there is undoubtedly something far dearer still, and that is the trumpet-call of duty, the summons to search his mind once more to see

whether he is not cherishing delusion still in its inmost recesses, whether he is not still the sport of a lie after all his efforts to cleanse his soul from such pollution. No true man and no true woman will be deaf to that call, especially in the Unitarian church. Every Unitarian declares that his religion is simply the pursuit of truth, and that no religion purifies the heart like that one. For my part, and in spite of old age, I rejoice in the new controversy, rejoice that I have lived long enough to see the question raised, and I am thankful that even in this Wellington of outs a church has at last been established that affords an arena for such discussions as this; that we, too, may take our part in the foremost struggles of our day, struggles that shall sanctify and dignify our lives, and make them of some worth to ourselves and our fellow men.

—AMEN.

Graphic Border

Lecture 2. The Book an Eirenicon.

BRETHREN AND SISTERS IN THE MONOTHEISTIC FAITH :—

It has been borne in upon my mind lately that as members of this church we should do well to ask ourselves frequently what is the one great object we ought to aim at in maintaining this church of ours? What did we establish it for in the first place, and why do we now persist in keeping it going? It would be wise for us to ask such a question at times under any circumstances, but it is particularly desirable we should do so in the emergency in which we as a church now find ourselves situated, in the crisis in our history at which we have now arrived.

The pulpit of the church was vacant.

And I can conceive that more than one answer might be given to the question according to the idiosyncracies of each of us. And in fact, if we reflected on the matter, we should find that two questions rather than one were involved in the problem. There is the more general question, what is the object of church-life at all, why are *any* churches established, orthodox or heretical? And then there is the subordinate question, why in particular are Unitarian Churches established? And in respect to the first question I am inclined to think the old answer will not any longer serve. The old answer was no doubt this, that churches were established to enable men to escape from the wrath to come, from the eternal burnings. Well I need not say that amongst intelligent people that answer no longer applies; hell has been abolished, and even bad people no longer go there—and this whether there are "churches or whether there are not. If that is the best reason that can be given for founding churches these institutions need no longer be maintained. And, as you know, many persons are already acting on this conclusion, they no longer attend church, and no longer contribute to its funds. Many of you must have been startled recently, as I myself was startled, by reading in the public prints that, in the case of Congregationalists and Baptists, at Home, the roll of church membership is annually shrinking, whilst a very recent communication from Germany informs us that large numbers of persons, more particularly Socialists, are formally notifying the authorities that they are no longer members of the German Church. It almost looks as though the abolition of hell-fire "was going to be fatal to the very existence of the Church everywhere, as it certainly ought to be if churches exist for no better purpose than to rescue souls from imaginary horrors.

But I must not pursue this interesting subject, for it is not the one proper to this evening, and I will therefore simply give you my own answer to the question I have started. As far as our own Church is concerned, this present institution of which we here are members, whilst I recognise fully that one of its objects should be the promotion of social intercourse and fellowship amongst persons of a rational and rationalistic turn of mind in religious matters, I think our main object should be an educational one, the search for abstract truth on all the great subjects of theological and religious interest. We want to know what is wrong and what is right in the creeds that have come down to us from the past, what is wrong and what is right in the great philosophies that are looming into view in the present. To seek and find religious truth—that is surely our supreme object as members of this Church, since it is only by such truth that our lives can be purified and hallowed. We are here to carry on a propaganda, a propaganda of ideas, to be the missionaries of Modernism, that is our *raison d'etre*, and, I had almost said, our only one. As long as we are faithful to that ideal we shall flourish; when we are no longer an aggressive missionary church we shall begin to die out, as we deserve to do. The habitual occupant of this pulpit should be a man absorbingly interested in the great controversies of *our own day*, whose lips have been touched with a live coal from the altar of truth, a man with a prophet's ethical insight and a prophet's fire, a prophet's scorn of error, falsehood and wrong, and a hero's determination to solve somehow or other the great problems of his own age. Nothing short of this must satisfy us now. The fields are white already to harvest. Here in the capital city of this young country an opportunity is offered for a mighty word to be spoken from a free pulpit—a word that may influence our national life for centuries to come and give us a lead among the

nations of the earth. The Puritan Fathers uttered such a word at the founding of the little New England States of America three hundred years ago, and as a consequence there is evolved from their nucleus to-day one of the grandest empires this world has ever seen. A similar opportunity in the history of the world has come round again here. God send a *man*, a man to speak here also the informing word.

But now let us proceed to our study of to-night. It is, as you know, the continuation of our investigation into the book of the Acts of the Apostles. We want to know the truth about that book, whether it is a history or whether it is only pseudo-history, an *ignis fatuus* that misleads. On a recent occasion, you remember, we sought to ascertain the date of the book, and that with the view of determining its credibility; and we found, that, in all probability, it was a work, not of the first, but of the second century, the early second century it is true, say, about the year 125 A.D.

What then, let me ask again, is the historical worth of the book before us? It certainly *professes* to be history, so that in discussing its claims we must evidently ask first, what were the notions of history prevalent generally amongst the writers of antiquity, and especially amongst the ecclesiastical writers of antiquity? We know how rigid are the conditions imposed on modern historians, how they are shut up to the use of *contemporary* testimony alone, and how thoroughly they are expected to sift even that; they must subject even their eye-witnesses to the severest cross-examination, or their own books will be accounted quite worthless as historical authorities. Do the *ancient* writers come up to this standard, and, above all, does our so-called Luke do so ?

Well we know of only two ancient historians who even approach our moderns in reliability; these two of course being Thucydides and Tacitus, each of whom really did understand that a history must be the record of events that actually took place, and can be proved to have taken place. *Their* object undoubtedly was historic truth, and nothing less. On the other hand the great majority of ancient historians take no pains whatever to ascertain actual facts, but content themselves with recording the traditions popular in their time respecting the events of preceding ages. Some indeed, especially ecclesiastical historians, often do not give us even tradition, their object is an altogether different one, viz., to write a pleasing story, or, still more frequently, to seek the spiritual edification of their readers. Thus religious kings must be made prosperous and worldly tyrants must come to disaster, and, if this is not in accordance with the facts, well, so much the worse for the facts! We must understand therefore that we are not to look for what we call historical accuracy unless in very exceptional cases. Ancient religious histories are written for edification and not to satisfy merely intellectual curiosity.

What place then does the Acts of the Apostles occupy amongst the literature of the past? Was the unknown author a Thucydides or a Tacitus, or were his ideas of history the popular ones of pleasant reading and moral improvement? His style is undoubtedly a most charming one, so much so that we are at once predisposed in his favour and would much like to find him as accurate as he is fascinating. Speaking for myself I acknowledge I have until recently accepted him as an actual historian, whose statements of fact, at least those that are non-miraculous, might be accepted as authoritative and acknowledged as good history.

I am bound to confess however that the thorough examination to which I have more recently subjected the narrative of the book of Acts does not bear out this verdict. As you know the book is full of supernaturalism, a fact which ought to have discredited it to us all as of doubtful worth even in its non-miraculous sections. And a thorough analysis of these non-miraculous sections shows that in many cases they are as untrustworthy as the miraculous narratives themselves, and probably often relate events that never occurred. At the best the book is simply a historical novel, and whether it ought to be ranked even as high as that I am not at all sure. It is written for edification and not for instruction.

I have already said we must eliminate all the narratives of supernatural occurrences as *palpably* fictitious; we need spend no time in proving that point. Don't imagine however that these are the only sections to be rejected at sight as undoubtedly manufactured for the occasion. All the *speeches*, long and short, in the book must go the same way. As long as men believed in the verbal inspiration of the bible these long speeches excited but little scepticism; it is true we knew there were no stenographers in those days to preserve the speeches of the heroes, but that did not matter because the Holy Spirit supplied not only the thoughts but the words of the author, who was merely a machine, a sort of typewriter, to the Holy Ghost's dictation. If however you reject this dogma of inspiration you are brought at once face to face with a new difficulty. Whence did the author *get* these long speeches? How did he know, we ask, that the speeches he gives us as uttered by Peter, Stephen, and Paul, at various exigencies in their careers were actual words used by them on the occasions referred to? Well, the truth is he didn't know, he simply invented them himself; and, had you taxed him with the charge he would no doubt have admitted the impeachment, and would have told you besides, that, if you objected to his action in the matter, you were too particular in your notions of history altogether. He would have admitted to you frankly enough that his history would not bear your test in any part of it, that the most he claimed for the speeches was a fair degree of probability that Paul or Peter, in the circumstances in which he placed them, might be expected to say something like what he put into their mouths. We *know* that would have

been his attitude of mind for two reasons :—

- It was the universal custom of the times for a historian to invent orations for his heroes; not only did the average chronicler do so, but the most critical historians followed the same practice, Thucydides does it as well as Herodotus; there was in fact nothing else to be done if the book was to contain any speeches at all. And—
- The speeches of the book of Acts contain internal evidence that the real author of them was the writer of the book himself and nobody else. This is plain from the fact that they are written in exactly the same style as the narrative portions of the book, the same words are used, the same locutions, and the same tone of mind. In addition, all the speakers, whether Peter, Paul, or Stephen, utter the same statements, and, in fact, repeat to some extent the same speech in each case; indeed you might almost say there is only one speech in the Acts, but one day Peter utters it and another day Paul. Thus, for instance, Peter's speech at Jerusalem in the second chapter of Acts turns on a verse quoted from the 16th Psalm, but on an erroneous text of it, a text obtained from the Greek LXX, not from the Hebrew. "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, nor wilt Thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." In the Hebrew the text reads "holy ones"—plural. But again, in Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch the same verse is made prominent, and the same corrupt text of it is employed. You see it is really one person speaking on both occasions, and that person the author of the book, the so-called Luke, as he makes the same mistake each time.

In a similar way you will find that this very same speech of Paul's at Antioch coincides in a most suspicious manner with that of the martyr Stephen when pleading for his life before the Sanhedrin. Both speeches, strangely enough, consist almost entirely of a summary of the history of the Hebrew nation, and that from the most ancient times. There is nothing appropriate to the circumstances in this theme, especially in the case of Stephen; the speeches are in consequence wholly artificial, and so betray their real origin in the mind of the historian who thought a speech necessary on the occasion, but, having himself nothing special to say, put in a history of the nation to fill up the gap. The thing speaks for itself.

Indeed that the author himself does not attach much importance to the details of the speeches he introduces into his book is plain from the fact that in some places his own narrative contradicts them. For example, as you know, we have in the book of Acts no less than three accounts of the conversion of St. Paul, one in narrative form by the author and the others in two speeches professedly made by Paul himself. Well, in some points, these accounts absolutely contradict one another. Thus, in the narrative account we are told that, when Paul was struck to the earth by the bright light, his companions remained standing (9/7); but, in his own account of the matter before King Agrippa, Paul says his companions as well as himself fell to the ground (26/14). So again, still more plainly, in the narrative these companions heard indeed a voice but saw no man (9/7); which is in palpable contradiction with the words supposed to be uttered by Paul when haranguing his countrymen from the Castle-steps at Jerusalem to the effect that they saw indeed a light but heard not the voice (22/9). There are besides other contradictions, of which however I will only mention this one:—that whilst Paul in his speech before Agrippa, just referred to, declared that at his conversion Jesus made him a speech of some length, commissioning him there and then as an apostle to the Gentiles (26/16), in the narrative Jesus only gives him his commission indirectly through the agency of another disciple named Ananias (9/15).

These contradictions all show that the author himself attaches little importance to his own utterances; either his narrative is wrong, or the speeches are wrong; at present we will assume it is the speeches that are unauthentic, and that both because we have already found his previous speeches very suspicious, and especially because in one case, you remember, that of Gamaliel, Luke lets the cat out of the bag altogether by making the orator refer to the distant past an event, the insurrection of Thendas, which we know did not take place till some dozen years later than the time at which he, the orator, was speaking.

There still remains the chief question however, which may be expressed thus:—Granted that the narratives of supernatural events are all moonshine, and the speeches altogether unauthentic, may it not still be true that the remaining portions of the work are founded on fact, the actors real persons, and the events good history? May we not still accept the general trend of the story as giving us in the main a true account of the early years of the Christian Church?

Well I can only say that, if we reply to this in the affirmative at all, it can only be a very qualified affirmative indeed. I should not like to give an absolutely negative reply, not only because we have the journal-sections to the contrary, but also because the works of Josephus forbid us to suppose most of the official persons mentioned to be other than historical characters. Moreover there is one character who fills so large a place in the New Testament generally that we should want strong evidence indeed to doubt his historicity. There is Paul of Tarsus, and Paul of Tarsus can, I think, hardly be resolved into myth under any circumstances. As far as I know there is only one scholar of any note who has ever ventured to do that, and that is Edwin Johnson, once a fellow-student of my own at New College, London. I decline however to follow him in this and a great many other of his extraordinary hypotheses. But, though Paul of Tarsus may be accepted as an actual

historical personage, it is the Paul of the epistles rather than he of the Acts in whom we must see the real missionary of the early church. You will say that leaves him rather shadowy and nebulous after all, seeing it is very doubtful if he ever wrote so much as one of those epistles exactly as we have them now. At the best the text has been terribly dislocated. Assuming however, as we may very well do, that he really did write some portions of some of them, he is there at all events; in fact he dominates the whole situation, and that to such a degree as to make it inconceivable without him. Peter may possibly be a myth, but not Paul.

All the same we can have but little confidence that many incidents in the life of Paul given us in the Acts of the Apostles ever occurred as there narrated. Of course it would be impossible for us to discuss many of these incidents to-night, I shall therefore select one of them, the one that has the greatest verisimilitude; and if I succeed in showing that this is all simply a pretty fiction, without any basis of historical fact, I think I shall have gone far to prove that the rest may be equally illusory, and so that the book of the Acts of the Apostles does not give us a true reliable account of the origin of Christianity.

Well then those who deny the historicity of the Acts of the Apostles are not without a hypothesis to account for the appearance of the book. They say it is a beautiful romance written for the edification of the church. But that is speaking in very general terms only, we must enter more into particulars. In what respect was this book expected to promote the edification of the church? What was its precise function? What was the special work it was intended to accomplish? Undoubtedly its aim was to heal the dissensions of the church, to fuse its divergent elements into one harmonious whole, to be a peacemaker, or, in the Greek, an *eirenicon*. The Acts of the Apostles is an *eirenicon*.

The early church, as you know, was by no means the scene of love and harmony we should have pictured it to be, had we been left to our own imagination. On the contrary we have learned from the Pauline epistles—and that whether these documents are authentic or not—that the early Christian church was torn by faction, torn by faction to such a degree that the discordant parties actually anathematised one another, each declaring the other to be no Christians at all, but actually outside the pale of salvation. A similar division to that which exists at the present day between the Roman Catholics and Protestants reaches right back in the history of the Christian church to the earliest days of which we have any knowledge, and even the watchwords were very much the same then that they are still. It is often said, and I think with great truth, that whilst the Roman Catholic church is founded on the gospels, the Protestant church is founded on the epistles; that whilst in the gospel of Mark, for instance, you have the teaching of the apostle Peter, in the epistles you have the tradition of the Pauline School, if not the very words of Paul himself. You have all read how the writer of the first epistle to the Corinthians declares that there were at least four divisions in the church at Corinth, that one says "I am of Paul," another "I am of Apollos," whilst Peter and even Christ have each also their special groups of followers. Still worse is the condition of the church to which the epistle to the Galatians was written. Here we have good evidence of what we learn so much more at length in the non-canonical authors of the time, such as the Clementine Recognitions, that there were in the earliest age of the church two parties in particular, which we may call the Jewish and the Gentile party respectively, or, otherwise, the party of Peter and that of Paul. You know the subject of dispute between these two sections of the church; it was the obligation, or otherwise, under which Christians lay to continue the observance of the Mosaic law in all its 613 particulars. Unless you observe these, one and all, you cannot be saved, said the Petrine section; in the epistle to the Galatians on the other hand you have these words;—"Behold I Paul say unto you that if ye be circumcised, Christ profiteth you nothing." And we know that the war between these two parties was carried on with the utmost rancour; "I would they were even cut off that trouble you" (Gal. 5/12) are the Pauline words in reference to the Petrine party. You see Paul is almost as fierce in the matter as John Calvin himself when he wrote of the Unitarian, Michael Servetus, that if the latter came to Geneva he (Calvin) would take good care that he should never leave the city alive.

Well the home of the Petrine party was of course Palestine where the Christian Jews were known as the Ebionites; whilst, on the other hand, the Gentile church ultimately became known as the Catholic party, and, this being by far the larger body, styled the Ebionites heretics. You will see they had an infallible talisman in those ancient days by which to determine truth and error; the party of the larger number was always right, and truth, like Napoleon's Providence, was always found on the side of the larger battalions. But the heretics avenged themselves. If their numbers were small, their language could be lurid. Paul of Tarsus was known amongst them as one of those who call themselves apostles and are not, a member of the synagogue of Satan, the apostate, Simon Magus, and so on. Now that the existence of such a state of discord in the church should deeply grieve the best minds of both parties we may be quite sure; nor would they be content, as years rolled on, with merely regretting the existence of the evil, one or more of them doubtless would attempt the thankless task of the peacemaker, and endeavour to find a common principle which might serve as the basis of agreement, or at least of compromise, between the parties. A history of the church must be written which should show to the present generation that the Peter and Paul of their great-grandfathers' time were never at variance at all, but worked and thought in harmony, taught alike by the Holy Spirit, and mindful only of the edification of the

church. And if, with this idea in mind you closely scrutinize the book of the Acts you will be astonished, not only at the complete absence of all discrepancy between the doctrinal utterances of the two apostles, but perhaps still more at the close parallel drawn between their lives, the incidents in the life of the one being little more than those in the life of the other with the circumstances changed. The first half of the book is, as you know, devoted to the history of Peter, and the second half to that of Paul, but the same incidents occur in both. The object of the writer evidently is to show that each apostle is just as much honoured by God as the other. Thus, to quote the words of Dr. Samuel Davidson :—"Peter begins his active ministry by healing a man who had been lame from his birth; Paul performs his first act of healing upon a cripple at Lystra who had never walked. As the shadow of Peter is supposed to work miraculous cures, so handkerchiefs and aprons belonging to Paul possess a magic efficacy. Peter and his companions expel demons; so does Paul at Ephesus, Philippi and elsewhere. Peter conquers Simon Magus and his sorceries; Paul shows his mastery over Elymas the sorcerer and Ephesian magic. Peter performs a severe miracle on Ananias; Paul does the same to the seven sons of Sceva through the instrumentality of an evil spirit. The one raises up Tabitha from the dead; the other Eutychus. Peter has worship offered him by Cornelius; the people at Lystra are on the point of sacrificing to Paul. The barbarous inhabitants of Malta call the latter a god. This parallelism is remarkable." (Introduction to New Testament, II, p.p. 875, 376.)

You see now how artificially, I will not say artfully, the book has been planned. The two chief biographies in it are intended to balance one another, and this of course can only be done by resorting to fiction, a traditional life of Paul must be matched by an imaginary life of Peter. Observe I do not say there is no basis of fact at all in any of the incidents recorded of the great Mediterranean missionary, but I do say that *some* of them have been invented, whilst of the rest some have been perverted, magnified and coloured to such a degree that they now possess far more of fiction than they do of fact.

As I said before we can only afford to take one instance by way of illustration, and that instance shall be the account given of what has been named the first general council of the Christian church, the council of Jerusalem, as it is called, the events of which are narrated at length in the 15th chapter of the Acts. This council, we are told in that chapter, issued a decree. Is that decree a fact? Was there ever such a decree, or was there ever such a council at all?

The picture drawn of this council in the Acts requires that it should have been held about the year A.D. 50, *i.e.* in the reign of the emperor Claudius, and of course in the lifetime of the first generation of Christians. The circumstances of the case are these. Dissension was threatening in the chief centre of Gentile Christianity, the church at Antioch. The Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians were, as usual, at variance; the chronic quarrel of the first century, already referred to, had broken out there, and the disciples were becoming alienated from one another over the famous question whether Christians, and especially Gentile Christians, were under any obligation to observe the Mosaic law with all its barbarous and tiresome customs. To settle the matter it was determined, we are told in the Acts, to send a deputation to Jerusalem to consult the apostolic church there and learn the views of the original apostles on the subject. The deputies chosen are Paul and Barnabas with some others who, in due course of time, arrive at Jerusalem and humbly lay their case before the supreme pontiff, James, and his cardinals Peter and the rest of the Twelve. (Imagine Paul of Tarsus a humble deputy to Peter!) These great men then deliberate, Peter speaking on behalf of the principle of freedom and uttering some most beautiful Pauline sentiments in condemnation of the law, if you please, whilst James ultimately moves a resolution, no, enacts a decree, actually abolishing the Mosaic law as far as Gentiles are concerned, who are to be recognised as good Christians in every respect though ignoring the claims of the Mosaic legislation altogether. And now comes the point. Though emancipated from obligation to the Sinaitic legislation Gentiles are not to be left altogether free, on the contrary they must submit to the Noachian precepts, as they are called, *i.e.* to abstinence from blood, from idol-offerings, and a few similar taboos. Now the unanimity of sentiment at this council was something quite phenomenal; the apostle Peter, as we said before, gave utterance to the most beautiful Pauline sentiments of freedom quite edifying to listen to, and Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch triumphant, carrying with them the apostolic decree which, be it specially noted, they subsequently delivered to all their churches throughout the Roman world in their future missionary journeyings. How beautiful!

And now pray, how much of all that is historic, or is any of it historic? For instance, is the decree a historical fact? Not if the Pauline epistles are of any worth at all, for in the Pauline epistles Paul of Tarsus ignores the decree altogether. You will remember that in 1st Corinthians one of the questions sent to Paul by his disciples in Corinth and which the apostle attempts to answer is:—May a Christian eat idol-offerings? or, in other words, as most of the meat exposed for sale in the markets had been killed as an offering to one or other of the heathen idols, may a Christian eat meat bought in the public market-places, or must he eat only kosher meat? Well, we see at once, if the story of the decree were trustworthy, there was no need for the Corinthian Christians to put this question at all, since it was already answered in the decree, a decree of which we are assured in the Acts of the Apostles that Paul had given a copy to each of these churches, and in which we know

disciples are distinctly forbidden to do anything of the kind. But passing that by, let us see what answer Paul makes to the question. Does he refer his correspondents to the Jerusalem decree on the subject, as he certainly should do, if it were authentic? Not at all, he never mentions that document once; and more than that, the advice he does give is exactly the opposite of that contained in the decree. Paul says an idol is nothing at all, so the meat is none the worse however it has been killed (1st Cor., 10/24-27). Unless therefore, he says, your attention has been specially called to the matter, ask no questions but eat and be thankful. But that is not obeying the Jerusalem decree and evidently neither Paul himself nor the Corinthians had ever once heard of this document.

But, secondly, not only was there no decree, there was no general council of the church at Jerusalem at all. There was a meeting of course, and Paul was there, and, fortunately for us, has left his own account of the matter in his letter to the Galatians—at least that epistle is either his or written by one of his later disciples well acquainted with his doings. What then does Paul say about it all? Well in the first place we find that the meeting referred to was no general council of the church at all, but just a private meeting caused by a surprise-visit to Jerusalem made by Paul, who was not a deputy sent by the church at Antioch, but had come on his own account at his own impulse, or, as he says, by revelation, whatever that means. "Then, 14 years after," he says, "went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also; and I went up by revelation" (2/1). He then goes on to say it was just a private conference between himself and the leading apostles, though the subject of conference was undoubtedly that referred to in the Acts. "I communicated to them," he affirms, "that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, but *privately*, to them which were of reputation." (.2/2). Nor was the demon of discord absent from the conference. The *stricter Ebionites* had apparently got wind of the fact that Paul had introduced into the company an uncircumcised Gentile Christian, by name Titus, and they had then insisted on the Mosaic law being enforced. Paul, according to the present text of our New Testament, absolutely refused to comply with this demand, and so a deadlock ensued, instead of the heavenly harmony indicated in the other account of the incident. And, lastly, there was no decree passed by anybody, but only a compromise between the party-leaders who simply divided the Roman world between them, Paul accepting the heathen lands as his sole province, and the Jerusalem apostles restricting themselves to the Jewish element in Palestine and elsewhere. The question at issue remained undecided, the Mosaic law continued in force amongst Jewish Christians whilst Paul and his disciples treated it as a complete nullity. Already you see there were two sects in the Christian church, the Ebionites and the Catholics, and, though the leaders had made a compact of peace, the rank and file on both sides repudiated one another and refused communion. The lovely harmony pictured in the narrative of the so-called Luke is conspicuous here by its absence, and is evidently due to that author's own invention alone; indeed it seems to me very likely that he had this very epistle to the Galatians before him at the time he wrote, and purposely modified it and coloured it up in order to manufacture his *airenicon*. The Acts of the Apostles is history as it ought to have been, not as it really was.

And, further, how absolutely certain it is that there was no general council at Jerusalem and no apostolic decree releasing Gentile Christians from the obligations of the Mosaic law is clear from the whole tone of the epistle to the Galatians. You know the occasion of this epistle being written. You know that Jewish Christians from Jerusalem had been visiting Paul's churches in Galatia and converting them to the belief of the dogma that the Jewish law was of universal obligation, and that without observing it there was no salvation for anybody, whether Gentile or Jew. Well, what does Paul do under those circumstances? Why he sits down and writes a long argumentative letter to his converts on the subject, remonstrating with them on their infatuation in yielding to the Judaisers. But, if there had really been a Jerusalem decree releasing the Gentiles from the obligation in question, there would have been no need whatever for this argumentative letter. Paul has simply to refer his converts to the official decree by which the apostolic church at Jerusalem had itself endorsed his own view of the subject, the view which made faith in Christ and not obedience to the law the only condition of salvation for Gentile Christians. Instead of that Paul never once mentions the decree in this letter of his, and evidently the only hypothesis that will account for that omission is that there was no such decree in existence. Nay, we can now go a step further than that and affirm that had there been such a decree in existence coming from James, Peter, and the rest of the original apostles, it is *impossible* that any Judaising teachers should ever have visited the Galatian churches on a proselyting errand from Jerusalem. And indeed, even had they done so, they must necessarily have had no success, since, according to the Acts, Paul had already delivered this decree to all his churches. You see the mere existence of that epistle to the Galatians is a standing proof that the decree was simply an invention of the author of the Acts, and had no basis in fact whatsoever; or, in other words, the existence of the epistle to the Galatians is a standing refutation of the historicity of the Acts.

And, finally; a still better standing proof of our view of this matter is the existence of the sect of the Ebionite Christians throughout the whole of the second century and later. These Ebionities, as you know, are the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem and Palestine generally, the very people, you see, who are supposed to have made the decree. The term Ebionite means *the poor people*, *i.e.* "the poor saints at Jerusalem," as we read in the New Testament." These Ebionites soon came to be regarded as heretics by the Christian church generally, and

that on account of the peculiar views they held. For one thing they repudiated all belief in the dogma of the deity of Jesus Christ, they were Unitarians, but we need not go into that matter now. What concerns us is the positive side of their creed, their belief in the perpetual universal obligation of the Mosaic law, which they declared to be binding on all Christians, Gentile and Jewish alike. Naturally this brought them into collision with the teaching of the apostle Paul, whom they loudly denounced as an impostor, "one who called himself an apostle and was not." Now this Ebionite church is supposed to have lasted down into the fourth century, and anyway they were much in evidence in the early part of the second century. And now you will see at once that this fact is quite fatal to the story in the Acts, that the church at Jerusalem had passed a decree in the middle of the first century, recognising the unimportance of the Mosaic law, and, in fact, abolishing it altogether, at least as far as Gentile Christians were concerned. In fact knowing what we do of the fidelity of the Jewish nation to its Mosaic law, what age-long persecutions it endured on account of that law in all periods of its history, but especially in the Syrian times that immediately preceded the Roman, we might have been sure *a priori* that, whatever else they became, whether they became Christians or not, they would never be other than Jews, and that no power on earth or in heaven would ever make them renounce their divine law or live in fellowship with anybody who refused to observe it. To make this Ebionite church affirm, as the 15th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles does, that the law was so burdensome that "neither they nor their fathers were able to bear it," is a statement false on the very face of it, a Jew of the first century would have died a thousand deaths before he would have said it; he was never tired of declaring that the law was his delight day and night, and that from his earliest to his latest years. We ought to have known instinctively and from the very first that this story of the Jerusalem council and its decree was fiction, a lie on the very face of it, in fact, it damns the whole book of which it is an integral part. Or, if anybody wants any further evidence of this, let him study those famous writings, the so-called Clementine Homilies or Clementine Recognitions, a book which I have often described to you on former occasions years ago, a work written, not as you might suppose from its traditional title, by Clement, bishop of Rome, at the end of the first century, but by some unknown author towards the end of the second. This book is an Ebionite fiction describing a heresy-hunt, the hunter being no other than the apostle Peter, and the hunted-heretic plainly Paul of Tarsus, though that is not the name given him in the work. Peter, in this book, appears in the role of the apostle to the Gentiles, and in that character pursues the wicked Simon Magus, *i.e.* Paul, all over the Mediterranean lands, holding public discussions with him in the great cities but especially in Cæsarea, Tripolis and Antioch. Peter tells Paul he is corrupting the Christian church by his false teaching and immoralities, disobeying the law himself and teaching others to do so also. He is no apostle and no Christian but only a sorcerer, and, as such, doomed of God to eternal perdition along with all his dupes. Of course, as I said, this is all a romance, but the immense popularity of the book in the Christian church throughout the early centuries shows how thoroughly that church recognised its verisimilitude and sympathised with its spirit. But now compare the description of these long wranglings between Peter and Paul in the Clementines with the charming narrative in the Acts of their meeting together at the council of Jerusalem, and of the delightful way in which Peter there plays into the hands of Paul, assuring the council that Paul is quite right, that God has put the stamp of his approval on the Pauline teaching, and that by causing the Holy Ghost to descend on his converts; that the Mosaic law is so exacting and oppressive that neither they nor their fathers were able to bear it, and consequently that Paul is quite justified in treating it with contempt; and all this, remember, as much as a hundred years before the time of the Clementine writings. Further, the Acts continues, the apostle James, the bishop of the church at Jerusalem and who in reality was the very ideal of a Jewish Christian, on good terms with the Pharisees and almost a better Pharisee than any of them, James is actually made by Luke to follow Peter in his repudiation of the Jewish law and himself to formulate the decree that substantially abolishes that law for ever! The whole thing is too ridiculous for further argument, and so we conclude finally there was no decree, there was no Jerusalem council in the proper sense of the term, and the 15th chapter of the Acts is fiction from end to end, a beautiful romance no doubt, but, one might almost say, without any historical foundation whatsoever.

My long address is finished at last, I will say no more to-night. I fear I have wearied you, yet am willing to believe that, as soldiers of truth, you do not refuse to endure weariness whilst the error of ages is being exposed, and so harmony restored to the intellectual and religious life of man. Light, more light, is the cry of our century, whilst all sterling men live and die in the belief that fulness of knowledge is all that is required to make that intellectual harmony perfect. The *dawn* of such knowledge has already appeared, and the dawn is the pledge that noontide also will arrive in its due season. The cynic may doubt that, but not the man of healthy mind whose soul is full of generous impulses and whose life is one long succession of altruistic deeds.

—AMEN.

Lecture 3. The Critical Analysis of the Whole Book.

BRETHREN AND SISTERS IN THE MONOTHEISTIC FAITH :—

It is probable that to most of you during the last few days King Edward VII had died during the previous week.

the solemn words of Koheleth have come to recollection :—"Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might, for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave whither thou goest." (9/10). Koheleth was a cynic; yet there is not a little wisdom at times concealed under his cynicism. And here in particular he sees the ethical value of the thought of death. He sees that death is a thought which forces all men to take a general view of life and its issues. It is not well for any man to be always thinking of death, but on the other hand it is not well for any man never to think of it. Nor is it easy for him to do so in a world where death is ever busy; least of all is it easy for any of us to do so at the present moment when a great King lies dead and unburied in London. What then is the significance of that fact to us here to night? I may ask. It is a great event, a national event, so great that none of us can refuse to look it in the face or listen to its message. And as we do so I think this thought will occur to each one of us: its message is an exhortation to us to increased industry, to harder work, and that because it is so evident that the night cometh when no man can work. If you want your life to be a worthy life, to show a *completed* work, not a frustum, or a torso, but a well-rounded whole—work, work incessantly, unhalting, unresting, every day something, that so death, when it comes, as come it will to each one of us someday, earlier or later, as we all know, it may find us calm and strong, not distressed by regrets, regrets of what might have been, but with the blessed consciousness that we have actually, not only planned, but done something, some completed thing, however small, to leave the world a little better than we found it. We would all like to be serviceable to our race, some feel the impulse more strongly than others, but we all *feel* it, especially in such solemn times as the present; it is in such an hour as this that new and better thoughts are born; resolutions to lead an altruistic life, as the only one the recollection of which will bring any comfort in dying hours. Remembrance of selfish enjoyment brings no satisfaction at the end of life, only the remembrance of duty done, service rendered to family, or country, or race. And the satisfaction as I said before, is in proportion to the completeness of the achievement, the unswerving devotion to a great task.

It is in that spirit, dear friends, that I return to-night to the subject of my recent lectures in this pulpit. The work of the age, and, may I add? the work of my own life, is to ascertain the truth in respect to Christian Origins, the rise of that great Cult that has dominated Europe for nigh 2,000 years. We know something about it now, but we want to know the complete truth about it, and that is a task that only the most unswerving devotion, the most continuous application, can hope to achieve. In resuming it to-night, therefore, I no not think anyone can accuse us of being indifferent to the claims of the hour, or heedless of the solemn voices that are calling to us from a royal and an imperial death-chamber. It is no light task in which we are engaged, no idle occupation, but one of the most serious and sacred in which we can employ ourselves, the pursuit of religious truth. This solemn interval in the nation's life through which we are passing can be devoted to no higher purpose than that.

Well then in dealing with the book of Acts, and especially in dealing with its credibility, we have already ascertained two points; first, its birth-date, probably in the early part of the second century, and, secondly, the fictitious character of its most feasible story. The Jerusalem decree and the Jerusalem council are both alike romance. That I think we proved up to the hilt in our last lecture.

And now we go further and say, such as this decree is, and such as this council is, such also for the most part is the rest of the book. There may possibly be some slight basis of fact for some of the pictures drawn, such as always exists in a historical romance; as in the case to which I have just referred, there was apparently a private accidental meeting of apostles at Jerusalem, though no general council of the church and no decree; but for the most part the events recorded in this book of the Acts are altogether imaginary, fabricated for a purpose, the non-miraculous ones just as much as the supernatural.

Our criticism to-night is to range over the whole contents of the book; not, of course, that we shall unmask each fictitious statement with the same thoroughness as we did that of the Jerusalem decree; that is neither possible nor necessary. Having done it in the one case, the most historical-looking we could find, we can afford to treat the others with less ceremony; but we shall have *something* to say on the chief incidents throughout the book. And we will begin with a supernatural occurrence, the rational explanation of which you will, I think, find most interesting. I allude to the account of the descent of the Holy Ghost on the apostles on the day of Pentecost, as related in Chapter II of the book. This is now known to be neither more nor less than a variation of a rabbinical fable in the Talmud in connexion with the supposed giving of the law on Mount Sinai. According to this Talmudic fancy, the voice of God, proclaiming the law, was heard on that occasion, not merely by the Hebrews gathered at the foot of the mountain, but also by the seventy nations of the Gentiles scattered over the face of the earth. This was done by the air itself becoming animated and giving forth

articulate language, whilst it assumed at the same time the form of flames, the mark of the Shekinah's presence. This voice, as I said, was heard all over the world, and, though it was only one language, seemed to each of the listening Gentile nations as if it were its own vernacular. Here then you see you have the original of the descent of the Holy Ghost on the apostles in tongues of flame on the day of Pentecost. The feast of Pentecost was originally, as you know, the feast of Harvest, but, later on, it became as well the anniversary of the Promulgation of the law from Mount Sinai, as it is still amongst the Jews, and this, you see, gives us the connecting link we want. Luke transformed the legendary story of the promulgation of *the Law* to the Gentiles into another which should give them the *Gospel* in like manner. The author of Acts wishes to emphasise the thought that the gospel of Jesus was intended especially for the Gentile nations, and for that purpose he repeats the fanciful scene on Mount Sinai, choosing the anniversary of that event for the occasion. It is true he doesn't make one language intelligible to them all, but instead, he gives to the disciples a miraculous power of speaking *all* foreign languages—and this of course comes to the same thing. The whole scene in this second chapter of Acts is therefore a fancy picture, not a real event. And, as the cause is thus an idle fancy, so must be the effect, viz., the conversion to Christianity of 3,000 persons in one day (v. 41). Those who imagine this was a real incident in the earliest history of the church are simply labouring under a delusion. The fact that, according to this veracious history, they were all baptised in one day would of itself be proof sufficient of that.

In this connexion most people will think of that beautiful picture of the communistic life of the earliest Christians given us in the opening chapters of this book. Must that too, you will ask, be relegated to the land of fable? Was there no time in the history of the Christian church when the law of love prevailed universally, and when each sought, not his own, but every man another's welfare? In reply I do not hesitate to say that the picture of heavenly harmony and ecstatic happiness here depicted, this second garden of Eden, must be greatly toned down by all who do not wish to be beguiled; that must be admitted; but, on the other hand, I am not prepared to say that there was not some *basis* of fact for this representation. There is, I believe, very little doubt that the Christian movement was originally a socialistic movement, and owed much of its success to that fact. As may perhaps be shown someday at greater length, the Christian movement was in all probability a development of the Essene organisation. John the Baptist was the originator of the Christian movement, and John the Baptist was undoubtedly an Essene. The phrase "John the Baptist" is just a synonym for "John the Essene." *There* is the real historical origin of the whole Christian movement. The Essenes of whom you read so fully in Josephus were either the early Christians themselves under another name, or at least the original sect out of which the Christian church developed. Christianity was just reformed Essenism; that is one of the interesting positive facts at which criticism has arrived. But if this be so, as the principle of Communism and monastic life generally was the most marked feature in Essenism, it could not possibly be altogether absent from the constitution of the offspring of Essenism, viz., the Christian Church. We may assume, therefore, that there was a marked socialistic tendency in the incipient Christian community; but, as Socialists are notorious for their gift of quarrelling, be assured that these Christian Socialists were no exception to the rule, as we see indeed in the Pauline epistles. That that is not their characteristic in these early chapters of the Acts is only another proof that the author is not a historian but only a romancer. In this particular instance, however, his romance has probably a basis of fact to it. The mirage of the desert is an hallucination, but there is always a substratum of crags and sparkling salt.

As to the arrests of the apostles and their examinations before the Sanhedrim, as recorded in the fourth and fifth chapters of our author, these are probably all moonshine, as they are the result of a miracle wrought by Peter on a lame man at the gate Beautiful of the Temple, which is necessarily moonshine. Besides, the apostles are miraculously released from prison by an angel, thus showing we are not at all in the land of realities here, but only in that of gross fable and imagination.

But now we must ask further, Is the story of the arrest and martyrdom of Stephen equally fanciful? or was there really an early Christian disciple of this name, and did he actually suffer martyrdom? His *name* is certainly calculated to excite suspicion, Stephanos, a crown, the crown of martyrdom. It almost looks as though the name was manufactured to fit the story, whilst the story itself reads very much like a faint reflection of that of the trial and crucifixion of Jesus. There is certainly one unhistorical feature about it, and that is that the Jews put their victim to death without consulting the Roman authorities. We know that could not have happened, there was always a Roman guard on the spot, in the castle of Antonia, close by the Temple, to stop any outbreak of that sort. Moreover the *object* of the introduction of Stephen into the narrative is very plain, it reveals itself just at the end of the martyrdom: "and the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet whose name was *Saul*" (7/58). This is the first appearance of him who is to be the protagonist of the rest of the book, and Stephen is invented and brought before us in order to introduce Saul of Tarsus to the reader, and to introduce him as a persecutor. Again it seems as if our author had the epistle to the Galatians before him and was weaving therefrom a pretty romance as a commentary on what he finds in the epistle. Paul, you remember, acknowledges in that letter that he was once a terrible persecutor of the Christian church. "For ye have heard of

my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion," he says, "how that beyond measure I persecuted the Church of God and wasted it . . . But when it pleased God to reveal his son in me" (Galatians I, 13-16), he continues, so that here we have a suggestion both of persecution and the subsequent conversion of the persecutor; and the so-called Luke, taking this as his text, proceeds to embellish both facts *more suo*; Saul persecutes Stephen to the death and then becomes the object of a miraculous Christophany that leads to his own conversion. The colours are laid on bright and thick in both cases, but the miraculous Christophany, which is the turning-point of the whole, betrays the fictitious character of the entire story.

I have already said the very name Stephen is suspicious, but of course it is always possible that the bearer of it may be at least a historical person, especially as he appears as one of seven deacons elected by the church at Jerusalem, all of whose names are given (6/5). This list of names certainly looks like an extract from the archives of the mother-church.

And that, I believe, is all the history there-is in this narrative of Stephen. The long speech he makes we know is fabricated, and so of course is the miraculous Christophany in which it also issues. Christophanies are very cheap with our author but very damaging to his credit. Here they certainly condemn the martyrdom as unhistorical, and, if that is unhistorical, so probably is the persecution of the Christian church which follows. Moreover we are told that the "disciples were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judea and Samaria except the apostles" (8/1). Why "except the apostles"? If there had really been a persecution of the Christians by the Jewish Sanhedrim the apostles would have been the very first who would have had to flee. But you soon see what is the occasion for introducing a supposed persecution here; it is, as in the story of Ananias and Sapphira, a little before, to set forth the greatness of the Jerusalem apostles. The dispersed laymen like Philip, another of the deacons, become evangelists, we are told, and convert many to the faith. How, when they are fleeing for their lives, they manage to preach and convert multitudes, is not explained. But the denouement soon comes and clears up everything. Laymen may preach and convert people but they can't confer spiritual unction or miraculous powers. Only the great Jerusalem-apostles can do that. So Peter and John are now fetched in a great hurry from Jerusalem and by the imposition of their sacerdotal hands the Holy Ghost is communicated to the new disciples; and it was, of course, to produce this dramatic effect that our author had detained his apostles in the capital when all the smaller Christians had fled from it. Evidently you have here a manufactured story to increase the greatness of the great apostles. And this view is confirmed by two other features in the narrative. (1). The scene of it all is Samaria, if you please, a place where it is hardly too much to say no Jew dare show his head in real life. And (2), a character called Simon Magus is introduced into the story, a character who is now believed by not a few scholars to be a mythical person altogether. There was a *deity* called Simon worshipped at Samaria, but that is all; and the only Simon Magus known to history was the apostle Paul, who went by that name among the Jewish Christians opposed to him in doctrine. This Samaritan Simon Magus is a phantom introduced to prevent the name being applied any longer to Paul of Tarsus. And even this imaginary Simon Magus is made to enhance the dignity of their Holinesses the Jerusalem apostles.

But the great protagonist is coming on the scene now, for we have reached the story of the conversion of Paul. What do we know of this man from the epistles, almost the only source of knowledge on which we can at all rely in these matters? Well, as you are aware, the epistle to the Galatians admits there was a conversion, a conversion of a persecutor into a disciple of Christ, and that it took place at Damascus; whilst both epistles to the Corinthians confess to visions at times, probably cataleptic visions, in which the patient was caught up into the third heavens:—that is all, but that is quite enough in the hands of Luke to enable him to paint a very dramatic picture of conversion, a picture of supernatural light, supernatural voices, and a supernatural blindness, in short a Christophany. Luke knows how to make the best use of his materials, but that the narrative of Paul's conversion, as given in the ninth chapter of Acts, is entirely the product of Luke's imagination is evident from the fact that a miraculous Christophany is the very nucleus of it. And how cheap are miracles in Luke's estimation is shown in the circumstance that he provides another Christophany immediately afterwards for the enlightenment of the Christian disciple Ananias, who is sent to Paul to miraculously relieve him of his miraculous blindness. You see the whole episode belongs to the realm of unreality; it is not some *natural* event, like a sun-stroke, exaggerated and glorified by the narrator, but a pure invention of his altogether, like the rest of his book, like his decree and council of Jerusalem. That is plain from the fact that there is a regular conversation, kept up in both Christophanies, between Christ and the disciple, which *must* be an invention in any case. Here then we have again proved our contention, that the narrative of the Acts is a romance, manufactured out of such few hints as the author could pick up from the epistles.

Having now reached the story of Paul I shall not stop to dwell on the further history of Peter, especially as the additional marvels related of him refute themselves. To raise a dead woman like Dorcas to life again is a mere bagatelle in this most veracious history, and serves as a fitting prelude to the two simultaneous ecstasies by which the Roman centurion Cornelius and the apostle Peter are introduced to one another. It is all pure invention, and palpably so—a romance to show that Peter of Galilee, and not Paul of Tarsus, was the great

apostle to the Gentiles, or at least that the one hero was as much entitled to the credit of Gentile conversion as the other. But now, leaving all that, what we really want to know finally is :—How far is the *latter* half of the book of Acts historical? *i.e.*, how much dependence can we place on the story of the three great missionary journeys of St. Paul? Are they as imaginary as all the rest of the book, or may we suppose that, though the book begins with fiction, it ends with fact? Fact must begin somewhere or other in the professed history of the Church,—is this the beginning of it?

We must remember, however, that we cannot hope for perfectly trustworthy history even here, because the forged decree and the imaginary council of Jerusalem come in the very middle of it. On the other hand, there is some hope that we are getting into realms of truth and soberness at last, as it is in these missionary journeys that we come across the extracts from what purposes to be the journal of a contemporary and companion of the Apostle. Whether he is Luke, or Timothy, or whoever he is, we have great hopes of *him*, though even his journal, as we have it now, is not without some traces of super-naturalism.

All three missionary tours are made to start from Antioch, the gorgeous capital of the gorgeous East, the second city of the Empire, only Rome itself excelling it. On the first tour, we are told, the way was through the island of Cyprus to Southern Asia Minor; more particularly, to the towns of Perga, Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe. in all of which places Paul and Barnabas made converts. Now we have no epistles of Paul to any of these places by name, how then does Luke come to send his hero to them? Well, in all probability, the epistle to the Galatians was still his authority. It is true these towns are not in Galatia proper, but some of them at least are in Phrygian Galatia, and it is not at all unlikely, as the orthodox Professor Ramsay has shown, that the epistle to the Galatians was written to the Christians of these towns. Such a journey as this that Luke describes is quite a possible event in the history of Paul, and we shall not attempt to deny its reality. It is probably the slight thread of fact running through the web of fiction given in the chapters we are now considering, *i.e.*, chapters Xiii and Xiv, for fiction it still is to some extent undoubtedly, deeds of magic disfiguring the whole of it. There is, as you know, a very dramatic story of the two apostles being worshipped as the gods Jupiter and Mercury at Lystra, but as this is represented as a consequence of the magical healing of a lame man there, the worship is probably just as apocryphal as the miracle. As far then as the first tour is concerned, reality and fiction seem mingled in about equal proportions. It cannot be denied, however, that in the second tour a new element comes in, the extracts from the contemporary journal, the we-sections, of Luke or somebody else. We ought to be getting closer to fact now, and so, I think we are, though there is unfortunately plenty of fable still. You must not look for strict accuracy in any popular history of this period, and especially in any ecclesiastical history. Thus the narrative here opens badly with an account of the circumcision of Timothy at Lystra, to which place Paul now pays a second visit. This account is probably pure invention of the author of the Acts, a pious fraud in fact, written to make Paul resemble Peter, just as in the early part of the book Peter is made to talk exactly like Paul. Paul must be made a good Jew like Peter, keeping the Law, and a later generation must not be allowed to know that there was any dissension between these two great men in antiquity, and *that* in spite of what the epistles say to the contrary. You know that the epistle to the Galatians, at all events as we have it now, informs us that Paul absolutely refused to circumcise Titus, even when called upon to do so, and why there should be one law for Titus and another for Timothy no one can say. The Paul of the Acts of the Apostles is an imaginary Paul, not the real man at all. On the other hand there is very little doubt for two reasons that Paul did make this second missionary journey.

- His letters, or even, if you like his supposed letters written by his favourite scholars, show that he visited Europe, as told in this connexion in the Acts of the Apostles, and that he founded churches at Philippi, Thessalonica, and Corinth. And—
- As we have already hinted, that part of the Acts which reports his travels in Europe includes one of the famous journal sections of his anonymous contemporary and companion. Thus we read in 16/10 "And after he had seen the vision immediately *we* endeavoured to go into Macedonia." There are only eight verses of this journal here but that is quite sufficient to make us feel that we are getting on firmer ground at last. On the other hand the story of the miraculous deliverance of Paul from prison at Philippi is, as you might suppose, no part of the journal-section, that is all *added* by Luke to make Paul appear as great a man as Peter who, you will remember, was in the same way miraculously delivered from prison in Jerusalem by an angel. All moonshine, of course, all written for theatrical effect. As I have already said, however, I think there need be no doubt that Paul did actually make a missionary journey through Greece, visiting, as here described, Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, and Corinth, and founding churches at most of these places. Most of the details are doubtless imaginary, like the speeches, but of the journey itself there need be little suspicion; history is superseding legend and myth in our book at last. Of course we want a witness of better character than the author of the Acts to *prove* this, but, as we have seen, we think we have the necessary evidence, at least as far as a visit to Philippi is concerned, in the fact that the journal affirms this, that there is an epistle to the Philippians, said to be an epistle of Paul, and that the

first epistle to the Thessalonians mentions (2/2) that Paul visited Philippi and met with ill-treatment there. Similarly there is little doubt that the section affirming Paul's visit to Corinth and his long stay of 18 months there is also historical, and that both on account of the Pauline letters to the Christians of that city which we possess, and also on account of the reference made by our author Luke to the then pro-consul of Achaia, Gallio by name. We know from our classical authors that there was a Gallio, pro-consul of Achaia, in the latter years of the reign of Claudius, and that he was the brother of the great philosopher Seneca, prime minister of the emperor Nero. We know too that Gallio himself was a philosopher, and so likely to act as he is here made to act by Luke, viz., as the enemy of all bigotry and intolerance on the part of the Jews. "He drove them from his judgment-seat," our author says. We know that even romancers speak truth sometimes, so that we must be prepared to admit that even the author of the Acts need not be always drawing on his imagination. Anyway, as the visit to Philippi seems historical, it is quite likely that that to Corinth may be so too, and in fact that the whole second tour, as here described, may be accepted as such, though only in its main features. I say "only in its main features," for just as there is much in our author's narrative even here which we cannot accept, so there are many omissions in it also which we have to supply. In other words he doesn't give us a complete biography of the apostle at this period, or anything approaching to it. Thus, in reference to the apostle's life in Corinth, our author mentions this one visit and that is all, whereas from the second epistle to the Corinthians we learn that Paul made *two* visits to that city and was purposing to make a third. "This is the third time I am coming to you," he says (2 Corinthians, 13/1). Hence you see how imperfect is this Acts of the Apostles in every way. Even where it is real history it is only very imperfect history; it adds much and omits much.

But, now, let us see what the account of the *third* missionary journey is worth, the journey of which the principal feature is represented to be the Apostle's long residence and work in Ephesus, the famous city of Diana on the west coast of Asia Minor. Was there ever such a residence, and, if so, is the account of it given in the Acts a trustworthy one, or, on the other hand, is it merely a picturesque fancy of our most—well, artistic author? We shall want some very substantial corroboration this time, for most rationalistic critics are agreed that in the description of this journey our author—well, excels himself. We mustn't use plain Saxon on all occasions.

Who, then, if any, are our corroborating witnesses this time? I reply, in the first place, certainly not the epistle to the Ephesians, though a beginner in these studies might be apt to suppose so. This epistle to the Ephesians, indeed, is perhaps the most unsatisfactory of all the Pauline letters. We don't even know to whom it was addressed, as, in the oldest Mss., it is not addressed to any particular church at all. Nor does the general style of the epistle recommend it; it is, in fact, little more than a collection of phrases strung together from the other epistles, especially that to the Colossians. Scholars, even orthodox scholars, who accept the other Pauline epistles as authentic and genuine, often reject this one. This witness is, therefore, discredited and he must stand down.

Confirmatory testimony, however, is certainly to be obtained from the other Pauline epistles, but before referring to them, I wish to call another witness, viz., our old friend the journalist. There is a *we*-section, in fact, you may say there are two *we*-sections, incorporated in the narrative of this third missionary tour (18/23-21/17). Perhaps we are entitled to say, therefore, that that settles the historicity of the narrative as a whole. The story of the young man Eutychus, nearly killed by a long sermon but subsequently revived by the preacher, is a portion of this journal section. You will say perhaps, how then can we any longer put confidence in the journalist, for this is the account of a miracle? My reply is, I don't think the journalist ever meant to describe this revival as a supernatural occurrence. You see, he makes Paul say, "Trouble not yourselves for his life is still in him" (xx. 10). There is little doubt, however, that Luke has altered the *preceding* words, so as to make the thing read as much like a miracle as possible. Luke is quite capable of that, and a good deal more than that.

But, as I said just now, we can gather from the other epistles that Ephesus was the scene of a great mission conducted by the Apostle Paul. We know that because the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written from Ephesus, as we see from the epistle itself in two places. "But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost," says Paul. And why? "For a great door, and an effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries" (1 Cor. 16/8,9). And again, "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me?" (1 Cor. xv. 32). There is a big fight on, you see, at Ephesus, and Paul, as usual, is in the thick of it. One almost seems to hear the Apostle anticipating the words of Professor Aytoun, who sang :—

" And if when the battle's over,
You should look in vain for me,
Where the dead are lying thickest

Search for him that was Dundee."

The poet says "Dundee" but we would say "Paul of Tarsus."

Well, all that, you see gives our Luke good reasons for spreading himself, and, of course, he does not fail to do so. His ideas of religious success, however, are of a somewhat vulgar and ostentatious order. It is true he makes his hero cleanse the town of imposture, the practitioners of which burn their books to the value of £2000, but he follows this up by making Paul himself the biggest impostor there, so that even the Apostle's cast-off clothing has a magical efficacy, curing diseases and casting out devils wherever it is applied. "And God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul" is the hardy assertion of our unabashed chronicler, "so that from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them" (19/12). I don't think our recent spiritualistic visitor, Mr. Bailey himself, could beat that. Anyway, those who accept that statement as historical truth are precluded from finding any fault with the Roman Catholic church for working miracles with the holy coat of Treves. I am afraid our author is past praying for. Anyway, he thus degrades our mighty Mediterranean preacher into a modern thaumaturgist or wizard, liable to be sent to gaol as a common cheat. How can a writer of such a mental calibre as that be accepted as a historian?—or, who can feel sure that even the famous description he gives of the tumult in the theatre at Ephesus has any basis in actual fact? But though we may not be able to feel *sure* of this, on the whole I am inclined to think this riot in the theatre a highly probable event, since the narrative is not only full of details but full of names also, so that, if anything at all is true in the book of Acts, it may well be this. Indeed, the hints in the epistles to which I have already referred seem to imply some drama of this sort, and Luke may possibly have got the particulars of it from another part of the journal, although he does not indicate that he has done so. Anyway, another journal-extract begins almost immediately afterwards, so that our guess as to his authority for this uproar in the Ephesus theatre is probably not far from the truth.

Summing up, therefore, we accept the story of the three missionary journeys of Paul given in the Acts as substantially historical in outline, though certainly not in many of its details. We think the journal is at the basis of it, or at least at the basis of the last two journeys and *probably* at the basis of a good deal that follows these. Christian history, in opposition to Christian myth and legend, must begin somewhere, and we think it begins here. Though the book of Acts opens with the grossest fiction and romance, it does seem to contain an element of fact as we approach the end.

A very few years more and the indefatigable missionary will disappear from sight for ever, his many journeys ended, his work *complete*. He dies, but we know not how, for the writer who has recorded so much about him, and invented so much about him, is, for some reason or other, silent at this point. But of Paul it may indeed be said that whatsoever his hand found to do he did it with his might, and did it to the end too; there was no waste of faculty in his case. There is something not altogether depressing in meditating on the death of a good man, especially if he has been a great worker. Such a one seems to have *earned* his rest, and even to *demand* it. He willingly falls asleep, and survivors *fear* to disturb his repose by idle regrets.

And for us to-night, dear friends, there is a death in the back-ground of all our minds, a royal and an imperial sleeper will wake no more. A life that has touched our own, though very slightly, through nearly all the years of our pilgrimage in the case of the oldest of us, is now passing, not indeed from *all* our thoughts, but from our habitual thoughts. The king of this vast British empire of which we are all so proud lies dead in his palace. The hour is a very sacred one, and we will not profane it by using many words. We will only ask, what are the lessons of this solemn hour? Some, we know, would dwell on the vanity of earthly greatness, the emptiness of earthly rank and titles, the artificial character of it all, seeing that the great leveller, Death, fails to respect it. But these are very trite observations and occur spontaneously to everybody on such occasions as the present, and I therefore will not enlarge upon them. The thought that comes most readily to my own mind in view of what has happened is just this, how transcendent is the worth of human affection. Our departed monarch was beloved, and, in his death, we all, even the humblest of us, feel that we have lost a friend. That, we know, is by no means always so in the case of monarchs, as we saw only a few weeks ago on the continent of Europe. A monarch may die unheeded or even hated; he may have been heartless, self-indulgent, greedy, hard, cruel, and then the mourning that takes place at his death will be purely ceremonial and formal, alike on the part of his family and his subjects. But in the case of him whom we mourn to-night the reverse of all that is the case. Our Edward VII was a man of the kindest heart; no cold reserve fenced him in, but good-will and sympathy with all with whom he came in contact distinguished him in an eminent degree, so that not only his private friends but many millions of people over the whole face of the earth now *genuinely* lament his departure and hasten to show their respect for his memory. They see he was a man first and a king in the second place only, and they honour him accordingly. Kindness of heart can vanquish even the isolation that is necessarily

involved in the possession of a throne. It is a lesson to us all to cultivate human fellowship before everything else.

And my final thought is this. Our King's death emphasises for us our relationship as citizens. Last Friday-week we were all separate units, pursuing each his own way, the day following we formed only one great whole, one great community, with the same solemn thought in the mind of each, the same feeling of blank regret in every heart. A national calamity woke us up to the thought that we were a community, every one members one of another, fifty millions of us at least, to say nothing of the far greater myriads of India. Suddenly we were made to learn that the true symbol of man is the little coral zoophyte found in the living coral branch, each one, so it is said, an individual, yet each an integral part of a living mass. It reminds me of a question put to me on one occasion :—Does a man belong to himself or to the state? Instinctively I replied at once—to the state; but I had to defend my answer by argument. Now, however, under the shadow of the solemn event that has happened no argument is necessary; we all *feel* that we are one great family, that an empire is a community of brothers, that citizenship is our most marked characteristic. It is only of late years that this idea has taken such full possession of the European mind, though it was the characteristic thought of antiquity. But in future times I venture to say the thought "I am a citizen" will be the dominating note of every human life. Hitherto, whenever a man has not been wholly selfish, his allegiance has been given to his church; in future, may I not say? the state will be his church, and he will live for that. We shall return to the tone of mind exhibited in the Old Testament amongst the ancient Jews, where patriotism and piety are almost synonymous terms. Orthodox Christianity has not been favourable to the idea of citizenship. A man had his own soul to save, and that was his chief business in life. That idea however is now passing into the background, and the altruistic idea of citizenship is taking its place. A man saves his own soul now by saving that of his fellow citizen. The natives of one country belong to one another, they are blood-relations. If this were the proper time to refer to it, one might easily show how this thought involves another, the obligation every young man is under to qualify himself to defend his country in time of danger or whenever its honour is challenged. But I say nothing further on this point now. And, of course, there are innumerable other ways in which a man can show his sense of citizenship. He can be a good comrade at all times, and that by being helpful at all times. That is the new ideal of human life, an ideal, I am thankful to say, which many are already seeking to realise. That is the part of a good citizen, and, so living, we shall achieve a higher and a nobler life than men have lived in the past, we shall be loved in life and keenly lamented in death.

So lived—may we not venture to say?—so lived, at least, in his late years, and so died, King Edward VII. Born on a dangerous eminence, he may not have escaped some of its dangers in early life, but his years as a sovereign have been years of usefulness and honour, and that down, literally, to the very hour of his death. In one respect, indeed, his virtue stands conspicuous by comparison with some other monarchs of his own and past times. He sought not military glory, he desired not to wade through seas of blood to a conqueror's fading chap-let, he never called himself the War-Lord of Europe. Quite the contrary, indeed. As far as a constitutional monarch could exert influence on international policy, he made himself an active agent in the promotion of peace in the council-chambers of the nations, and in this way sought hard to serve the great country over which he had been called to preside. His title to fame on this score in the eyes of all the wise and good will be pre-eminent, he was a true citizen of the State, a lover of England, and wise to know its real interests, The temple of Janus has been shut throughout the whole of his reign. He was Edward the Peacemaker. Amid pomp and state and attended in person by mighty monarchs, as becomes an English King, he will this week be borne to his rest, but the ceremonial will be no hollow one; it only symbolises the *genuine* and keen regret for his loss experienced by the populations of half the globe. May he rest in peace.

—AMEN.

Lecture 4. Authorities.

BRETHREN AND SISTERS IN THE MONOTHEISTIC FAITH:—

There is an old Latin proverb, well-known to everybody, even in its Latin form, *Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur in illis*, "The times change and we change with them." Illustrations of the truth of this adage are constantly presenting themselves in life, but I know none equal to the changes that take place in modes of thought and the resulting opinions. In *books*, for instance, the great classic of one age often becomes the neglected fossil of the next, and this, not because the world has refuted it, but because the world has simply outgrown it. In metaphysics, for example, what book ever had a greater vogue, and that for nearly two centuries, than John Locke's "Essay on The Human Understanding?" It was not only the universal text book on the subject in the colleges of England, but no less a genius than Voltaire translated it into French, and always

looked upon that translation as one of his most useful contributions to the progress of the age in which he lived. But who dreams of reading Locke's Essay now, unless it be some unhappy theological student of an orthodox college, who has it imposed upon him as a task, as I had it imposed on me some fifty years ago? But there is another famous book which illustrates the adage I quoted even better than that, viz., the book known as Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*, once supposed to be an absolute demonstration of the impregnable truth of the New Testament generally, and especially of the Acts of the Apostles. Now you will remember that last Sunday evening I showed the utterly untrustworthy character of the book of the Acts by comparing its statements with those of the Pauline Epistles. But that is the very argument by which Dean Paley in his *Horæ Paulinæ* establishes the credibility, not of one, but of both those documents, the Acts and the Epistles both. He supposes somebody to discover in an old library a Diary and a Volume of Letters evidently referring to the same series of events but professedly by different authors, and, by pointing out innumerable instances of slight variations between them amid general agreement, he claims to have established the independence of the witnesses, and the consequent truth of the story in question. But so completely has the point of view now changed from that of Paley's day, that, though little more than a century has elapsed, Rationalists now use his own argument to demolish his conclusion. Surely the irony of things could go no further than that.

But now to our task. Last Sunday night, you will remember, we attempted a running criticism of the whole contents of the book of Acts, or rather perhaps we should say of its principal incidents. But we did not quite complete our labours. We left off at the conclusion of the three great missionary tours of St. Paul, *i.e.*, at his return to Jerusalem after his last tour. There remains to be considered therefore the chapters relating to his imprisonment at Cæsarea, his voyage to Rome, and his imprisonment there, chapters far too interesting and important for us altogether to neglect. What have we to say then as to the historicity of these sections of the Acts?

Of course we must have some better testimony than that of our so-called Luke to feel sure that he is here telling us the truth with respect to Paul's life at Cæsarea and Rome. And we will put the matter this way :—Did Paul ever make a journey to Rome and suffer imprisonment there? When we have settled that question we shall be able to answer the smaller one about a previous imprisonment at Cæsarea in very brief terms.

Well then there seems very little doubt that Paul's imprisonment at Rome was a real historical fact; and that for this reason :—The section of the Acts that leads up to this result is a journal-section and therefore apparently entitled to our confidence. The long and interesting account of the apostle's voyage as a prisoner from Cæsarea to Rome and ending in his arrival there is contained in the 27th and part of the 28th chapters of the Acts, and the whole of that is a continuous journal section. The journal closes with the words :—"And when *we* entered into Rome Paul was suffered to abide by himself with the soldier that guarded him" (28/16). There are fifteen more verses of the Acts, but these are no part of the journal. However that does not much matter, because, as we have now seen, the journal settles the question.

Naturally, however, we turn again at this point to the epistles, to see what confirmation, if any, they give to the concluding story of Paul's life as found in the book of Acts. Were any of them written in prison? or, do any of them profess to have been written in prison? and, of those from prison, were any written in Rome? In reply I would observe at least three of the epistles bear marks of the prison stamp; and of these one makes it very plain that the office of origin was the imperial city on the Seven Hills. Thus the letter to the Christians of Colosse concludes with the pathetic words, "Remember my bonds;" whilst in the short cognate epistle to Philemon the writer speaks still more plainly of himself as, not only "Paul the aged," but "Paul the prisoner." From these two letters, however, we learn nothing as to the *locality* of his imprisonment, whether Cæsarea or Rome. All the same we may discover even that from another epistle, the one to the Philippians, the most pathetic and surely the most beautiful of them all. Here too the burden of the letter is the same, "my bonds," "O my bonds," but this epistle is probably a little later than the two I have just mentioned, for the writer is looking death in the face now, death by martyrdom. "Yea," he says, "and if I be *offered* upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all." (2/17). That, of course, might have been written either at Cæsarea or Rome, but here are similar extracts that can be true of Rome only, for they imply that the writer was well-known at Cæsar's palace and was in fact on familiar terms with the Christians in Cæsar's household, whose greetings he sends to the Philippians. "So that my bonds in Christ," he says, "are manifest in all the palace and in all the other places." (1/13). And again, "All the saints salute you, chiefly they that are of Cæsar's household." (4/22.) The epistles, therefore, though only in a feeble sort of way, confirm the statement of the journalist and of the author of Acts that the great Mediterranean missionary ended his shining course within the walls of a dungeon in the capital of the then known world. It is true that "the Acts" says nothing of his death, that would not have suited one of the minor purposes of our author in writing his Eirenicon, which was always to show up the Roman government as favourable to Christianity. You will find he is careful to do that all through his book. But when you remember that Paul must have arrived at Rome about the year 62 A.D., and that the conflagration of Rome and the subsequent outbreak against the Christians occurred in the year 64, there is only one conclusion

possible :—the biggest man among the Christians of Rome would not be the last to receive the summons to martyrdom. We can almost hear the carnifex of the prison calling for Paul of Tarsus and the prompt reply of the captive :—*adsum*. Not Colonel Newcombe himself would pronounce the word more eagerly.

There was then an imprisonment of Paul at Rome; was there also a previous imprisonment at Cæsarea? That is our next and final question. Here unfortunately the epistles fail to help us at all, and even the journal itself is not quite explicit. The chapters of the Acts (chapters XXI to XXVI) which tell of the imprisonment of Paul at Cæsarea are not a journal section and do not contain a journal section, that is our difficulty; so that trustworthy evidence here is not easily to be obtained; nevertheless we can get a little, and in this way. As I have already remarked the next chapter, chapter XXVII, that which describes the voyage to Rome, *is* a journal section, and, though it doesn't tell us that Paul sailed from Cæsarea, what it does say is that (27/1-3) he sailed from a port 24 hours to the south of *Sidon*, which of course may well mean Cæsarea, whilst it tells us besides that he *was put on board a prisoner*. In saying what it does therefore here the journal undoubtedly not only sanctions the idea of an imprisonment at Cæsarea but gives also a general confirmation to the narrative of the *previous* six chapters (XXI to XXVI) which professes to furnish us in detail with an account of this imprisonment, with all that led up to it, including his arrest at Jerusalem. I do not think, therefore, we need cherish any doubt of the general purport of these chapters but may in fact say that they are *based* on history. To affirm on the other hand that the *whole* narrative is historical would show great credulity on our part after all that we have learnt of the weakness of our author for romance. Thus these chapters contain no less than five long speeches, mostly by Paul, not one of which can have any claim to genuineness. But that is not all. The scene opens with the arrest of Paul in the temple at Jerusalem, and that under circumstances very discreditable to the apostle. Luke makes him play the hypocrite, and that on a large scale too, in order to escape the ill-will of the Jewish populace. The fundamental principle of Paul's creed, as we know, was, that the Mosaic law was abolished for everybody, a principle that made him absolutely loathed by all the Jews of Jerusalem, including the Jewish Christians. In the chapters before us, however, Paul, in fear of his life, is persuaded to attempt to deceive his fellow-countrymen by showing himself in the temple as a good Jew completing a Nazarite vow, and so obeying the Mosaic law. The result, usual in such cases, followed here; nobody was deceived by this act of hypocrisy for a moment, but, on the contrary, everybody was all the more enraged by it, and Paul was only saved from immediate death by the arrival of Roman soldiers from the castle of Antonia, who snatched him from the hands of his would-be murderers and carried him into the fortress. Is any one prepared to believe such a yarn as that of Paul of Tarsus, and on the authority alone of our Luke? Why, our Paul, the Paul of the epistles, would have faced a thousand deaths rather than have been false to his principles like that. Possibly he was attacked, and that in the temple, but not because he was completing a Nazarite vow, or playing the hypocrite in any shape. That version of the arrest was *invented* by our author, to carry out the purpose of his book, which was to show that Paul was quite as good a Jew as Peter, or any of the Twelve. The book is, as I have said before, an Eirenicon, or Peacemaker, between the Pauline and Petrine factions of the early church. As a matter of fact we may be quite sure Paul was attacked by the mob, if at all, not because he was showing respect to the Mosaic law, but because he was not.

I need not go into the details that follow the arrest in our book; they may or may not be true, but probably not, save perhaps in the matter of the removal of the prisoner to Cæsarea, the seat of the Roman government at the time. It is not at all likely that the commander of the Roman garrison at Jerusalem allowed his prisoner to address the enraged mob from the steps of the castle, especially as he did not know but what his prisoner might be a malefactor, worthy of death. There certainly may have been an examination of Paul before the Sanhedrim, and even a conspiracy of some Jews to assassinate him, but we have no authority for this. Nor have we any authority either for the dispatch which Lysias is said to have sent with the prisoner to Felix in Cæsarea. There is no explanation given as to how Luke came to know the verbatim contents of this dispatch, which therefore we can only regard as another product of the very active imagination of our author. But the story is all of a piece. For instance, the military guard sent with the prisoner to save him from assassination by a few civilians is just a small *army*, an army of Roman legionaries, 470 in number, probably more than there were in the castle of Antonia to send, all told. One can only suppose it another invention of our romancer to show how great a man our prisoner is. Finally, when Cæsarea is at last reached, the prisoner is put on his trial *twice*, once before the civil governor, Felix, and subsequently before a royal guest of the governor, Agrippa by name, whose sister also actually takes her seat on the judicial bench, thus anticipating our female enfranchisement movement by about 2000 years. We can do such things in fiction. And that this trial before Agrippa is a fiction seems plain for another reason. It will be remembered that one of the evangelists, and only one, actually puts Jesus on his trial twice, once before Pontius Pilate, and again before Herod Antipas. (Luke 23/15). I need hardly say that the evangelist in question is the same author, Luke, to whom the Acts is ascribed. It is a little weakness of his to put prisoners on their trial twice, once before the foreigner and again before the native prince. This is evidently part of the general machinery of his novels, his stock-in-trade. And in both trials in both cases the prisoner is

pronounced innocent. I do not deny that, not only the trial of Paul before Agrippa, but the whole narrative of these chapters is very dramatic, very cleverly done, and very interesting, so interesting indeed that one could wish it all to be true; but fiction is generally interesting, far more so indeed than cold matters of fact, and our romancer could give points to a good many *modern* novelists in this matter. But brilliant fiction is not history in either ancient or modern times.

One more incident and we have completed our investigation of the narrative of the Acts. The final section of the book (XXVIII, 17-31) is not a journal-section, and certainly is not a historical section; in fact, it implies about the most hardy assertion in the whole book. It implies that there was no Christian church at Rome when the apostle Paul got there in the year 62 A.D. Paul, you remember, according to the Acts, on his arrival in the great city sends, not for any Christians to come and see him, but for the leading Jews of the capital, whilst these latter inform him in their turn that they have never *heard* anything about his doings in the East, good or bad, and know nothing of Christianity, except that the Christians are everywhere spoken against. Well, if this were true, of course there could have been no Christian church in Rome up to this date, and that is evidently what our *artist* in literature wishes us to understand. But no one who knows anything at all of Christian Origins, or even of ancient history in general, will believe this for a moment. It is true we cannot do now, as former scholars have done, we cannot appeal to the fact that Paul had himself been in communication with the Roman church years before this, because we cannot now be *sure* that Paul himself ever wrote our epistle to the Romans; but we know there must have been a considerable population of Christians at Rome about this time, inasmuch as the historian Suetonius informs us that amongst the good deeds of the emperor Nero was a fearful persecution which he initiated against a most criminal sect of people called Christians (Weizsäcker, A.A., II, 141). There is of course a much more full account of this persecution in what is called the Annals of Tacitus, but, as the authenticity of this work is more than doubtful, I don't quote it. The testimony of Suetonius is sufficient and there is no doubt about the genuineness of that. Not only then were there Christians in Rome when Paul got there but they were there in such numbers and had been there so long that they were publicly known as a most abominable sect of people, obnoxious to the ministers of justice. What spirit of perversity then, you may ask, could possibly possess our Luke to induce him to ignore this fact altogether and represent Rome as virgin soil on which the gospel had yet to be planted? The reason is plain enough, he is not writing history but simply embodying his own theories in a romance. His theory about Paul's action is this, that wherever he goes he appeals first to the Jews, and then, when they refuse to hear him, he turns away from them and preaches to the Gentiles. He has made Paul do that in every town to which he has taken him, and so determines he shall do the same at Rome. Had Luke recognised a Christian church at Rome this would have been impossible. The *facts* were dead against him; well then that is so much the worse for the facts, says Luke, my theory must be carried out.

And thus from first to last we have found the book of Acts a tissue of misrepresentations, and, I am sorry to say, of misrepresentations purposely fabricated. That the fabrication has been very cleverly done, and by the adoption of a literary style the most plausible and insinuating, such a style as to deceive, if possible, the very elect—the very German scholars themselves—that only makes the matter ten times worse. Ecclesiastical writers have always had a bad name for veracity, and Luke, the first of them, is one of the worst. The Roman Catholic "Lives of the Saints" with all their mendacities, are only Luke continued. This will seem a bard judgment, I know, to many, but I have given *reasons* for every statement I have made, and I will now confirm my judgment by what some people like much better than reasons, and that is the authority of great names.

Here then are the opinions of scholars on the question, famous scholars, scholars too who are free to think and free to say what they think. Let us take the great French scholar Renan to begin with, a man who in the two great crises of his life himself played the hero on a grand scale, sacrificing his livelihood and his future prospects to his conscience. Speaking of the Jerusalem decree Renan says:—"The decree which the council (of Jerusalem) is said to have decided upon is assuredly a fiction." (The Apostles, p. XVIII). Or again, referring to the anonymous author of Acts, he says:—"Historical fidelity is a matter of indifference to him; edification is all he cares for." (p. XII.) And similar to this is the language used by Mr. Cassells on the subject, the author of the once anonymous master-piece entitled Supernatural Religion," which made such a commotion in the religious world nearly forty years ago. Thus, referring to what is called the martyrdom of Stephen, Mr. Cassells says:—"With the exception of the narrative in the Acts there is no evidence whatever that such a person as Stephen ever existed" (p. 661), and, "considering the generosity of Paul's character on the one hand, and the important position assigned to Stephen on the other, it is perfectly unaccountable that, if Stephen really be a historical personage, no mention of him occurs elsewhere in the New Testament." And the writer then goes on to say that "miraculous agency is more freely employed in this book (of Acts) than in any other in the canon" (p. 662). The same writer then sums up his judgment on the book generally in these emphatic words (p. 751):—"Written by an author who was not an eyewitness of the miracles related; who describes events, not as they really occurred, but as his pious imagination supposed they ought to have occurred, who seldom touches history without

distorting it by legend, until the original elements can scarcely be distinguished; who puts his own words and sentiments into the mouths of the apostles and other persons of his narrative; and who represents almost every phase of the church in the apostolic age as influenced, or directly produced, by supernatural agency;—such a work is of no value as evidence for occurrences which are in contradiction to all experience. The Acts of the Apostles therefore is not only an anonymous work, but upon due examination its claims to be considered sober and veracious history must be emphatically rejected. It cannot strengthen the foundations of supernatural religion, but, on the contrary, by its profuse and indiscriminate use of the miraculous, it discredits miracles, and affords a clearer insight into their origin and fictitious character" (p. 751).

A later writer of the same order is the learned Dr. Schmiedel, the author of the article on the Acts of the Apostles in the great Encyclopaedia Biblica, now so well known. In this article Dr. Schmiedel distinctly imputes to our author a deliberate attempt to deceive his readers. This is how the Doctor expresses himself:—"It is upon this assumption of a distinct authorship for the we-sections that we are best able to pass a comparatively favourable judgment on the compiler's deviations from historical facts in other parts of the book. But there is one charge from which he cannot be freed, viz., that he has followed the method of retaining the "we" without change. In the case of so capable a writer, in whom hardly a trace can be detected, either in vocabulary or in style, of the use of documents, this fact is not to be explained by lack of skill, such as is sometimes met with in the mediaeval chroniclers. The inference is inevitable that he wished—what has actually happened—that the whole book should be regarded as the work of an eyewitness." (§ 1.) And again, "the results then with regard to the trustworthiness of Acts, as far as its facts are concerned, are these. Apart from the we-sections no statement merits immediate acceptance on the mere ground of its presence in the book. All that contradicts the Pauline epistles must be absolutely given up, unless we are to regard these as spurious. Positive proofs of the trustworthiness of Acts must be tested with the greatest caution." (§ 13).

But far away the greatest work on the book of the Acts of the Apostles produced by German scholars in these later generations, greatest because the most thorough, searching and exhaustive in its method, is, in my judgment, that of Dr. Edward Zeller of the University of Berlin. I need hardly tell you that the views I have expressed in this present course of lectures on the book of Acts are the result of my own independent and original researches. In this, as in all my other courses, I have been my own authority. Nevertheless, if I were under compulsion to give some famous name as patron of my theories on this book, I should undoubtedly mention that of Dr. Zeller. Anyway he is the man to whom I am more indebted for help than to anybody else. The whole of these lectures may therefore be considered to some extent as one long quotation from this most un-compromising author, and I will in consequence only give you two or three further sentences from his book on the subject. Speaking of the Jerusalem council he says:—"The contradictions quoted would alone suffice to make us look upon the apostolic council of the Acts as a fiction traceable to the pragmatism of the work, a fiction which indeed harmonized with the pacific objects of our author but which can have no place in history." (II. 40). And, more generally, speaking of the book as a whole, he says:—"But, if the usual view of the object of the Acts cannot be carried out even on the traditional premises respecting its historical credibility, it loses all foundation when it is seen how much that is unhistorical it records, and how much of this unhistorical material can be explained only by reflection" (i.e., only by deliberate manufacture) "on the part of the author, and not by purposeless legend. If the description is from the commencement *adapted* to the parallel between Peter and Paul, and if this parallel is obtained only by a thorough alteration of history" (in English we should say only by a thorough falsification of history) "by unhistorical episodes, additions, and changes in the historical material, it is quite obvious that the writer with whom this description originated has some other object in view than the mere transmission of history" (p. 134).

After this it is hardly worth while mentioning Baron von Soden, another professor of theology in the University of Berlin and also a writer in the "Biblica." I will however just quote a line or two from his well-known work in the Crown Theological Library. Thus in reference to the earliest chapters of the Acts he observes:—"The description of the church of Jerusalem proves that (the author) lacks all accurate and detailed information. ... It is no doubt the author's own *ideal* of a Christian church which he thus transplants into those early days—a church where all are good, pious, obedient to the apostles, and where no "spiritual gifts" disturb unity and order" (p. 214). And again:—"We cannot realise for ourselves the event of Pentecost as (our author) describes it—he is not clear even as to the locality—while the miracle of tongues with the immediate conversion and even baptism of 3,000 souls is an impossibility." (p. 220). And, later on:—"All these things and much besides are only intelligible on the supposition that the author is moved by no kind of *historical* interest in the scenes which he describes. Moreover the *plan* of the book shows that the author does not intend simply to narrate the course of history" (p. 221).

My penultimate extract, a short sentence only, is from a book recently issued by the well-known Thomas Whittaker, entitled "Origins of Christianity," and is to this effect:—"The Acts of the Apostles can of course no more be regarded as critical history than the first decade of Livy. A critical historian like Thucydides is

unthinkable among the early Christians." (p. 80).

Amongst specifically Unitarian divines there is one for whom I myself have a great regard, I mean the Rev. John Chadwick of Boston, U.S.A. In his beautiful little work entitled "The Bible of To-day" he of course discusses the book of the Acts of the Apostles, which he describes as "A Theological Romance," and elegantly styles it, after Renan, the Christian Odyssey. That he is in entire agreement with the views I have advocated in these lectures of mine will appear from what he says of our book on p. 250 of his own work. Here it is:—"We may accept in full the charges which the Tubingen critics make on its veracity and still return to it with unabated interest. It may not be history and biography, but it is at least one of the most charming fictions that were ever written."

I shall quote nothing from Weizsäcker's great work on The Apostolic Age, although substantially it agrees with me and I have made considerable use of it in the preparation of the present course of lectures. The book does not lend itself readily to quotation, and there is, I think, no need of further authorities. It is time we faced the general conclusion to be deduced from the discussion contained in these four lectures of ours.

The question presumably that will now be uppermost in the minds of my hearers is this :—If the book of the Acts of the Apostles is as unhistorical as Mr. Gammell now claims it to be, how can we pretend to know anything at all of the origin of Christianity? The four gospels are undoubtedly mythical, to a very large extent, if not entirely; if now Luke's second volume turns out to be as unhistorical as his first, surely there is nothing left for us but to acknowledge that we know little or nothing of the way in which Christianity first came into existence. If Jesus is gone, and all that precedes the journal-sections in the Acts of the Apostles is more or less imaginary, mostly *more*, who is to tell us what were the real events which issued in that system of religion we know as Christianity? The Christian church comes into view in due time in secular literature and history, but, apparently, we don't know how it got there. It comes upon us full-orbed, like Minerva from the head of Jove, and the previous growth of it is either not known at all, or must apparently be sought for outside the pages of the New Testament. We don't even know *for certain* the time at which Christianity first appeared in human history. Our New Testament traditions say it was in the reign of the Emperor Tiberius and the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate in Judea, but we can't be *sure* even of this. There seems to have been a Jesus, Jesus ben Pandera, a thaumaturgist who lived and was ultimately put to a violent death and hanged upon a tree, a hundred years before our era, in the reign of the Maccabean or Asmonean King Alexander Jannaeus, and this is the Jesus undoubtedly to which all the references in the Talmud point. It is also the Jesus which all the early opponents of Christianity have in mind, such as Celsus and Porphyry, and, what is most remarkable of all, it is actually to this date that Epiphanius, the popular bishop of Constantia, about A.D. 400, assigns the life of the Jesus Christ whom the Christian Church worshipped. This, in fact, is one of the standing puzzles of Christian Origins. And more than that. If the historical Jesus did appear in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, as we have just said, then the apostle Paul ought to have come on the scene soon after, and there is actually some ground in the Pauline epistles themselves for such a theory. I have before now called your attention to the fact how utterly bare of all indications of date are the Pauline epistles. It seems as if somebody had in early days gone carefully through them and eliminated every trace of the date at which they were written. Nevertheless, *one* note of time has been inadvertently left in them, and that one note, strange to say, fixes the writer just about a century earlier than does the Acts of the Apostles. The place I refer to is II Corinthians XI, 32,83. "In Damascus" says Paul, "the governor under Aretas the King kept the city of the Damascenes with a garrison desirous to apprehend me; and through a window in a basket was I let down by the wall and escaped his hands." You see Paul was in Damascus when Aretas was King thereof. Aretas was the family name of the Kings of Nabathea, whose capital was Petra, and the only time, as far as history knows, when Damascus was under the rule of any Aretas was early in the first century B.C., *i.e.*, in the days of Alexander Jannaeus, which is just when Paul ought to have lived if Jesus ben Pandera was the original of our gospel Jesus. And so you see how reasonable was my remark just now that we don't really know for certain, not within 100 years or so, when the Jesus of our gospels actually did live, *i.e.*, if he was ever a historical person at all. Plainly, if we plant our religion in the realm of history, we shall be in sorry plight. Plainly, we have got to face the fact that we really know nothing, or almost nothing, of the Origins of Christianity, and, if we flatter ourselves that we do know, we are only living in a fool's paradise, a locality, I must say, very pleasing to many people.

Perhaps you will ask here, Is there really no direction in which the microscope of the critic could be turned to obtain some positive as well as negative facts on this famous question? When so many acute and powerful minds have been exploring the records of these remote ages have they never stumbled upon any indications of the actual origin of the Christian religion? If the traditional account is erroneous must we be content with an utter blank in our minds as far as this great subject is concerned? Is not criticism strong enough to paint a picture of the reality, if only in rude outline, as well as obliterate the traditional picture? In reply I would say I think it can, and that some such attempt may perhaps be made someday in some future lectures.

But the principal moral of our story remains yet to be drawn. The fall of history should turn our thoughts to

philosophy. The kernel of Christianity, for us Unitarians at least, is not any thoughts about a person at all, whether Paul or Jesus or anybody else. According even to our own New Testament traditions the kernel of Christianity originally was an ethical principle. "Repent," Jesus is made to say, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." There you see the important matter is not the preacher but his message. It is the unhappy fate of *most* religions to get perverted from a code of ethical principles to the personality of the founder. The religion that has suffered least from this evil is Mohammedanism, which has never made a god of its prophet. Yet even here there has been perversion, for originally Mohammed was no essential part of Mohammedanism. Mohammedanism was originally the assertion of the Divine unity alone, that was all the prophet maintained. Later however, and especially after his death, the personality of Mohammed was made part of the creed. Men were now required to believe, not simply that Allah alone is Allah, but that Mohammed was his prophet, and so far the original religion was corrupted. But just as Monotheism remains as the essential part of Mohammedanism, so the ethical teaching ascribed to Jesus still persists after all theories and dogmas relating to the personality of the great Teacher of it have been exploded. It is quite true that there are indications in the New Testament, especially in the Pauline epistle and fourth gospel, that the personality of Jesus was a part of the gospel, and an essential part of the gospel, from the very first, as orthodox preachers to-day are always maintaining, was in fact the essence and substance of the gospel; Jesus Christ was Christianity, but that is not the story told by the *synoptic* gospels; according to them Christianity consisted at first of an ethical movement only, the inculcation of a moral reformation as a prelude to the commencement of God's Kingdom on earth. And so true is this, that many critics, such as Dr. Martineau, have maintained that Jesus never set himself up as Messiah or supposed himself to be Messiah. He thought only of his work, the moral reformation of men; He himself was no part of his own gospel.

That original Christianity therefore remains to us still. The Christ is gone, and most of his apostles are gone too, but the sermon on the Mount remains and all the high ethical ideals which it contains. This is the true Christianity, and it is on this that our sermons must dwell in the future. Nor will it be otherwise with the New Testament epistles. Their dogmas have all been exploded, their mythology has all faded away, but the exhortations to goodness and brotherly love in which they abound are as divine as ever. Your religion is not gone because the book of Acts is little more than a romance. The apostolic remonstrance still holds good and is still as salutary and important a thought as ever, "if a man love not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen?" Such teachings as these are the very marrow of Christianity, and have always been so in reality. These philosophic principles are the proper themes for the preacher, themes which no criticism can invalidate, because they belong, not to the past alone but to the eternal present, not to history but to philosophy.

And, as you know, there is no lack of material in the New Testament for such sermons as these I have been speaking of. Wherever the Sermon on the Mount originally came from, whether from an Essenian monastery or not, it undoubtedly embodies in itself a whole ethical system, a system complete in itself, one too that breathes a spirit divinely heroic, sternly virtuous, the product of the heart. The atmosphere of it is most salubrious but most Alpine. Its characteristic principle is sincerity, truthfulness in the inward parts; and this it is which has given it its divine power in all lands, in all ages, and in all hearts. "Except your righteousness," it says, "shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." The internal disposition, not the outward act, still less the theoretical belief, is that which is of worth in the eyes of God. Perhaps indeed even this is not the root principle of the earliest Christianity, its root principle is that of altruism. The *word* altruism does not occur of course in the Sermon on the Mount, but the thing itself is involved in every word of it. If we know anything at all of the earliest Christian movement it was a communistic one, a life in common, where each studied, not his own, but the other's welfare. They did not *call* this altruism, they called it love, but the idea was the same. Every true moral reformer from those days to this has felt and taught that the only principle that will *save* humanity is that of the substitution of the common good for the individual good as the driving power in human nature, and this is the characteristic Christian principle, judging by the sermon on the Mount. So judged Christianity is as true to-day as it was 2,000 years ago. Had Christian teachers confined their attention to the principles ascribed to the Messiah at the beginning instead of substituting for them the personality of the Messiah himself, the Christian church would never have been torn into sections, or excited the opposition of any one. And more than that, were Christian teaching to revert to-day to what its ideal Master said, and not to what he was, the present walls of separation between the churches would at once collapse of themselves, and so a church universal, a true church catholic, would spontaneously and immediately arise and introduce that millennium of peace and goodwill at present regarded as Utopian. Not a word of ours to-day is directed to the destruction of this earliest Christianity. It is only against bad history and not against good ethics that our iconoclastic efforts are directed.

One other thought and I have done. Altruism is good, not because Jesus taught it, but because of its own essential nature. Some people find fault with us for destroying the basis of morality by our attacks on dogmatic

theology. Prove Jesus to be a myth, they say, and why should any man do right or abstain from doing wrong? Now I might reply to this by pointing out that it is unsupported by the nominal founder of Christianity. In the Sermon on the Mount the Teacher, whoever he was, always gives a philosophic reason for his injunctions, he never bases them on his own personality. "Take no thought for raiment," he says; Why not? Because I bid you? Not at all, but because, if you reflect, you will see that the lilies of the field take no thought, yet all their wants are supplied. Are ye not much better than they? Just a bit of rationalistic reasoning you see; the Jesus of the New Testament was himself a Rationalist; he based his teaching on argument, and not on authority—not even his own authority.

But of course the proper answer to our accusers is that you *cannot* base a system of ethics on personal or external authority, whether that of Jesus or anybody else, you can only base it on the nature of things. It is the fundamental error of orthodoxy to substitute external authority for internal fitness as the reason for conduct. Rationalism may destroy the external authority, and then, on orthodox principles, morality is in danger. But Rationalism can never destroy the internal fitness of things, and therefore an ethical system based on reason can never be in danger either from Rationalism or anything else. Show a man that all the good he enjoys is just the product of the co-operative action of society and he will see at once that he is the servant of society, bound by his very life to study its interests. A rational being can be content with nothing short of a philosophical reason for his conduct, mere authority is beside the question altogether, and it is intellectual degradation to act on any other principle. In this respect, I think, the generations that preceded Christianity had an advantage over the Christian generations that followed. If you read the ancient Latin and Greek classics you will find their authors always founded their ethics on philosophy, not on authority. The disciples of Plato adopted their principles, not because Plato taught them, but because he gave them good reasons why they should adopt them. It was a retrograde movement intellectually when the authority of the Master was substituted for rational argument as a principle of belief. However, perhaps the best result that will accrue from our iconoclastic criticism will be that ethics will be strengthened by being built once more on the impregnable foundations of reason and conscience. The unspeakable blunder that was made when dogmatic Christianity was substituted for ethical Christianity will thus be corrected.

Rejoice, dear friends, in your privileges as Unitarians. It is only in a Unitarian place of worship that these great principles can be discussed and advocated—at least with any consistency. The church of the Unitarians is the church of reason and a rational faith. We recognise no higher court than that, and we never can. When the reason and the intellect are disparaged in a Unitarian pulpit, as they sometimes are, when emotion is made to dominate logic, when mysticism takes the place of rationalism, then will the the Unitarian Church be guilty of the act of suicide, and that robust, healthy tone of mind that has hitherto characterised its members will be ex-changed for the morbidness, the weakness, and the decay of a dying community. But I will not conclude with words of gloom. This is the hour of Unitarian triumph, and you and I, thank God, have lived to see it. The principles of reason and science advocated for centuries by our spiritual ancestors are now rapidly becoming the accepted principles of all other Christian churches. Soon the popular creeds will be so renovated and transformed that religion will cease to be the laughing-stock of the wise, its principles will so purify human nature as to make mankind one vast family, a family no longer distracted by wars and strikes, by physical, social, and intellectual evils of all kinds, but one which by wisdom and benevolence universally distributed, shall advance step by step to the full satisfaction, alike of the head and the heart of all its myriad members,—a consummation worthy of the thousand lives of toil, self-denial, isolation, and heroism by which it will have been achieved.

—AMEN.

Graphic Border

The Laymen's League

Annual Report

Presented by the Council to Meeting of Members, held at S. Mark's Parish Mall, Remuera, Friday, May 26, 1911.

Introduction.

In presenting any report for the year just concluded, the Council is conscious it must be one dealing with a

period of more than ordinary interest and significance to Church people.

Called into existence for the purpose of "defending the rights of the laity against the encroachments of ecclesiasticism" which were being made at the time of the League's formation, the events of the past year have been such as to affect seriously the League's position and mission.

With a real desire to avoid, wherever possible, reference to persons no longer in our diocese, the Council feels it is absolutely incumbent on it to chronicle a much altered condition of affairs brought about by that very absence.

Membership.—finance.

Our members, in point of numbers, are about the same as that of last year, and their support of the efforts of the Council is no less hearty. Our finances are, as formerly, sound. After providing for all our liabilities, we have a credit balance. Since the institution of the League, the Council has not had to make a personal appeal to any individual for monetary help; all needed by us has been sent in spontaneously. This is as it should be; but, still, we desire to place on record the fact so as to thank our subscribers and emphasise the principle that all support for Church work should be of a similar character to that we have experienced, which, no doubt, it would be found to be to a greater extent than at present if the work undertaken were in manner and method such as to commend itself to the full sympathy of our people.

The Late Bishop of Auckland.

In common with the rest of the members of our Church in this diocese, the Council exceedingly regretted that the health of Bishop Neligan should have broken down in the manner it did, and we joined most fervently in the hope so generally expressed throughout the provincial Church that his return to England and prospective engagement in work of a much less trying character than can ever be looked for in the domain of a colonial diocesan, would effectually restore him to full health and strength.

But it would be rank untruthfulness to say that the League does not deem a change in the occupancy of the See of Auckland an advantage. Bishop Neligan, with all his large powers in matters of organisation, and in other directions, had his drawbacks. He failed, from the first, to understand the spiritual feelings and aspirations of the people of our communion in the Auckland diocese, even as he failed to gauge the loss which our Church, and he himself as its local head, sustained because of his alienation of the sympathy and co-operation of our Nonconformist friends in the work of Christ. These two blemishes by themselves would wreck all hope of a successful episcopacy to even a much more powerful and ecclesiastical mind than that possessed by our late Bishop. The Diocese of Auckland is essentially Protestant, and, notwithstanding all appearances to the contrary, will remain such when the teaching and methods of a few Romanising "Priests" who have come amongst us have disappeared, remembered only as a transient incident in our history, sometimes brought to mind by the discovery on a bookstall or elsewhere of a "Priest's Prayer Book," "The Catholic Religion," or that more attenuated, but no less hurtful, production, a "Mirfield Tract."

But, notwithstanding any faults or failings our late Bishop may, in the estimation of many members of our Church, have possessed, all of us unite in the prayer that God may abundantly bless him in his new sphere of work, for which, we doubt not, he will be considerably assisted by the six years' experience he has obtained of the religious needs of a people in a diocese possessing, in some degree, education, knowledge, and spiritual grace.

Visit of the English Mission.

The report presented by the Council last year made some reference to this matter, which had not then eventuated. We then ventured to express the opinion that the Mission would, in the main, be composed of members of the sacerdotal section of the Church. We said :—

"Some of the clergy in question are admittedly active members of societies, the Romish character and trend of which will be referred to in the columns of *The Churchman* during the coming few months. Members of the Reformed Church of England may well therefore look askance at such 'Missioners' and be pardoned for doubting whether the inclusion of a few evangelical clergy in the Mission can neutralise the harm eventuating from the advent here of other men of such a dangerous type."

This surmise proved to be in the main correct, a large proportion of the Missioners being of a most pronounced type of ritualists, though there were some men distinctly sound in the faith and practices of our reformed Church. Much has been said and written in England and in this country regarding the "wonderful success" of the mission. Indeed, the terms indulged in by some of the missioners themselves as to what they had accomplished and the light they had spread amongst us, partakes so much of the character of fiction as to be

amusing, but by no means edifying. During the progress of the Mission the League refrained almost altogether from indulging in any criticism of its proceedings, though there was much in some of them which gave pain and sorrow to many true and devout members of our Church. Canon Stuart and some of his companions preached a sound Gospel, and in doing so left an impression for lasting good in the minds and hearts of those who heard them, which, we would fain believe, overshadowed and rendered, in a measure, abortive the efforts of other members of the Mission to lead and encourage our people into thoughts and practices foreign to our Church and its teaching.

"The Churchman."

All the expenditure of the League, except a small sum for hire of meeting place, has been in connection with our little paper. The requests from various quarters for copies of each monthly issue have been so numerous that a much larger number have had to be printed. The circumstances and surroundings governing the issue of *The Churchman* cause the Council to work under some disadvantage in its production. Being entrusted with the duty of affording some little light and information on subjects of vital importance to Church people, with which, it may be said, in many instances, they seem to be almost utterly unacquainted, there is naturally some little difficulty experienced in getting people generally to understand our motive and line of action. This difficulty, also naturally, is accentuated by the good offices of some of our friends in the Church, who, objecting to the existence of both the League and its little organ, sedulously delry our humble work as that of party men, bent upon the destruction of all law and authority within the Church, if not of the Church itself. We are merely, they say in effect, "pestilent fellows," who should be treated as such. In truth we are, in our humble way, the real upholders of true Church rule and authority, when based upon sound foundations, and we are only in conflict with "authorities" when they exceed their rightful powers and trespass upon those of others.

But, notwithstanding these difficulties, our two years' work has established the magazine in the good will of hundreds of Church households, where it is now looked for, read, and valued.

The Churchman lays no claim to high literary style or capacity, the writers in it being very "common people"; indeed, not by any means "experts," Neither does it profess to have all knowledge on the subjects treated of. But the Council does claim that it seeks in all appearing in the paper to present in a clear and truthful manner the main causes of the present division in the Church of England, and to endeavour to bring back to the "old ways" Churchmen disposed to stray into superstition or indifference, by the presentation of the real doctrines and practices of our Church. With feeble hands the League tries to do this duty, leaving to God rather than to man judgment as to the purity of our motive.

Our New Diocesan.

Nearly all we have been considering so far has reference to the past. What of the future? The reply will largely depend, under God, upon our recently-selected. Bishop, who, in the arduous and most difficult position he has succeeded to, is entitled to the loyal and hearty support of all sections of our people. We make no secret of the fact that members of the League, possessing any knowledge, however slight, of the Archdeacon of Gee-long, were not enamoured with the prospect of his coming to Auckland as its Bishop. Some of us, indeed, in our places at Synod, voted against his selection upon grounds which it would serve no good end to enumerate. But when Dr. Crossley was chosen, and he had accepted the position, it became the duty of every true Churchman to fall into line with his brethren in rendering due obedience and help wherever possible to our new leader.

Certain it is that Dr. Crossley will need this aid to the full if he is to succeed in any adequate measure in bringing into harmony some of the discordant elements which he will find existing in his diocese as the result of errors of administration in the past. For these errors and their consequences our present Bishop is, of course, in no way responsible, and except in so far as he may be tempted to perpetuate any of them, which God forbid, he should not be in any way associated with them in the minds of our people. Bishop Crossley's record must be that of his own acts and words, and by these alone should he be measured or estimated. Relying upon God's over-ruling power and the sound sense with which the Bishop appears to be endowed, we look hopefully forward to the unification of the Churchmen of this diocese through his wise conduct of affairs.

Unity.

We honestly desire unity in our Church, and among all Christian people. We recognise to the full that division has always been a most potent cause of national decay. We confess that in ourselves, as in all men, there is an element of pride, self-will, self-conceit, self-assertiveness, which, if not controlled by divine grace, will hinder unity. We acknowledge that God, not man, is the Author and Preserver of Unity. But we are taught

in the Bible and by experience that there is a true unity and there is a false unity which is the counterfeit and enemy of the true, and when we are exhorted to maintain unity or reproached for breaking it, we are compelled to inquire into the nature of the unity to which these admonitions refer. Is it a spiritual unity in a divine Person, the Head of mankind, the Head of the Church, the Head of each man, or it it the carnal and mechanical unity of an external ecclesiastical system? The former is the conception of the Bible and the Prayer Book; the latter is the conception which has gained currency in Western Christendom by the teaching of men who sought to assimilate the organisation of the Church to that of the Roman Empire, which had been its fiercest and cruellest enemy. The notion of the Church as a world-wide society, endowed with inherent and practically independent supernatural powers and authority, possessing a monopoly of divine grace, fixing the means and conditions whereby that grace is to be dispensed by its officials, dominating on the strength of these claims national, family and social life—this is the notion which the Oxford movement has, to a greater or less extent, implanted in the minds of many bishops, clergy, and of some laity. Membership in this society is the first pre-requisite to eternal salvation: acquiescence in its dogmas is faith: loyalty to its officials, submission to its direction, support of its schemes, observance of its ordinances, is good Churchmanship. Obedience to the command of the Church, rather than to the revealed will of God, speaking to the reason and to conscience, is Christian duty. Separation from this society, however infected it may be with error and corruption, is schism Opposition from within to falsehood, injustice, misgovernment, is a shocking breach of unity. Now, it is plain that if this conception of the Church is the right one, the law-givers, kings, prophets, who warred against the corruptions of the Jewish Church were pestilent breakers of unity. To destroy the golden calf, to breakdown the high places, to denounce the wrath of God against formalism, superstition, idolatry, was really a grievous sin, though Jewish puritanism may have looked on these actions as commendable. Nor can any Christian believe that our Lord showed us an example when He cleansed the Temple and uttered His fearful reproaches against the Scribes and Pharisees, or that St. Paul did anything worthy of imitation when he withstood St. Peter to the face, pronounced an anathema on perverters of the Gospel and declared false teachers to be the enemies of the Cross of Christ. The propagandists of the Church system are wise in their generation when they discourage, or, if it is in their power, forbid the study of the Bible, for no one who reverences, understands, and gives heed to the Holy Scriptures can blindly yield up his reason and conscience to any man or any body of men. Such a one will reverence the Church as the New Jerusalem come down from God out of heaven, as the great witness to the Kingdom of God on earth, with which it will one day be co-extensive, as the means for proclaiming the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, for making Christ known as the Lord, King and Saviour of mankind, as the universal Catholic human society which upholds the sacredness and dignity of national and family life, as the spiritual teacher which enlightens the conscience, guides the will, and informs the mind of communities and individuals, as the lasting memorial that a fellowship has been established between men, and that the visible and invisible worlds are one. He will give all due respect and obedience to those placed in authority, he will be ready for the common welfare to sacrifice his tastes, though not his convictions, but his supreme loyalty and absolute devotion will be reserved for the Lord and Judge of men.

Conclusion.

We have made this somewhat extended reference to the subject of unity for the purpose of placing on record the views held by the League as to the true basis of such, the attainment of which is only possible by an adherence on the part of all seeking for it to sound ideas of its constituents. We recognise that within this diocese there are conflicting views regarding the proper means to be adopted for the bringing of our people together upon some common ground leading to unity; but we also recognise that unless some such event can be brought about it may be stated as a certainty that our people will continue in an increasing degree to float into Nonconformity or indifference. But, given a strong lead by one who, from his high office, has the power at least of restraining the actions of clergy and others disposed to indulge in practices which make for disunion, we are not without hope that the laity, strengthened by mutual trust and respect, will willingly follow and support any effort having for its aim the uniting of all sections of our Church and the restoration of it to that place and influence for good in this community which it possessed in years gone by. Circumstances in the immediate past were not favourable for such a union of hearts and purpose, but with the advent of our new Diocesan those circumstances have changed. Personal determination on the part of all concerned may well be pleaded for at the present juncture to secure peace within our borders.

The Council, upon a review of the whole position, has concluded that, with the object of assisting towards such a desirable end, the League should take the pronounced step of suspending its operations, and thus by example invite members of the Church with whom for some time past we have found it impossible to be in accord concerning some matters, to also consider their position. In any case, whether our example is in any way followed or not, our duty appears manifest, and we will ask members, by resolution to-night, to adopt the

course suggested, so that our new Bishop may find himself utterly unhampered, so far as we are concerned, in the big task he has in front of him of evolving full order and satisfaction out of elements now somewhat chaotic and distressful. We are quite alive to the fact that in taking this decided action our motives may, probably, be misconstrued in some quarters, and not to our advantage. This we can afford to let pass. But to those loyal supporters of the League who have come to look for then *Churchman*, and who, missing it, may possibly feel disposed to think a retrograde step has been taken, we give our full assurance that nothing but the conviction that what we are proposing is called for in the general interest of our Church would have led us to take it. The desire for that welfare must govern all, the mistakes or misgovernment of the past must not be allowed to prevent our seeking better things in the future, and assisting toward that end. May God grant that our hopes in this direction, and for the revival, not only of true Churchmanship, but of real Godliness in our diocese are about to be vouchsafed to us.

William J. Speight,

PRESIDENT.

The Brett Printing Co., Ltd., Auckland.

This resource is unavailable for copyright reasons.

Photograph of John Ferguson

The Economic Value of the Gospel Angus & Robertson Ltd. 89-95 Castlereagh Street, Sydney 1910

BY John Ferguson Minister of St. Stephen's, Sydney

This Address was delivered by the Right Reverend the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia in the Assembly Hall, Melbourne, on September 22, 1909.

The Economic Value of the Gospel

Throughout the course of my ministry I have often been painfully impressed by the persistence of that widespread misconception which supposes the chief end of the Gospel of Jesus Christ to be the providing of a better estate in another world for those who confess Him here; and which assumes, to the utter perverting of the truth, that the gospel has no specific gift for the immediate needs of men—that it affords them no practical advantage in the struggle for existence—that it adds, at any rate, but little to the means whereby they hope to attain success (that is, money, fame, position, power)—that, in short, it may be left out of consideration in estimating the forces which make for the prosperity of a people.

This misconception not only involves a very superficial appreciation of the gospel, but implies also intensely selfish notions about wealth and well-being. The true conception is clear, if men will but look for it.

We—and here I mean the Church in its comprehensive sense, that is, all who sincerely confess and follow Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour—to whom the Gospel has been committed as a sacred trust, know full well that the gospel call is a call to manhood, that the gospel power is the power of God unto manhood, and that the gospel ideal of manhood is Jesus Christ.

We affirm that the gospel is the mightiest of all factors essential to the true and lasting prosperity of both individuals and nations; and, consequently, that it is of the highest economic value.

Can we justify this assertion? Most certainly.

I.

We, who have received the gospel as an intimate personal message from Jesus Christ—who believe it, and rejoice in its truth, sweetness and power—find a passionate interest in speaking of Jesus Christ as wholly our Saviour. We put Him in the forefront. His personality is saving truth in its sublimest form. With utmost earnestness we exert ourselves to build up the young in the knowledge of Him; we would draw all men unto Him, so that they, being enlightened by the knowledge of Him and possessed by His Spirit, shall be changed into His likeness. Jesus Christ is the type of true manhood, the ideal man. This we joyously and vehemently declare; and we ask the child, the man, the patriarch, of every estate to listen to us with open ears and open hearts because we are speaking of the most fruitful reality one can have for this present world's present use.

Upon much that is of infinite value in the full presentation of the gospel I cannot here touch; but upon this part of it I want to lay weighty and loving emphasis—that we invite men to find in Jesus Christ the perfect response of human being to divine manifestation: reverence for authority; open, unalloyed trust; prompt and eager obedience; the sympathy of love; the courage and strength of a pure conscience; harmony of will; communion of spirit, and unity of purpose with the Divine. We ask men, further, to observe how Jesus Christ in

His daily open intercourse with men exhibits, in sharply defined relief against the heartless selfishness of the world, His love of mankind, His love of mercy and of truth, His sympathy with man, His patience and tenderness, His sense of responsibility for brother and neighbour, His unwearied longing for their release from the bondage of sin, His faithful warnings and affectionate entreaties that they become men meet for fellowship with Himself, children of God in this world. He would have men united to Himself by faith and love, and all those personal forces which are active in the full surrender of being to being.

Thus to apprehend Jesus Christ is part of the urgent call of the gospel. By word and example we seek to enforce it; and we wrestle with God in prayer that His kingdom may come—a kingdom of men full of the grace and truth of Jesus Christ, of men who have put on Him as the very character of their being and their life.

Putting on Jesus Christ is adding to manhood's power. The more closely we approach Him in spirit, in temper, in virtue, in walk and conversation, the more abundantly we add to the fulness of our manhood. The ideal qualities of our manhood are all in Jesus Christ. He is the Son of Man; He is the peerless example of our humanity at its best. The spiritual qualities which we discern in Him are essential to true manhood; we must possess them if we are to be men in the highest sense.

Upon the spiritual resources of our manhood depend our moral capacity and our usefulness in the responsible relationships of life. In ideal manhood there is also an ideal adaptation of our personal service to the calls of obligation. The test of manhood comes when we realise that each one of us is a trustee of the common good; that we have duties into the discharge of which we must put our most generous endeavours; that, as citizens and neighbours, as masters and servants, as toilers in the several spheres of industry, we must be faithful to ourselves, and also to the just claims of others; that we have grave responsibilities in the sanctity of the home, in the bonds of friendship, in the activities of the Church; responsibilities grave indeed, but also of noblest kind, which we must seek to fulfil with sustained earnestness. There must, be no doubt and no hesitation about this. The fitness of a man for the duties of citizenship, and for the special labours of his wonted vocation—his meetness also for the closer personal relationships of life—depend upon the qualities, physical, intellectual and spiritual, which are characteristic of his manhood.

By spiritual manhood we mean that manhood in which the love of man, the love of righteousness, honour and truth, the love of patience and forbearance, the love of all that is beautiful and pure, the love of burden-bearing and service, is the inspiration of life, the ruling passion strong for battle and fearless of death. Such is our ideal as men who know the gospel and love it. Our devotion to Jesus Christ constrains us and enables us to build ourselves up in His likeness, and also to draw others into fellowship with Him—a fellowship whose consummation is that holy and eternal brotherhood, the kingdom of God.

II.

The economic value of the gospel now looks us full in the face. It is the salvation of manhood for the wholesome life of to-day. "We are sadly familiar with the pernicious action of base aims and vicious habits upon the nature and faculties of man. Experience is a painful, but honest teacher. It is the fool that does not give heed. We all know men of physical vigour, high mental development and practical capacity, in whom low conceptions of honour, selfish passions, and mean ways impoverish their powers, and prejudice the service which they do render, as well as make impossible the work which, with such excellent endowment, they might have done for mankind. Not the strength of a giant, nor the intellect of the loftiest genius, can hold out against moral instability, against the desolating sweep of physical lust or the debasing tyranny of greed, malice, envy, and hatred.

On the other hand, it stands beyond the risk of challenge that spiritual qualities increase the practical value of man's physical and intellectual gifts. In spiritual manhood we have not only the conservation of power; we have also the enrichment and application of power. Take a man of normal health and average mental equipment; fill out his life with the commonplace motives and manners of selfishness: it needs not a prophet to tell the further story of his life. Take another man of like natural gifts, and complete his manhood with the aspirations of the spiritual ideal: his life will prove him to be a man who does honest work and wins respect. He is a man of worth and honour. His manhood is not dominated by lusts and desires, that poison and pillage the resources of nature and opportunity. It is inspired and strengthened by the fostering authority of a holy obligation to the God of His being.

The end of the gospel is more than salvation from the corruption that is in the world by lust. It is the edification of the whole man in the truth and life which Jesus Christ has unfolded. "Yea, and for this very cause, adding on your part all diligence, in your faith supply virtue, and in virtue knowledge, and in knowledge self-control, and in self-control patience, and in patience godliness, and in godliness love of the brethren, and in love of the brethren love." Here, in homely words, we have the workaday garb and features of spiritual manhood. Is there unwholesome limitation here? Is there impoverishment? Is there aught but the buoyant

assurance of comfort and power for the good of the individual and the community? The economic value of the gospel is in Christian manhood; and by the economic worth of Christian manhood must the Church justify her existence.

III.

Manhood is the gospel ideal of wealth, personal and national. The man sound in body, vigorous in mind, pure in heart, generous in purpose, loving in thought, active in labour, hopeful in spirit—that man is the standard unit in estimating the wealth of a people. Manhood is the supreme value; it is wealth of bodily health, wealth of intellect, wealth of love, wealth of diversity in gifts, wealth of adaptation, wealth of power to turn nature's treasures into a ready ministry of human progress. Manhood is the joy of the home, the strength of the State, the basis and substance of imperial power. The men who love righteousness and hate iniquity, who speak the truth and scorn falsehood, who live in charity and good-will, abhorring malice and evil-speaking, who think not merely of their own things, but also of the things of others, who find exhilaration in industry, who wrest from the physical world secrets which lighten human burdens and sweeten human conditions, who count not their lives dear to them if by sacrifice the sorrow of the world shall be turned into joy—such men are wealth in the noblest sense. The secret of wealth is not in the mine, or in the factory; not in the fruitful field, or in the counting-house; not in the laboratory, or in applied science; but in the pure and enlightened conscience—that is, in Christian manhood.

We are familiar with the notion that material possessions constitute wealth; and no doubt we are too often called upon to deplore the destruction or the wasteful use of the material resources of wealth. Sheep and cattle perish in droughts, or by floods; wheat-fields are bereft of crops; the pastures are burnt up; mines are wastefully worked, or let lie idle in the cruel grip of speculation—businesses are badly managed, or hurled into bankruptcy by the mysterious surprises of the money market; enterprises that promised well are brought to ruin by the sheer perversity of man; and when such disasters come nigh us and touch us with the stinging friction of personal interest, we promptly and with sympathetic vigour cry "Loss! loss! huge loss! And we have sorrowful apprehension of the misery, perchance widespread misery, which lies behind it all. This is natural, and distinctly human.

But we should have as prompt and as sympathetic an apprehension of the huger disasters which, as a people, we are suffering through the chronic waste of manhood. Of late years, it is true, we have advanced far in the better appreciation of the national importance of sane and capable human life. Child-life not only receives our pity, but has also safeguarding legislation and the protection of public sentiment. We are more intelligently and jealously careful about the health conditions of labour. Moreover, when we hear of catastrophes involving loss of life on land or sea, we are not slow in the expression of our desolation of feeling. We count as heroes those who risk their lives to save the life of others. All honour to the brave; and so be it for ever. But we have a long way to go yet before we shall have reached a just appreciation of the true value of human life, either from the strictly personal or the national standpoint; we are yet far from an intelligent and passionate recognition of the unmeasured waste of wealth whose tragedy moves with such painful eloquence under our eyes, in almost every moment of our working existence. Our reformatories, our prisons, our asylums, ah! what painful lessons they mournfully teach us. What man of vital sensibility can regard without emotion the degradation and corruption of manhood through ignorance and vice, through evil environment, bad laws and bad customs, through wilful indulgence in selfish pleasure and other kinds of sin? Physical strength and bodily comfort, intellectual power and imaginative resource, moral sanity and spiritual beauty, all that constitutes the glory of man and provides joy in work, peace of home, fulness of inspiration, subtilty of invention, mutual confidence and brotherhood—all are lost to the national wealth through the degradation and depravity of manhood. What a portentous study! The gospel ideal bends over it—yes, broods over it, as the Saviour over Jerusalem, weepingly, but not without hope. For the gospel is the power of God unto salvation. Its grand objective is man. Its divine purpose is to build him up into strong and virtuous being.

IV.

The gospel, therefore, is in vehement antagonism to every tyranny and to every custom, to every ordinance, and every practice, which harass or injure man, which hinder self-development through the exercise of that freedom whereby he has the opportunity of approving himself as a son of God. It opposes its full strength to ignorance and vice; it counts him an enemy to God and to his kind who consciously encourages, in knowledge of its baleful effects, anything which weakens or destroys the distinctive capacities of man.

It is against the octopus of the liquor traffic, whose debasing and death-dealing influences are a scandal to conscience and to common-sense, as well as a cruel burden to the human heart. We who love the gospel, and

recreate our lives in the strength and refreshment of its truth, are under the most solemn and imperious obligation to use every honourable and instant means in order to deliver our fellow-beings from the curse of drunkenness and from the contributory causes; from a system of trading which encourages the vilest greed and sweeps into prison, asylum and cemetery a bigger wreckage of woe and ruin than any other destructive force known to us. Thank God, the gospel is for man, and against everything that hurts him.

It is against every system of money-making which robs the labourer of the just reward of his toil, which sets against his wasted body, his dwarfed mind, his shortened life, payment according to the iron law of wages. Where there are men living in the spirit of the gospel there can be no iron law of wages. We who follow Jesus Christ should be first—indeed, we must be first—to proclaim our detestation of any system which, glorying in itself as an effective and economical money-making machine, counts the health of manhood, the health of homehood, the health of nationhood, of less importance than solid dividends.

The gospel is against despotism of every kind; it is against the despotism of the unreasoning crowd which sets at nought law and order, and is cruel in its wrath; it is against anarchy, which sets on fire all the worst passions of man, which has never been and never will be the road-maker to peace and prosperity.

The gospel is against all those who take rent for unhealthy dwellings and for places where the worst vices are sheltered. What man who knows and loves the gospel could have a moment's peace, were his conscience testifying and saying, "You get your living out of houses where disease and sin are the paying tenants?" Nor should we who uphold the gospel as the supreme means of social salvation give a moment's respite to those who flout the gospel and live by the pollutions of their fellows. The gospel is against all who despise the sanctity of the person; and against every condition which makes birth into this world a curse and growth a futility.

V.

On the other hand, the gospel welcomes and encourages science, philosophy, poetry, art, commerce; every thinker, every worker, every institution, every system, everything which makes the body healthier, which invigorates and enriches the mind, which quickens and purifies the imagination, which enlarges and strengthens faith, hope, and love, adds zest, interest, and variety to life, and brings the sunshine of heaven into the bosoms and homes of all who live on earth.

Especially the gospel encourages education. Bring out of man all the power for good that is in him; declare how fearfully and wonderfully he is made; turn all his faculties to beneficent uses; increase the values of his nature; vindicate his right to call sun, moon, and stars his ministering servants; fit him to be master of every secret from the South Pole to the North Pole, from the central fire to the rounded seas. Thus the gospel speaks rejoicingly. For it is man, who has such wealth in his being, that the gospel would endue with the best of all knowledge—how to be lord of himself, and how to love his neighbour as a brother. It is because we love men and God's message to men that we rejoice so unfeignedly in modern pedagogy, and in the great advance which the science of teaching has made in our day. We mark with satisfaction the advantages which our children have in elementary and superior schools, which our young men and our young women have in our colleges and universities. Because we believe, with the gospel, that manhood is truest wealth, we hopefully anticipate the day when our people and our legislators will be so deeply convinced of the essential importance of educated manhood to the prosperity of the nation that the schools, colleges, and universities shall be made open and free to every young soul, from the A B C to the highest academic distinction. We look forward to that bright, good day, when the highway of knowledge will be as open and free as the beaten track which runs from the furthest home-stead to the capital of the Commonwealth.

VI.

All this I have said by way of illustrating and emphasising the gospel conception of manhood as the wealth of our people. Manhood, not money, is the standard; distinctly not money. Just for the moment, think how gross the popular conception of wealth is. "This man has money, houses, lands, and other possessions. He is wealthy. Ah! would not Australia be a grand country if every man in it had such potency of wealth? If we were all rich we should all be happy." So many are foolish enough to talk in this fashion. They do not think, they do not realise, what a reeking desolation Australia would be if their dreams of riches could materialise. The money lust is a chief curse, if not the chief curse, of our time. The madness of a nightmare befouls the waking hours of the day. This money lust is a cruel demon. To it we rightly attribute the heartless abuses of the competitive system of commerce—abuses which grind the human being till he sweats blood. "Commerce is war," says one. "Business is robbery," says another. "I am after dividends all the time," says a third. Thus and thus men in their selfish madness speak. Business is business; and religion is outside of it; philanthropy is outside of it. But why

stop here? Why not add, man-hood is outside of it?

One of the most evident outgrowths of the money lust is seen in the depraved sensuality of the over-rich. Through the apotheosis of wealth, corruptions of the basest sort eat the soul of good out of man. The sore-tried powers of invention fail in the quest of fresh pleasures and beguiling excitement, but the ponderous staleness of wealth remains—a woeful object. A marble mausoleum does not redeem an unprofitable life.

To the money lust we attribute the vile dishonesty which infests so many mines, factories, and business establishments. There you have inspectors, detectives, and searchers, check upon check, precaution upon precaution, watch upon watch, all to prevent the leakage caused by the borings of this canker-worm. Where money rules, dishonesty has a marketable value. And the cynic chuckles over the ancient insult to human integrity, that every man has his price.

It is the money-lust that gives vitality to the huge insanity of gambling, a vice which knows every nook and cranny of deceit, laughs at law, and defies the strictest scrutiny of the police.

It is the money-lust that makes home-life bankrupt, thus destroying a sacred institution which has in it the assured promise of the best and most abundant blessings for mankind.

And yet there are those who exalt silver and gold to the loftiest position as the standard of civilised prosperity—lucre and not manhood. But the Gospel of Jesus Christ resolutely stands by manhood.

Even if we consider material products as the main substance of national wealth, the perfecting of man's moral integrity would assure not less wealth, but more. The time and material now wasted through idleness, carelessness, inefficiency, and ignorance would be saved. Through equitable dealing the products of skill and labour, of expert knowledge and business facilities, would be more generously distributed. The comforts obtainable by money, instead of being crowded round the few in superfluity and dissipated in criminal wastefulness, would be shared by the many. Common-sense cannot fail to see that if those who handle capital, and those who are wage-earners or sharers in profit, were alike animated by the spirit of the gospel, the present demoralising agitations and conflicts must cease; the excess of riches here, and of poverty there, the gluttony of self-indulgence in high places, disease, bitterness of soul, and despair in obscure places, must come to an end.

VII.

Never was there more instant need for proclaiming the economic value of the gospel. Democracy is the power of to-day. It will be the greater power of to-morrow. And democracy is in deadly antagonism to privilege of birth and to privilege of wealth. The iron tongue of the warning bell is vibrant. This is the message we hear: "Democracy seeks economic salvation—that first. The relations between capital and labour are wholly unsatisfactory. The burden of guiltiness lies on the men who control capital. Capitalism is a bad machine, and out of date. It is worked by those whose common interest is but lust of profit; and this has made them unscrupulous. Meanwhile the masses pay, in sweat and blood, in ill-health and domestic misery, for the pride and grandeur and over-abundant wealth of the few. The balance is hard down on the side of those who engineer capital. It must be righted. Pair play is bonny play. Therefore, economic salvation is first, and everything else must take a lower place."

Very good; we understand this surge of angry protest. But what we utterly fail to understand is economic salvation without moral integrity. Legislation may create machinery; it cannot new-create men. The gospel can. Hence its value. New machinery, seemingly efficient, may be secured, but what about the men behind the machinery? An ideal system in the hands of incompetent men may be an even greater misfortune than a defective system in the hands of those who work primarily for their own interests. Given the ideal machinery, will it put an end to envy and strife, heart-burning and jealousy? Will it quench the fires of hatred, and turn the hot hearts of men into fountains of the living water of kindly brotherhood? If selfish gain is still to be the dominant motive, alas for the machinery, and alas for everybody! Unless uprightness and truth, loving kindness and good-will, permeate industrial and business life, not the best conceivable machinery can stay the inevitable doom. The law of righteousness is as imperious as the law of gravitation. Both laws are in the one God. Hence the earnest vehemency with which we urge manhood as the prime essential of economic salvation—the manhood which honours uprightness in thought, word, and deed, which bears the brother's burden, and loves out of the pure heart fervently. Hence it is that we insist upon the economic value of the gospel, which is the power of God

VIII.

Now, it may be quite justly remarked that all I have said is trite and commonplace. I certainly did not mean to say anything else; it is the commonplace that is of chief importance, and as a rule gets the least intensive regard. But I can imagine a ready protest of this sort: "We know well all you have told us; we have thought it

out as closely as you, and with a more painful interest. Only the blind fail to see that moral integrity is indispensable to prosperous economic life. But we can attain moral integrity without the gospel."

This is not news; all the same, it would be interesting to learn how. You will tell us that, if bad conditions are rectified, men will come to themselves; that, if they are trusted, they will respond to the sympathetic pressure of responsibility. Be it so. We are as hopeful as you, but something more is needed. You will tell us of excellent men who, as friends, neighbours, and citizens, lead exemplary lives, who are faithful also in their domestic relationships, who order their conduct simply by the rational principles of morality, and confess not the authority of Jesus Christ, save as the example of lofty ethical being. We all know such men, or have heard of them. We reckon them a good asset in the substantial wealth of the community. Your rational morality, born and bred in the world of hard experience—your sublime ethical principles, so lustrously beautiful in the few instances of rare endowment, of such priceless worth to our race—we accept at full value. But it is not enough. You will tell us of the great value of enlightened education, of the powers of assimilation evoked by sympathetic or magnetic teachers, of the treasures of wisdom and the vital inspiration which are to be found in our choicest literature, of the refining influence of music and other forms of art; you will, perhaps, add something about the discipline of sport, and of social fellowship, and of public affairs. These, you say, are factors in building up manhood. No doubt they are, and valuable, too. But are they sufficient? We say, "No." It is beyond their power to reach the height of Christian manhood. Do not forget that the finest ethical principles you set before us are deftly cut from the vesture of our Lord Jesus Christ. You take a bit of the raiment and leave the Lord. We would be clothed with the Spirit; we would put on Christ Jesus and be found in His likeness. We stand for the full gospel, for the gospel life, and for the gospel power. What Jesus Christ teaches He teaches to men whom He would draw to Himself, and whom He would fill with the spirit of power, that they may live in the beauty and strength of His doctrine. We stand for spiritual manhood, which is moral manhood plus something much higher and much stronger.

IX.

Now comes the question—How are we to give demonstration of the power of the gospel to build up manhood as I have described? A present-day demonstration is demanded—proof before the eyes of living men. We are called upon to show that the gospel is indeed the power of God. It must be shown through us. From this our faith does not shrink.

Shall we then address ourselves to the perfecting of the organisation of our Church, so that the ministration of the gospel and the outspreading of population shall advance with equal step? Without doubt we must steadfastly aim at this, and send the glad tidings farther than the railway goes, and as far as the swift post carries the mail and spreads the news of the world.

It is essential that we insist upon an evangelical pulpit, laying it upon our ministers with loving insistence to set forth Jesus Christ, the Seeker and the Saviour of sinners, in full tenderness, in all the sweetness of the gospel spirit, and in all the simplicity of the gospel manner. The Word is for all men, but in a peculiar sense it is God's message to the stricken and the lonely and the hopeless. Such are eager for it, in the day of their visitation. Of this we had refreshing testimony in the ever-memorable mission of the brave and godly men who came to us from America to fulfil for a season in our land the call of their Master. The enthusiasm of the multitudes was an inspiration. And the spiritual results were not without rich encouragement to all of us, but especially to those preachers whose hearts, through stress of labour, had lost something of the old-time fire, and to others, too, in whom the breath of worldliness had blighted their once-hopeful energies.

Shall we prosecute with zeal and judicious expedition the enterprise to which we have already put our hands—the union of the Churches—in order to save a sinful waste of time and money, of brain and spiritual energy, and to constitute one mighty army, arrayed against the forces of evil? This work is of God. The gospel calls for it. We must not deny its voice.

Shall we give more earnest heed to the careful training of our ministers? There is but one answer. We want men of learning, cultured men of the best university quality, if we can get them; but always men of sense as well as of learning—men with enthusiasm for Christ and their work; men who are men, and who love men; whose personal character is one with their zeal and their message; who are themselves in large part the message: who know men and the wiles of human nature, as well as its better possibilities; who can unseal the human heart, and read what is written therein.

Shall we devote more attention to our Sabbath Schools and kindred institutions? There is nothing nearer to our hearts than that our youth shall be built up in the knowledge of Jesus Christ, their Lord and their Saviour. Christian parents have a field here almost entirely their own. If they could be made to realise with more vivid feeling that the spiritual quality of home life is a mighty power in the making of Christian manhood, we should have a new spirit in the school, in the Bible class, in the congregation, and in the nation.

Shall we show our faith in the gospel truth that the world belongs to Jesus Christ by our generous devotion to Foreign Missions? God knows we do believe that the day is coming when every man shall bow to our Redeemer, and every tongue confess Him to the glory of God the Father. Let us show our faith by our works.

All these and many other things we must honestly strive to do, in order that the gospel be everywhere known in the fulness of its meaning, that men may judge of it, and God work through it. The full stature of Jesus Christ is our standard of manhood, the Spirit of God our power. We proclaim this; we believe it.

X.

There is yet more for us to do—the most important thing of all: we must ourselves be the demonstration of our doctrine that the gospel makes the best manhood. Here is the cross. We cannot escape it; nor would we. It is almost in vain that we appeal to the authority of the Word of God, or to the authority of the Church, or to the example of saints, or to the testimony of history. The world is impatient with us. The proof must be of to-day. And it must be in ourselves. This responsibility Jesus Christ has also put upon us. It is a burden and a glory. In our contact with men we have the divine opportunity. We know whom we have believed. We know that by faith Christ dwells in us. This means a new life, and a renewed manhood. Where is the life? Where is the manhood? Men must feel the life; must see the manhood—and in us. We do not shrink from the challenge. Our hope is in God. We trust in the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the great Head of redeemed humanity. He will enable us, humbly we say it, to build up in ourselves a noble and worthy manhood, in whose evident qualities the claim of the gospel to be of the highest economic value shall be completely justified—a manhood whose physical, intellectual, moral, and spiritual endowments shall make it the foundation and the ever-increasing substance and strength of the prosperity of our Common-wealth.

The treasuries of wisdom and knowledge contain no richer deposit than the gospel. We are eager to prove it. Therefore do we plead with those who call for present-day demonstration of the virtue of the gospel to give more diligent heed to the message of Jesus Christ, to put Him to the test, by taking Him whole-heartedly into their inmost life; to prove the gospel by the practice of it. Then should we have their generous help in creating upon the continent of Australia a Christian civilisation, that kingdom which is righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. If we are loyal to the gospel, we shall exalt our nation in righteousness. If we build up our people in righteousness, we shall secure economic salvation; not otherwise.

W. C. Penfold & Co., Printers, 183 Pitt Street, Sydney.

Front Cover

The Rationalist Press Association, Ltd.

Chairman: Edward Clodd *Honorary Associates:* Alfred William Benn Björnstjerne Björnson George Brandes Charles Callaway, M.A., D.Sc. Dr. Paul Carus Prof. B. H. Chamberlain Dr. Stanton Coit Dr. F. J. Furnivall F. J. Gould Prof. Ernst Haeckel Leonard Huxley Joseph McCabe Eden Phillpotts John M. Robertson Dr. Washington Sullivan Prof. Lester F. Ward Prof. Ed. A. Westermarck Thomas Whittaker *Auditors:* Messrs. Annan, Dexter, & Co., Chartered Accountants, 21, Ironmonger Lane, E.C. *Bankers:* THE LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, LTD. (Law Courts Branch). *Solicitors:* MESSRS. ELLIS, MUNDAY, & CLARKE, College Hill Chambers, 23, College Hill, London, E.C. *Secretary and Registered Offices:* CHARLES E. HOOPER, NOS. 5 and 6, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

How to Join and help the R.P.A.

The minimum subscription to constitute Membership is 5s., renewable in January of each year.

A form of application for Membership, with full particulars, including latest Annual Report and specimen copy of *Literary Guide*, can be obtained gratis on application to the Secretary.

Copies of new publications are forwarded regularly on account of Members' subscriptions, or a Member can arrange to make his own selection from the lists of new books which are issued from time to time.

To join the Association is to help on its work, but to subscribe liberally is of course to help more effectually. As subscribers of from 5s. to 10s. and more are entitled to receive back the whole value of their subscriptions in books, on which there is little, if any, profit made, the Association is dependent, for the capital required to carry out its objects, upon subscriptions of a larger amount and upon donations and bequests.

Rationalism as Defined In the Memorandum of Association:—

"The mental attitude which unreservedly accepts the supremacy of reason and aims at establishing a system of philosophy and ethics verifiable by experience and independent of all arbitrary assumptions or authority."

Introduction

Since the Dreyfus case set France quivering with agitation and drew the earnest attention of the whole civilised world, no judicial or semi-judicial procedure has stirred the feelings of men and women so profoundly as the execution of Francisco Ferrer y Guardia. The eyes of Europe have been directed to Barcelona with a keenness and suspicion that has completely baffled the Spanish censorship. Strictures have been passed on the Spanish Government's conduct by grave bodies of lawyers in France and Belgium, and by some of the most authoritative Conservative journals in Europe; while a wave of popular indignation has fallen on Madrid with a force that has dislodged the Government from its position. By an inevitable reaction the Press of Europe has been employed by a corps of anonymous contributors to besmirch the memory of the dead man, and to vindicate those who are responsible for his death. While leaders of culture, such as Sudermann, Maeterlinck, and Anatole France, have branded the execution of Ferrer as a judicial murder, a flood of stories and documents has been poured out which, if one-half the statements were true, would place the Spanish Government in the position of the most tolerant power on earth for its long forbearance.

Which side in the great controversy is right? It is no academic question. If a man whose only object in life was to uplift his fellows by educating them, who had no share whatever in the violent outbreak which was put to his charge, has been hypocritically tried and executed by persons whose corrupt interests were endangered by his educational work, then a foul and repellent murder has been perpetrated. Such murders do stain the chronicles of nearly every country in Europe, but they belong to a barbaric past. If Spain has stooped to such a murder in the twentieth century, the tattered mantle of its pride must be stripped from its shoulders; the corrupt system which finds room or need for such a crime must be laid bare to the eyes of the world.

A sympathetic student of Spanish life and letters, I have endeavored to ascertain the true story of Ferrer's life, work, and death. I have conscientiously considered the statements on both sides. I have scanned the columns of Spanish, French, Italian, Belgian, German, and English journals, and listened to the special pleadings of Roman Catholics, Conservative Spaniards, Freethinkers, Socialists, and Anarchists. I have, in a special visit to the Continent, closely examined men who had taught in Ferrer's schools—men who were in the midst of the tumult at Barcelona from July 26 to 29. I have plied Ferrer's intimate friends, some of whom are friends of my own, searched diligently for authoritative documents, submitted legal points to lawyers, listened to the pleas of opponents—in a word, made every conceivable effort to learn the truth. And that truth I now place before English readers in a plain narrative, with an enormous accumulation of proof.

The brief and astounding summary which I give here will be fully substantiated in the following chapters. I must ask the incredulous, shuddering reader to examine carefully the evidence I have gathered, and the counter-evidence which I analyze, before he allows his feeling to submerge his judgment. The number of English readers who understand Spain is exceedingly small. I trust that this plain and fully documented story of the real situation will prevent that fine and promising people from having its annals again stained, by those who hold power over it, with another such crime against humanity as the murder of Francisco Ferrer.

Ferrer was murdered. He had no connection whatever with the fatal disturbances which recently wet the streets of Barcelona with blood. He was in England a few weeks before the outbreak, and intended to remain in England for some months. The news that a dearly-loved niece was dangerously ill caused him to return to Barcelona. The child died; but another accident, a request for information from Paris, detained him in Barcelona over the fatal day. He wrote to a friend from Barcelona in the midst of the riots—wrote as a spectator, wondering what would happen next. Every word of this was proved by his letters to intimate friends. And when those friends sent these decisive letters to his advocate at Barcelona *they were stolen by the officials, and not suffered to be used in his defence.*

Ferrer had for many years held aloof from politics. Of the two chief groups of advanced political enthusiasts in Barcelona, the Republicans and the Anarchists, neither recognised him as entirely belonging to them. His work was education alone, and not one line of his school-books has yet been quoted, with chapter and verse, in the journals of any country in support of the calumny that his schools taught violent rebellion. They did not. Ferrer had political ideals, which I will duly describe; but his personal task was to make the people of Spain competent to use their judgment on political, social, and religious subjects. With single aim and noble self-sacrifice he used a comfortable estate in providing the schools which the Government refuses—in view of its own laws—criminally refuses, to provide. For providing those schools he was murdered.

But who in modern Spain could seek a man's life for erecting schools in which violent insurrection was not suggested? Here is the second part of my task. By a similar collection of authoritative proof I have to show how education alone, without any inspiration of violence, endangered certain corrupt interests and moved high-placed men to perpetrate a thinly veiled crime. As far as the Roman Church is concerned, the task is not

difficult. From time immemorial it has not argued with heretics, but burned them, where the conditions were medieval. The conditions are medieval in Spain. My evidence will show that it was the Barcelona clergy who first demanded that the riots should be put to the account of the founder of the Modern Schools. Other and most extraordinary evidence of the guilt of the Spanish clergy will be found in the pertinent chapter; but if I indicated its nature here, apart from the evidence itself, the reader would deem it incredible.

At first sight I seem to have a more difficult task in extending the guilt to the statesmen of Spain. In reality, one who is acquainted with Spanish literature could fill whole chapters with weighty denunciations of the utter corruption of the Spanish political system. I will lay before the reader such proof, even in the words of señor Maura himself, of that corruption that he will understand why Spanish politicians dread the educator of the people. I will show that the device of "suspending the constitutional guarantees"—or suspending civilisation—is a scandalous trick for throwing on legally incompetent military men the work of ridding the corrupt system of its critics without the inconvenience of a trial. I will show that the bomb outrages which are pleaded in justification are the work of the clergy and the civic officials. I will show that the witnesses against Ferrer—who were never cross-examined—would have failed ignominiously in any civil court, and that in a fair trial a mass of rebutting testimony would have been produced. All this was known to the Home Secretary, señor La Cierva, and the Prime Minister, señor Maura, and they also knew that only a military council would condemn Ferrer. I warned them that the evidence would be produced when Ferrer was dead. They have been swept from office by the indignation and disgust of Europe, but the memory of a brave and noble-spirited man remains to be vindicated.

This is the gist of the story which the following chapters will tell and substantiate. England stirred to some purpose with effective anger and disgust when Papal and Austrian power fought their bloody fight to retain the domination of Italy; but no single deed was done by those Powers comparable in enormity to this; for Ferrer used the pacific weapon of enlightenment. England was not restrained by consideration of France's internal politics when a corrupt body attempted to consign Dreyfus to a living death; and a greater wrong was done to Ferrer than was contemplated against Dreyfus. Many English journals, dissenting from Ferrer's views, have nobly pleaded for justice in Spain's treatment of him. But many English journals have opened their columns to the lying and reckless statements of the Spanish and clerical agents, mantled with anonymity, who have set out to poison the mind of Europe, and who fancied that bold mendacity would suffice where proof was wanting.

This little work is not made up of the contrary assertions of anonymous informants. It is built on solid and analysable evidence. I never met Ferrer, and do not write under the influence of his great personal charm. I do not share the ideal of Anarchism—a system, however, which must not be confounded with the use of explosives—and do not write in defence of a school of thought. I write as one who, after laborious search for the true features of the case, feels that a man of noble aspirations has been murdered by corrupt politicians, at the instigation of an equally corrupt Church, and I trust that an exposure of their corruption will enable English men and women to keep in memory the name of one more man who has died in what he believed to be the cause of humanity, and to watch the course of events in Spain with more enlightened interest.

Chapter I. The Life and Aims of Ferrer

FRANCISCO FERRER Y GUARDIA was born at Alella, in one of the quiet vine-clad valleys of Catalonia, January 10, 1859. Nothing in his origin gave promise of the distinguished career which has been brought to so tragic a termination. For half a century Spain had been washed with blood, and the new aspirations of Europe had fought valiantly for a place in its life. Over Spain had been spread the titanic struggle of Napoleon I. and England. To Spain the Holy Alliance had sent back the Catholic monarch, who, with a lying oath to observe the Constitution, had turned on his more enlightened subjects with a ferocity that far outran the "white terror" of France, Austria, and the Papal States. Over Spain had raged, when Ferdinand VII.'s bloody reign was over, the long and violent conflict of Liberals and Conservatives, Clericals and Anti-clericals.

No valley of Spain was so remote or so densely ignorant as to be insensitive to the prolonged and murderous conflict of the old and the new ideas, but it was only a vague and confused echo that rumbled in the ears of the peasantry. Usually only one man in their village could read—the priest—and the version he gave them of the distant battles was couched in the language of the seminary. The Liberals were the forerunners of Antichrist. The mouth of the pit had been suffered to open; the emissaries of Satan were then, in 1859, in power at Madrid. They had ventured, two years earlier, to pass a law of universal elementary education. So the small vineyard-owner Ferrer and his wife—from whom, by a pretty Spanish custom, the martyred teacher took the name of Guardia—shrank closer to their church, looked on letters as more dangerous than wine or pretty faces, and bought their indulgences of the *cura* with a complete ignorance that Europe at large had trodden them underfoot three hundred years earlier.

One thing of import Francisco Ferrer, to keep the shorter name by which he will live, inherited from his parents—vigour of character. The cardinal mistake of English judgment on Spanish affairs is the belief that Spain is an outworn and decadent nation. It is a complete and fatal misunderstanding. The new ideas have had to fight a sterner battle in Spain than in any other country, except (in recent years) Russia, and the best blood of the country has been spilled like water. Yet the enthusiasts for progress have re-formed their shattered ranks decade after decade, and it is only by the unscrupulous and barbaric procedure, of which this story will give a vivid illustration, that the medieval abuses have been retained by Church and State. Spain does not lack vigour or ambition. But its vigour is in part paralysed by the deliberate refusal of education, and in part suppressed by an utterly unscrupulous political system and an apprehensive Church.

Seven years after Francisco's birth, in 1866, the reactionaries again resorted to the expedient of bleeding Spain to reduce its insurgent vigour. By that time Europe at large had fought and won the battle for freedom of ideas. The Papal monarchy was shrinking before the advance of enlightened Italy, while the English fleet encouraged the advance from the blue shores. But Spain, an isolated fragment of the Middle Ages, escaped or deceived the eyes of Europe, and perpetrated infamous deeds in defence of the ruling clerical and political interests. Even then Spain proved its vitality. The progressive forces, seeing that disunion had put them at the mercy of reaction, joined once more and effected a revolution. An Italian prince, Amadeo of Savoy, was called to the throne, but his foreign ways gave material to the malcontents, and Amadeo retired in mortification from his hostile kingdom. Then the Cortes (Parliament) proclaimed the Republic of 1873, by 258 votes to 32—a triumph won by the Progressists, it must be remembered, after seventy years of war and brutal persecution.

It is at this period that the son of the vineyard cultivator in the quiet Catalonian valley comes to years of discretion. Devoid of education, living in a family of fanatical orthodoxy, the lad had no encouragement to lean towards rebellion. His brother Jose was a young iconoclast, it is true, with a destructive aversion for objects of piety. But Francisco was quiet and respectful. I do not labour the obscure details of his boyhood. We have graver matters to consider. All that one need note is that, as Francisco advanced into youth, his younger spirit responded to the cries that echoed from over the hills, and he began to differ profoundly from his father. At the age of thirteen he was sent to Barcelona, some twelve miles away, to take service in a drapery establishment. The proprietor had known religious persecution, and his anticlerical temper was communicated to the industrious and intelligent boy, who became a great favourite. By his twentieth year he openly declared himself Republican, and the family link was broken. A few years later he joined the Freemasons.

It is important to understand Ferrer's early revolutionary career, because some of the documents which were embodied in the charge against him belong to this early period. Those who framed the charge were well aware of the real nature of these documents. They knew the recent history of Spain, and the part that Ferrer had played in it. But few people outside the country are acquainted with the stirring and complicated story of Spain's political development in the later nineteenth century, and Ferrer's murderers found it possible to surprise foreigners with revolutionary documents and insist, mendaciously, that they were of recent date. They belonged to Ferrer's early manhood, and were curious relics of a phase in his career that he had long outlived.

The figure in Spanish political life that caught the eye of the young Catalonian was that of Ruiz Zorrilla, the brilliant and passionate leader of the Republican Progressist party. Zorrilla had been one of the leading spirits in the revolution of 1868, and had then joined in the importation of Amadeo of Savoy, under whose short reign he occupied the post of Minister of Public Instruction. Ferrer was destined to enter into close co-operation with him, and in Zorrilla's anti-clerical, Republican ideal and zeal for education one can see the early source of his inspiration. If the reader finds the atmosphere of rebellion unfamiliar, I must remind him of the long decades of bloody persecution that the Church and the old dynasty had perpetrated, and must ask his reserve until later chapters have set before him the repellent features even of the actual Church and political world. Spirited and enlightened men, when they had no interest in the existing caucus, or refused to put self before humanity, were muttering rebellion all over Spain. The reign of Charles I. in England was not a juster ground of revolt.

When Amadeo was driven out and the Republic of 1873 was set up, Zorrilla went to Paris and declared that he renounced politics. He returned to Spain, however, when the army destroyed the short-lived Republic and enthroned Alfonso XII. He then formed his Republican Progressist party, and worked with remarkable success. The army had made or marred revolutions, and the army must be republicanised; so he pushed his propaganda with great effect among the military. Francisco Ferrer, who had left his home on account of his advanced ideas, was now an inspector of railways, and was in a position to render important service by conveying the secret communications from centre to branch.

This was in the early eighties—Ferrer's early twenties. Undoubtedly he was then devoted to the cause of violent revolution, and any document that merely implies such a sentiment—setting aside the gross and clumsy forgeries which involved murder and pillage—can very well be admitted for this early period. It was only through a very natural ignorance of this period of Ferrer's career that English people were persuaded to accept

them as sentiments of the mature Ferrer. We shall see immediately how his ideas evolved. Revolution was a familiar thing in recent Spanish history. There had been seven revolutions in the preceding seventy years, and those who desired the remedying of Spain's repellent maladies turned instinctively to that method.

This period of Ferrer's life culminated in 1885. That was the year of the abortive revolution led by General Villacampa, and Ferrer took part in a local Catalanian rising. The insurrection was suppressed. General Villacampa was condemned to death, but the sentence was commuted to deportation by the Queen Maria Christina; a point worth remembering in view of the statement that a Spanish monarch has no such prerogative. France, as usual, received the fugitives, and both Zorrilla and Ferrer settled in Paris, where Ferrer filled the honorary position of secretary to Zorrilla.

In this decade of life in Paris we have a second and very interesting period in the young man's career. I need not dwell long on the material details. With the inevitable limitations of a foreigner, he found life hard at first, and attempted to obtain subsistence as a commission agent. The occupation failed, and it is difficult to trace his movements for a few years. What is clear is that, after a time, we find him in the position of professor of languages at the Philotechnic School in Paris. A writer in *Le Temps* remembers him as "a man of iron will, and especially an idealist a model professor, giving excellent lessons in a very original manner." He is described as "a man of medium height, very nervous and refined, with extraordinary eyes, like live coals, and a look that one could never forget." His lessons were much sought, and he made lasting and devoted friends in the French metropolis. One who knew him there a few years later tells me that he had a comfortable and refined home, using his resources with great ability and moderation. Since he had first become conscious of his lack of culture, he had studied most assiduously, and held a high position as teacher. It is another element that enters into the ideal of his later life.

That ideal slowly took shape in the pacific, intellectual atmosphere of Paris. I wish to speak with the most complete candour on the important aspects of Ferrer's personality and ideals. Skulking under the disguise of anonymity, there are writers who have shamefully traduced a murdered man, and nothing that one can say will escape misrepresentation in the cheap Roman Catholic journals. But I am laying my case before those men and women who would form an honest judgment on this great crime, and it is my duty to place before them the facts as I know them. I have examined half-a-dozen intimate friends of Ferrer on the evolution of his ideas. It is unfortunate that he wrote no work from which one can learn his mature views. An elementary Spanish grammar is his only literary work. But there are passages enough in his letters and journal to bear out entirely the judgment I formed, after closely questioning his friends, on his later views.

I must say at once that the statement of some of his less intimate friends, that he came to hold views akin to those of Tolstoy or those of our English Quakers, is denied by those who knew him better. On the other hand, there is not the slightest doubt that, after his long sojourn in Paris, Ferrer ceased to advocate, counsel, or in any way encourage violent insurrection. I have spoken fully on the matter with his intimate Anarchist friends, and the utmost that any of them claimed was that he did not go out of his way to condemn other people's methods. His method was that of education. Do not let me be misunderstood. He did not educate without an ulterior ambition. He trusted that an educated Spanish nation would put an end to that corruption of Church and State which I will presently describe, and which fills modern Spanish literature with laments. But he nowhere, either directly or indirectly, suggested or counselled violence. He held aloof from active participation with any political party in Barcelona, and was absorbed in his schools.

This will be quite apparent as we follow him through the last decade of his career, but it is important to establish that he went back from France to Spain with no intention to engage in political work. We shall see the nature of the "evidence" against him on this point later. It has not the shadow of a particle of value. For the moment I will give a few of the many weighty testimonies to his real views and disposition.

The first testimony is his own explicit declaration, published in the Barcelona Republican weekly, *Fructidor*, February 8, 1907. He had been asked to furnish an account of the origin of the Modern School, and, in referring to the idea which inspired it, he said: "When Zorrilla died I lost all my confidence, which had been already much weakened, in the results of a revolution effected by superficial revolutionaries, who were themselves the victims of much the same prejudices as the monarchists whom they would deprive of power. From that time forward I devoted all my activity to the task of establishing a school which, in my humble opinion, might serve as a model for all the schools which advanced bodies were endeavouring to found, in order to preserve the child from the mendacious teaching of the official schools. That was the origin of the Modern School." This emphatic repudiation of revolution, in a Republican paper, to be read by his friends of all parties in Barcelona, is decisive. It was not submitted at his "trial." It is supported by the testimony of all who knew him.

As I go to press an important article on Ferrer appears in the *Nineteenth Century* (November). The writer, M. Naquet, is not only a high Parisian authority, both from the cultural and the political point of view, but he knew Ferrer well, and had given material assistance to Ruiz Zorrilla in his revolutionary campaign. He was in

close touch with Ferrer during the fifteen years he spent in Paris, and later, and describes their relations as "of the most fraternal character." Further, M. Naquet himself openly advocates the removal of corruption and abuses in Spain and Russia by violent methods. His authority is, therefore, quite apart from his well-known personality, extremely great, if not decisive. And this is what M. Naquet writes on the subject: "Ever since the days when he acted as the lieutenant of Don Zorrilla, Ferrer's point of view had undergone profound modifications. The successive checks to all the Spanish conspiracies in which he had been involved, and his deeper study of the domestic quarrels which had ruined the Spanish Republic of 1873, had imparted a new direction to his political ideas. He had arrived at the conclusion that the employment of violence is useless; that, despite its apparent swiftness, it is the slowest method in the end. Without going to the length of accepting the doctrine of resignation, or accepting the passive-resistance theory of Tolstoy—he was far from that—he believed that the surest and quickest way to progress was that pacific way which consists in transforming by means of education the conceptions of one's contemporaries." These are not the ideas of M. Naquet, when there is question of such countries as Spain and Russia, nor do the words express a mere inference in regard to Ferrer's development. The point was often debated between the two friends, and to Naquet's contention the younger man used to reply: "Time respects only those institutions which time itself has played its part in building up. That which violence wins for us to-day another act of violence may wrest from us to-morrow. Those stages of progress alone are durable which have rooted them-selves in the mind and conscience of mankind before receiving the final sanction of legislation. The only means of realising what is good is to teach it by education and propagate it by example."

These were the real sentiments of the man who was shot on the charge of having led or inspired a violent rising of obviously hopeless character; and M. Naquet expressly adds that these ideas took deeper and deeper root in the mind of his "noble friend" in the later years. But, the astonished reader will ask, why was not the testimony of so authoritative a man as Naquet brought forward at his trial? Listen. "I communicated this crucial fact," M. Naquet proceeds, "to his noble defender, Captain Francisco Galcerán, but he was not allowed to read my letter, any more than the others which were received from England and France in exculpation of his client." We shall see that this is only one of the "crucial facts" that were suppressed by the servants of the Spanish State and Church.

The whole article must be read, in the *Nineteenth Century*, November. In conversation with me M. Naquet expressed his great pleasure at being allowed to vindicate his friend in one of our leading reviews.

Another French writer who knew him, André Morizet, gives the same testimony in *L'Humanité*. "Intellectually," he says, "Ferrer was not one of us. He was one of those who prove refractory to all ideas of organisation, and expect the renovation of the old world solely by the development of freedom of conscience. He not only kept aloof from the action of political parties, but even Trades Unionism had little interest for him." The last phrase must not be taken too strictly, however.

From distant Italy comes the same testimony. In an article in *La Ragione* (Rome, October 10) Oddo Marinelli writes: "Fifteen years in Paris, in constant expectation of the revolution which was to regenerate his country, had caused him to lose all hope that Spain would rise again through the efforts of revolutionaries. Having taken part in the many attempts at revolution engineered by Zorrilla, he came to the conclusion that the education of the child alone would lead to the betterment of men and to the dawn of happier days for his unhappy country." Marinelli adds that Ferrer wrote (May 27, 1907) from his prison cell to a group of Barcelona youths: "Do not let us play with words. Liberals, Republicans, or Anarchists—these were, and are, words to be avoided by us who march with all our hearts towards the ideal of human regeneration."

These concordant testimonies are a few out of the many that have been published, and agree entirely with the words of the seven or eight personal friends of Ferrer with whom I have spoken. We shall find him, true to that ideal, looking on, passively and wonderingly, when the crowds are seething about him in the fatal days of July at Barcelona. The fifteen years of study, observation, and reflection at Paris had induced him to turn from revolutionary ways to an ideal of education. Of "revolution" he still spoke and wrote frequently; but he always said "social revolution." He gained belief in the power of ideas. To the end he had cherished friends of the revolutionary school. He did not criticise their hopes and methods, but followed his own.

A distinguished Anarchist said to me: "To the Republicans he was an Anarchist; to the Anarchists he was a Republican." It is the finest statement of the political position he had reached. The works of Professor Reclus and Prince Kropotkin had a fascination for him. With them he believed—little wonder after his experience of the Spanish political world—that a decentralised administration of a nation's affairs, leaving the maximum of liberty to the individual, was the best ideal of society. This is the real gist of Anarchism. Its accidental alliance in a few cases—about one in a thousand Anarchists in Spain, a Spanish Anarchist tells me—with the use of dynamite must not blind us. As a social ideal it has a right to plead at the bar of public discussion like any other. But the work to be done immediately in Spain was to educate, and Ferrer eschewed political organisations to turn teacher.

He was then nearing his fortieth year. A teacher of merit in a small institution, unknown to the world, he moved restlessly under the burden of his ideal. The great contrast of France and Spain saddened him. The Spanish law of universal education was a comedy, as we shall see. Two-thirds of the Spaniards could neither read nor write at the beginning of the twentieth century. Only a few million could both read and write. One-third of the population of Madrid were utterly illiterate. In such a soil corruption thrived vigorously. The reflection, the contrast, burned into Ferrer's mind, and made education his constant day-dream. How was a young man of no fortune and no authority to educate a people, to fight the hostile influences of both Church and State? And suddenly an unexpected stroke of fortune put a powerful weapon in his hand, and he flew back to Spain to establish his now famous schools.

Among the many who admired the young teacher of the Philotechnic school and listened to his fervid ambitions was a wealthy Roman Catholic lady, Mlle. Meunier. She caught the glow of his enthusiasm, and, when she died at the end of the century, left him an estate in Paris worth some £30,000.

His relations with Mlle. Meunier have provided material for the anonymous writers who have thought fit to serve some cause or other by recklessly slandering the dead man. How some of their suggestions came to be printed passes understanding; but we may notice one Catholic untruth. A priest wrote in the *Manchester Guardian* that Ferrer had deceived this pious Roman Catholic lady, who believed he would employ her money in accord with her religious convictions. It is difficult to consider such puerilities seriously. Ferrer knew Mlle. Meunier for three years. He argued constantly against her religious beliefs. She knew him as an extreme Rationalist during the whole of that time, and she left the money to him, unreservedly, to be used as he thought fit. She thoroughly understood that he would use it in carrying out his new ideal. How educated men can, in such circumstances, suggest that she believed Ferrer, the notorious Agnostic and anti-clerical, would expend the money much as the priest would do is a problem I do not care to discuss. As the reader will guess, and as I was informed in Paris by those who knew her, Mlle. Meunier was really very unsound in dogma, not in judgment. Ferrer assured her that he would only accept the money as a trust for the foundation of secular schools, but she bequeathed it to him without any directive clause.

So Francisco Ferrer set out for Barcelona, eight years ago, with uplifted and unselfish feelings. Many things had happened in Barcelona since he had last seen it. Exiles had invaded his home in Paris with stories of brutality and injustice—stories we shall consider later—that hardly any but a Spaniard could credit. The tortures of the Inquisition had been revived. The corrupt officials of Church and State had descended with ferocity on the new generation that aspired to liberty and progress. Ferrer would not give them occasion to destroy his work. It would be such as civilisation could protect. But its ultimate outcome would be that those grim dungeons of Montjuich would never again echo with the groans of tortured men, nor would priests and politicians any longer keep Spain in the far rear of human advancement. And within five years he would be fighting for his life in the courts of Spain. Within eight years he was to yield up his life in the trenches of Montjuich to the forces he had challenged.

This tragic ending to so fine an ambition has so perplexed Europe that I cannot proceed further until I have plainly described, with adequate evidence, that profound corruption of Church and State to which I have already alluded. One point, however, remains to be considered in regard to Ferrer's earlier years. His domestic conduct has been so grossly impugned that one is compelled to say a few words about it.

Ferrer's legal wife was a woman of heated temper and pronounced orthodoxy. Needless to say, the difference of views drew on him painful attacks from his wife, especially after the birth of their three daughters, Trinidad, Paz, and a young girl, Sol, who is at school in Madrid. Ferrer was a Freemason, and had his elder daughters initiated in a Masonic ceremony. The irritation of the mother ended in a revolver-shot, and Ferrer, instead of prosecuting, consented to a separation. The eldest daughter works in a bakery or confectionery at Paris, and received help from her father until his imprisonment. The second daughter, who has entirely discarded her father's views, is an actress—a Catholic and Royalist. Both were profoundly attached to their father, and depicted him in the most affectionate terms in the Paris Press. Both honoured his conviction that the money bequeathed to him was a trust for humanity, and should be spent in public work, not on them. Trinidad, in the fine spirit of her father's wish, even refuses the help now willingly offered her, and supports herself by her own labour.

Mme. Ferrer went to Russia. There she joined the Orthodox Church, obtained a divorce, and remarried. For Ferrer himself no divorce was possible. In spite of the general immorality, the clergy of Spain cling to the antiquated ideal, and bitterly oppose a law of divorce. When, therefore, Ferrer found among his teachers at Barcelona a woman of great charm and helpfulness, a true and sustaining companion in his arduous struggle, he was not at liberty to contract legal marriage with her. It is one of those very exceptional cases that need only to be known in their true features. We have known such in high circles in England, and understood. But for the Spanish clergy, with their own body deeply infected with immorality, with their genial toleration of the most flagrant laxity in their most religious centres, to make a crime or a vice of this act of Ferrer's is one of those

pieces of insolence which one can only brush aside. To his real wife, Soledad Villafranca, and to his daughters, Ferrer was very sweet, affectionate, and generous. The world knows how bitterly they have mourned their loss.

I have anticipated the virtual marriage of his later years, since it must be understood in the light of his experience at Paris. Now I must take up the thread of the story, and describe those features of the Spanish Church and the Spanish system of Government which alone explain the ferocity with which his death was designed and accomplished. It is true that his educational work undermined the authority of Church and State. But what a Church and what a State!

Chapter II. The Church in Spain

NEARLY four hundred years ago a rebellious monk set Europe aflame with insurrection against the authority of Rome. Corrupt, sensual, sceptical, laughing at its own devices, the Court of Rome ruled a densely ignorant world with a levity born of ten centuries of secure domination. The world was growing, however, and the sonorous appeal of Luther brought it to sudden manhood. As is well known, one of the historic abuses that fired the indignation of Luther was the sale of indulgences. Scornfully he tossed aside the priestly casuistry that would represent the transaction as no "sale," but the "giving" of a spiritual favour—in return for a sum of money. Half of Europe followed the German monk. But for the armies of Spain and Austria the Papacy would probably have been erased from the map of Europe two hundred years ago. Sell indulgences! Protestants look back with amazement on the Papal audacity, and take it as a measure of the dense ignorance of the Middle Ages that even the attempt should be made. It is a test of medieval conditions, a plumbing of the depths of ignorance. And indulgences are sold by the million all over Spain to-day, under the direct and annual authority of the Vatican!

The sale of indulgences is so historic a symbol of Papal corruption that I cannot do other than take it as the first point in my indictment of the Spanish Church. I refused to believe the fact when it was first brought to my notice, long after I had quitted the Catholic ministry. My informant, an American gentleman who had lived in Spain for more than ten years, forwarded to me copies of these *bulas*, as they are called, and the truth was evident. I have since made full inquiries, written on the subject, been "answered" by an English Jesuit—who explained that the indulgence was a pure gift from the Church, in return for a specific sum of money, much as (he did not say this) your soap or your butter is—and have lost all doubt on the subject.

On the windows of Catholic book-shops in Spain one often sees the word "Bulas" in large type. You enter and ask for a "bula"—or you may go to the nearest priest's house for one—and find that there are four species, at two different prices. Lay a *peseta* on the counter, and demand the ordinary "bula de la Santa Cruzada." A flimsy piece of paper, much sealed and impressed, about a foot square, and with the signature of the Archbishop of Toledo, is handed to you, with your change of 25 *centimos*. You have *not* bought it. You gave an "alms" of 75 *centimos* (about 6d.) to the Church (minus the shopman's commission), and the Church graciously accorded you—but it would occupy too much of my space even to enumerate the extraordinary spiritual privileges which you can purchase for sixpence in that favoured land. The central grace is a "plenary indulgence."

Catholic theology teaches that there are two alternatives to heaven, two unfathomable pits of fire—Hell and Purgatory. If you die in serious, unabsolved sin, you go to hell; but few Catholics ever think of going there. It is so easy to get oneself drafted into the second department. But the second department, Purgatory, is exceedingly unpleasant; the fire and other horrors are the same; the duration is uncertain. Here, again, however, the Church comes to the relief. Confession and sorrow have relieved you of the first danger; something may be done to avoid the second. In earlier and harder times one went on the Crusades to achieve this. Some Spaniards offered the Papacy money instead, and received the comforting assurance that the Purgatory-debt was cancelled (a "plenary indulgence"). The sum has sunk with the course of centuries, and now in Spain you gain this gorgeous assurance, with a dozen others, for an "alms" of sixpence. But attempt to give your alms to the poor, and you get no *bula*.

That is the common *bula* of Spanish church life. The rich, of course, pay more than the small sum which is stated on the paper; and as the ignorant peasants find frequent need of this comforting assurance, since it only lasts until they sin again, the amount which the Church derives annually from this sordid source of revenue can be imagined. Another *bula*, of the same price, gives you the same comforting assurance in regard to any deceased friend to whom you may wish to apply it. Since, however, it is never quite sure that your "disposition" came up to the required altitude, you do well to continue buying and trying. A third *bula* is even cheaper, yet more substantial in its advantages. For 50 *centimos* (less than fivepence) you obtain permission to eat meat on Fridays and on most of the days on which Catholics in less favoured countries must not eat meat. Unfortunately, you find that the *bula* is invalid unless you buy the other *bula* as well; but ten pence is fairly

cheap for a year's permission to disregard the fast-days.

The fourth *bula* is the most infamous, unless the reader chooses to regard it with humour. Technically, it is known as the "composition"—an excellent word. It says that, if you have any stolen property of which you cannot discover the rightful owner, the purchase of this *bula* makes the property yours. The pickpocket does not usually know the address of his victim; and though the *bula* declares that the theft must not be committed in view of the *bula*, the practised conscience of a Spanish thief easily negotiates that difficulty. But this is not the full enormity or the full justification of the title "composition." One *bula* costs about a shilling, and covers about twelve shillings' worth of ill-gotten goods. For every additional twelve shillings you have stolen you must give one to the Church; in other words, take out a fresh *bula*. And—let me quote the incredible words of the document—"in the event of the sum due exceeding 735 pesetas 50 centimos [25], the amount compoundable by fifty Summaries, application must be made to Us for a fitting solution of the case"! The priest will take his tithe of your knavery on a scale he thinks fit to determine.

Let it be clearly understood that I am not reproducing the statements of writers, travellers, or residents; I am describing, or translating, the very words of the *bulas*, copies of which lie before me. Incredible as the facts will seem to most readers, there is only one quibble which the zealous Catholic, in his misguided wish to defend the Spanish Church, can raise: he will demur to the phrase "bought" and "sold." I may safely leave that question of casuistry to the British reader. From this appalling traffic the Spanish Church draws millions upon millions of pesetas every year—from the rich, who thus pay for its political support, and from the densely ignorant peasantry, whose hard-won centimos are stolen by this abominable chicanery.

English Roman Catholics who heard of the traffic for the first time innocently drew the attention of the Vatican to it, and were, after repeated letters, snubbed for their intrusion. The truth is that the whole traffic is under the control of the Vatican. These *bulas* are no bits of medieval parchment that have lingered into the dawn of the twentieth century; they are printed afresh every year, and they cannot be issued until an annual permission comes from Rome. Then a procession of heralds marches through the streets of Madrid announcing the glad news that Spain's unique privilege has been renewed. What a spectacle! Through streets equipped with the latest achievements of modern science there still marches the medieval troop, crying in the ears of educated Madrid that Spain still lives in the fifteenth century. I have only to add that until 1870 the Vatican openly took a percentage on this sordid traffic. In these days of inquisitive American and English converts we do not know what the understanding is between the Papacy and the Archbishop of Toledo, who issues and seals those symbols of the Spanish Church's degradation.

From the sale of indulgences I pass to other features of Spanish Church life which are hardly less repellent. One of the most offensive practices that the traveller notices in modern Spain is the persistent begging. There are 91,226 beggars in Spain, and they regard themselves as practising a profession which has the peculiar sanction of the Church. A resident in Spain informed me that he was boldly accosted for alms by a man whom he knew to have a flourishing market-garden near his own residence. Mrs. Bates, in her *Spanish Highways and Byways*, tells a story of a German lady who was accosted by a beggar. With modern feeling she explained to him that she would do something more pleasant than give him alms; she would give him an opportunity to earn the money. He drew his cloak about him with the dignity of a hidalgo, as he replied: "Madam, I am a beggar, not a labourer." The Church is directly responsible for this tribe of repulsive idlers. Her edifices are thrown open periodically that pious ladies may distribute bread, wine, and cigarettes to the sitting crowd of professional beggars.

Far heavier, however, is the guilt of the clergy in regard to the atrocious proportion of illiterates in Spain. We in England are urged to regard the Catholic Church as the great founder of schools, the educator of Europe. The claim is easily tested. There are still three parts of Europe where her power is unbroken—Spain, Portugal, and Southern Italy. In Spain the proportion of illiterates is 68 per cent., in Portugal it is 78 per cent., and in southern Italy—in Calabria—it is 79 per cent., of the population.

I have explained that a law of compulsory education was passed in Spain, under Liberal pressure. By 1877 four millions out of sixteen could read and write, and in the subsequent thirty years the ratio has only arisen to six in eighteen and a-half million people. The teacher is awarded a salary of about £20 a year, so that the character of such instruction as is given may easily be conjectured. Cut the State will not even provide this sum, and schoolmasters are thrown on the voluntary donations of parents. The result is that the vast majority of the children get no instruction, and the schoolmaster is the butt of Spanish wit. The Madrid papers gave a case in 1903 of a master who canvassed a district to find how many parents would contribute if he opened a school. Three families in one hundred promised to contribute. In another place, not far from Madrid, the alcalde endeavoured to enforce the law, which is universally disregarded, that there should be no bull-fights where the master's salary was not paid. The infuriated people drove the teacher to the plaza and baited *him*. Thousands of children in Madrid itself have no school accommodation.

For this state of uncivilisation the guilt must be equally divided between the Church and the State. Neither

wishes to see the people educated. The reasons of the Church will be suspected by the reader without difficulty. The reasons of the statesmen of Spain for withholding education will become apparent in the next chapter. In one important respect, however, the Church has the greater guilt. Poor the State is, undoubtedly, though no sane social student will fail to see how profitably a large part of its expenditure would be diverted to education. But the Church is wealthy, immensely wealthy. The vast revenue I have already described, together with all parochial dues and collections, goes to the secular (or parochial) clergy, in whose larger churches and cathedrals immense treasure has accumulated. While the workers in parts of Spain must labour for about five *pesetas* (3s. 6d.) a week, and while despairing schoolmasters must set their hands to whatever incongruous employment they can discover to augment their £10 to £20 a year for teaching in barn-like structures, the wealthier churches house incalculable treasure, and the clergy usually live in great comfort. The wardrobe of the image of the Virgin at Toledo would alone suffice to build hundreds of fine schools. One robe bears, says Mrs. Bates, "85,000 large pearls, and as many sapphires, amethysts, and diamonds." The crown used to decorate the statue is worth £5,000, and the bracelets £2,000. The total value of this useless and senseless jewellery in the great churches of Spain is beyond calculation; and the country is too poor to educate more than a part of its children, and that with ridiculous inadequacy. Cordova alone has 600 priests to 55,000 people; and Cordova is on the verge of bankruptcy.

But this overwhelming sufficiency of parochial clergy, with its incalculable wealth, is not the chief source of offence to enlightened Spaniards. A vast population of monks and nuns and Jesuits, who do no parochial work, is spread over the land, and amasses wealth with even greater success than the secular clergy. In the heated conflicts of the two bodies the truth is suffered to leak out. A Spanish prelate, Mgr. José Veleza de Gunjado, has recently declared that these regulars (monks and nuns) own two-thirds of the money of the country and one-third of the wealth in property, etc. While they flaunt vows of poverty before the ignorant peasantry, they draw out of the healthy circulation of the impoverished country a colossal proportion of its resources. A religious review (the *Revista Cristiana*—quoted in Diercks's *Das moderne Geistesleben Spaniens*) gave the income of the Jesuit body at Manresa alone as more than, £15,000 a year, and this is only one among a thousand instances of an immensely wealthy community. Before the Philippine Islands were taken from Spain the Church drew 113,000,000 *pesetas* a year from the Islands, the State being content with a further 66,000,000. Barcelona had 165 convents until the recent riots, many of them worth hundreds of thousands of pounds. The province of Catalonia supported 2,300 of these institutions.

Nor must the English reader be misled by audacious Catholic assurances that these wealthy communities represent the voluntary piety of the faithful, and are holy retreats to which the timid may retire from "the world." Even in this country the Catholic clergy generally—I am not speaking at random: I have been a priest and a monk—disdain and detest the communities of monks. Cardinal Manning was sternly opposed to them. The idleness and petty hypocrisy to which their ascetic professions lead is fully described in my *Twelve Years in a Monastery*. As I had the further advantage of living in monasteries in a "Catholic" country (Belgium), I obtained some idea of the real nature of such institutions under more or less normal conditions. The appalling laziness of the vast majority, the gross ignorance which masquerades as humility, the enormous consumption of alcohol behind closed doors, the all-pervading hypocrisy and very widespread immorality would, if they were fully appreciated by the educated laity of Belgium, turn the smouldering anti-clericalism into a fierce blaze of anger. Not one monk in twenty merited respect, even in his superstitions. The great majority were grossly sensual, lazy, and hypocritical. But even in Belgium there is a large body of critical observers, and the monasteries of Spain have the same corruption in a far greater degree.

The gross animality of the monks, the unscrupulousness of the Jesuits—for the Jesuit in Spain *is* a Jesuit—and the widespread immorality of the clergy are well known to Spaniards. Any who imagine that the charge of flagrant immorality against the Spanish clergy is a Protestant or Rationalist calumny should read the article, "The Priest and the People in Spain," in the *Daily News*, October 18, 1909. It is written by an Irish Roman Catholic, Mr. Doran, who wisely chooses to dissociate his co-religionists in the United Kingdom severely and emphatically from the Roman Catholicism of Spain. "I can remember the time," he says, "when I would have dropped the acquaintance of my best friend had he but said, or hinted, half the things I now know to be true in regard to the condition of the Church in Spain." He states that on one occasion, when he was dining with a number of Spanish priests, he remarked, "without giving the least offence," that "if some of them ventured to say Mass in Ireland they would be dragged off the altar." They replied, genially, that they always confessed to a companion before Mass. He found a state of immorality among the clergy "which it takes an Irishman half a lifetime to understand and an eternity to forgive." The sister of the gentleman at whose house he was staying was the mistress of a priest. He adds that the Spanish clergy will marry uncles to nieces readily, "given a sufficient amount of money," and that "nine Spaniards out of ten will tell you that the desire to earn an easy living is the motive which induces so many to join the clergy."

But even Mr. Doran is apparently ignorant of the infamous traffic in *bulas*, since he reproaches the priests

with eating meat on Fridays. They had, of course, purchased *bulas*.

After this Catholic testimony I need not linger over the morality of the Spanish clergy. As an ex-priest I have always refused to create prejudice against my late coreligionists by discussing this side of their affairs; but when a body of priests like those of the Spanish Church egg on the civic or military officials to murder in their corrupt interests it is time to speak. There is immorality enough even among the priests of this country. Sordid cases came to my personal knowledge. In Belgium the condition—a condition that any candid person will expect from their enforced celibacy and good living—is far worse. In Spain and the south of Italy it is flagrant, nor is it confined to the lower clergy and the monks. A writer in the *Church Quarterly* (October, 1902) relates how an Italian prelate calmly discussed with him the fact, which he neither resented nor denied, that one of the candidates for the papal throne, one of the most distinguished cardinals in the Church, was a man of "conspicuous immorality." The cardinal in question, whose life was described to me in Rome, kept a mistress in a villa not many miles from the Vatican. The hypocrisy that asks English people to shudder over the very intelligible and quite open conduct of Ferrer, whom the Church of Spain prevented from marrying when he wished, and cheerfully acquiesces in this sordid condition of the clergy wherever the mass of the people are still Catholic, is too revolting to characterise.

It must not be imagined, however, that this condition of the clergy in Spain is one of the popular charges against them. From time immemorial, in the Latin countries, the clergy have withheld their strictures on the conduct of their followers, and the greatest laxity prevails. In Seville, a town renowned for its Catholicism, a French Catholic writer, M. Bazin, was told by a priest, he says in his *Terre d'Espagne*, that more than half the unions of men and women were "free unions." While the Church parades before the world its high ideal of chastity, and speaks hypocritically of the growth of immorality in the wake of heresy, it is precisely in those regions where it retains enormous power to-day, and has held absolute sway for ages, that we find the most immoral parts of Europe. Northern Italy, predominant in rebellion against the Church, has a ratio of illegitimate births of only six per cent.; the Roman province has a ratio of twenty per cent., and the southern provinces much the same. It is a foolish superstition, encouraged by Catholics, that the laxity of the Latin races is a matter of temperature. The northern races were just as bad before the Reformation. That notorious laxity is due solely to the fact that an immoral clergy never dared to press on the people their theoretic gospel of chastity.

But if the bulk of the Spaniards smile at the immorality of their priests, those more enlightened Spaniards who see the life-blood of their country being drained to sustain such a system feel a pardonable bitterness. Let me give one detail by which one may measure the whole monstrosity. Diercks relates that the *Revista Cristiana* at one time made a calculation of the value of the wax and incense burned in Spanish churches in the course of a year. The total reached the extraordinary sum of £1,500,000—a sum little short of what Spain spends on education! And this is one small item of the total cost to the country of its religious system. Add to this the millions obtained in the ordinary way of fees and collections, the millions received for *bulas*, the millions charged (on one pretext or another) for scapulars, rosaries, bullet-proof prayers, agnus-deis, and the whole medieval magazine of charms, the millions received for obtaining dispensations to marry, for baptisms, funerals, masses (each of which costs from two to twenty pesetas), and other ceremonies, the millions acquired by wills, by taking over the goods of monastic aspirants, and in other ways. And the whole of this vast proportion of an impoverished circulation goes to feed the parasitic growth, with no spiritual vitality or social usefulness, which I have described. Let the light fall on the mind of Spain, and this decrepit and corrupt agglomeration of medieval vices and abuses will be swept ruthlessly away. Rebellion against the Vatican has followed immediately upon the extension of popular enlightenment in France, in northern Italy, and in those South American Republics which have dared to educate. Beyond all question, it is following the same course in Spain.

Will this effete and corrupt body, with all its dependent industries, contemplate impartially the spread of education in Spain? Will that colossal revenue from *bulas* and other medieval barbarities continue when Spain is Europeanised—to use the phrase of its own social students?

The reader will see that we are coming back to the question of Ferrer and his work. It was quite impossible to set that work in its true perspective without first describing the institution it imperilled. Assuredly Ferrer was disseminating an explosive—the explosive of an enlightened spirit and a sense of dignity and independence. We shall see how the Church marked him out for destruction. A few years ago the greatest Spanish writer, Perez Galdos, put a drama (*Electro*,) on the stage at Madrid, in which a beautiful young girl hesitated between the sombre call of the Jesuits and the call to life and happiness of sane heretics. It ended with her choosing life, instead of the living death of the medieval Church. The figure of the young girl was meant to be, and was recognised as, a symbol of Spain; and that Madrid theatre, and many a theatre after it, shook with the ringing applause of the Spanish audiences.

But if Spain is so largely anti-clerical, how comes the Church to retain the power it does? Spain is seething with anti-clericalism. Mr. Isaacson, in his *Rome in Many Lands*, quotes an orthodox Spanish paper, *El Correo*

Espanol, to the effect that only 1,500,000 men and 3,500,000 women, in a population of 18,500,000, now obey the clergy in Spain. I have dealt thoroughly with the question in my *Decay of the Church of Rome*. If that be so, how can we explain the power of the Church?

Here we come to another and not less sordid aspect of Spanish life, which it is absolutely necessary to understand if we wish to understand the murder of Ferrer. The political system is not less corrupt than the clerical, and the two corruptions support each other with despairing unscrupulousness. Many who are willing to admit the corruption of the Church will hesitate here, but it is a platitude of recent Spanish literature, and I will, in the next chapter, adduce such a series of witnesses to it—including the ex-Premier Maura, the present Premier Moret, and the gravest authorities in Spain—as will make the reader wonder rather why we treat with the Spanish Government as a civilized Power.

This is the opportunity of the clergy. Driven from other lands, they make their last stand in Spain and Portugal. From France, from Cuba, from the Philippines, they have concentrated on the land where only a few millions can read and write, and the political power is manipulated by a system as corrupt as their own. Within a few years, probably, they will be reinforced by the exiled monks of Italy. So long as Spain is ignorant, or only taught a smattering of letters and a vast amount of terrifying superstition in their own schools, they are safe. But they cannot wholly shut out the light from France and England, and they play a desperate game. Jesuitry is Jesuitry in Spain. From the boudoir of the Queen-mother, and now, I am informed, from the boudoir of the Queen, whom they have won, they rule Spain and swoop down with ferocity on all eruptions of revolt.

Chapter III. The Political System of Spain

WE have in English a very ample literature of travel in Spain and description of Spanish customs. It is chiefly remarkable for the number of important and unique features which these travellers have failed to see. Their periodical re-description of fans and mantillas, of bullfights and flirting, of cathedrals and vineyards, has merely succeeded in conveying to English readers a most inaccurate impression of the country. The unique things of Spain that it is useful to know are those features of the ecclesiastical world which I have described, and the complexion of its political world, which I am about to describe. One cannot wholly wonder at the perplexity of English men and women in regard to the execution of Ferrer. One must know Spain first.

It must not be imagined, however, that I am now about to describe features of Spanish life that are so obscure as to be open to different interpretations, or that I am about to retail the partisan charges of Anarchists. What I say in this chapter is based entirely on Spanish literature of the weightiest character, and is admitted by the foremost politicians of the country. It is the "open sore" of Spanish life, and is discussed in terms of scorn, anger, or despair by scores of recent Spanish writers who are far removed from either Anarchism or Socialism. One does not love to lay bare the shame of a neighbour nation. But when those who control this political system dip their hands in the blood of an innocent and noble-spirited man, it is time to tell the truth.

Let me introduce the matter with a glance at the recent work of a Catholic writer of undoubted culture and strict loyalty to his Church—Ramon de Torre-Isunza.

La Verdad à S. M. El Rey (1902). All quotations in this work are translated, literally, by myself.

He calls his book "The truth for His Majesty the King," and prefaces it with a personal letter to Alfonso XIII. As he looks for the revivification of his "dead country" through a combination of education and a regenerated Church, he will not be suspected of bias.

In his letter to the King he uses plain, agonised language. The country, he says, consists of "a corrupt society and corrupting authority"; the political system "exhibits an essential and inevitable corruption," and "is based on immorality and ignorance." señor de Torre-Isunza does not lack courage, but if he thinks this language will pass the cordon of Jesuits and servants of the Government round the King he is over-trustful. He quotes with approval Macias Picavea's statement that there is "no such deep immorality in any other State in the world" in the political and administrative life. But I must content myself with stringing together a few of the conclusions that the writer reaches in the course of his analysis.

"We are not far removed," he says, "from a veritable savagery, which is barely modified externally by traditional habits and imitation of foreign customs" (p. 163) "Our religion is a pharisaic formalism, the more immoral as it is hypocritical" (p. 168). There are "few men of honour" in the political world; all offices are obtained by corruption and intrigue, and the whole State is characterised by "a profound immorality and congenital debility" (p. 176). The Government is an "oligarchy," or "a number of gentlemen who take office for the purpose of exploitation" (p. 192). They are "bound by no law, and have respect neither for God nor man" (p. 197). The superficial opposition of Liberals and Conservatives has "no real significance" (p. 198); Parliamentary deputies are not elected, but fraudulently imposed on their districts; education is controlled by this "monstrous" system in its own corrupt interest, and the whole system of law and legal education is vicious

and demoralising.

It would be a profound mistake to take this language as the exceptional outpouring of a writer with an aversion to politics. I have chosen to begin with Ramon de TorreIsunza because he is a cultured and fervent Roman Catholic and Monarchist. But twenty other writers, nearly all Monarchists, use precisely the same language. In order to dispel at once the last trace of scepticism, I will now take a very weighty work, recently issued by the Madrid Ateneo Cientifico y Literario.

Oligarquia y Caciquismo como la forma actual de gobierno en España; 1903.

The Athenaeum of Science and Letters at Madrid is one of the most weighty cultural institutions in Spain. Most of the scholars and professional men of Madrid belong to it, and its publications have the highest authority. In 1902 its President, señor Costa, opened a debate in the Section of Historical Sciences on the theme: "Oligarchy and Tammany are the actual form of government in Spain." I have ventured to insert the word "Tammany" for the untranslatable Spanish word "Caciquismo," because, as will appear, it is the only word familiar to English readers which approximately conveys the meaning. Hundreds of distinguished men were invited to this momentous debate, and a large number of the leading scholars and politicians responded, by letter or presence. The whole proceedings were then officially published, and the shame of Spain laid bare as it had never been before.

I will summarise presently the fearful indictment which señor Costa brought against the politicians of his country, but will first quote a few of the better-known politicians. The most important of these is Maura himself, the ex-Premier, the arch-murderer. This man, who endeavoured to throw dust in the eyes of Europe by issuing to the press (through his Home Secretary) the forged documents against Ferrer *before he was tried*, and by confusing him with revolutionary Anarchists, admits genially enough the corruption of the system which sacrificed Ferrer. señor Costa quotes a passage from a speech he delivered in the Spanish Parliament on November 29, 1901. Eloquently surveying "the great and cruel sacrifices" which Spain had made in fighting for progress during the nineteenth century, he said that they had ended in "an immense imposture." "We have," he said, "no electoral institutions, nor the results of such institutions, nor public liberty..... we have absolutely not a single thing the inner nature of which is in accord with its external appearance." In his letter to the Athenaeum on the thesis of the debate, he said that it was "superfluous" to run over, after señor Costa, "the virulence of their social and political malady" (p. 115). "It is," he said, "traditional that public power is not sought or used in Spain to uphold the law, secure justice, protect culture, enhance prosperity, or direct the life of the people" (p. 116). But one reaches the lowest depth of repugnance when this man, who sacrifices "Anarchists" to defend such a system, observes that Spain is "really in a state of *anarchy* [his italics], in the full sense of the word, since all the legitimate organs of its political life are atrophied and inert" (p. 118).

After señor Maura's candid description of the system, in the defence of which (and the Church) he allowed Ferrer to be murdered, we will turn to the present Cabinet. señor Moret did not take part in the debate, but a speech of his, delivered in the Cortes (January 27, 1888), is quoted as one that "paints with a master-hand" the corruption of Spain's form of government. The praise is not too high, but I cannot reproduce it at length. Suffice it to say that he denounces "this civilisation of which we are so proud" in unmeasured terms. He has no pity for the "burdens and corruptions"—of the machine over which he presides to-day. He draws a vivid picture of the repellent corruption of an election to Parliament, in which it does not matter how the elector votes, as the whole thing turns on the success of the candidate in buying one or the other local *cacique* at the lowest price.

Then we have quoted another, and perhaps the most distinguished, member of the present Cabinet, Count Romanones. He deplures (in the work, *Biología de los partidos políticos*, p. 128) "all the evils of our public administration, stupefying the working of the Parliamentary function, all the vices which warp the efficacy of the army and the suffrage and thwart the course of justice." The "whole atmosphere of our political life" is tainted by *cacique* [Tammany]: "like microbes, they make the regions where they are found uninhabitable." But Count Romanones is inhabiting that region to-day.

It must be well understood that these politicians are not denouncing the rival party. They are describing the system which flourishes to-day, and is employed by each party when it comes to power—the system which the Marquis de Riscal scourged in the same terms twenty years before, and that the Marquis de Torre Hermosa described in 1899 as "not a Parliamentary system with corruption, but what we call its corruptions are the system." However, I need not now fill the chapter with quotations. A few more responsible strictures, and I pass on to describe the system.

"All is rotten in our unfortunate country. It has no government, no electoral body, no parties, army, or navy. All is fiction, decadence, and ruin" (*El Correo*, February 7, 1901). "We are now more or less at the level of a *kabila* of the Rif, though we seem in constitution and laws to be a civilised people" (April 19, 1901).

"Every citizen has a vote, but few use it; and if they do so to the detriment of the Government, it is falsified in the urn" (*El Impartial*, January 26, 1901).

Señor Sanchez de Toca (in *El problema cubano*) not only roundly denounces the whole system as corrupt,

but traces the corruption to "the demoralisation of those who hold the highest political offices" (p. 234). It is "a government by the worst": honest men hold aloof from politics. Dr. Madrazo (*El pueblo Español ha muerto?*) tells us that "all the institutions of Spain are framed to put abilities at the service of the oligarchs," that the Liberals and Conservatives are "branches of one tree," and that the Church "shrinks from no means, however unjust, to attain its end." But these authorities will suffice. Further dozens will be found in the work issued by the Madrid Athenæum.

Many a reader will begin to wonder, not that there are revolutionaries in Spain, but why there are not more, and those more effective. The story we have to tell presently may throw some light on that; but it must not be supposed that cultivated Spaniards who are not working in the system, and living on it, are silent. I repeat that the whole of recent Spanish literature is full of fierce strictures and pathetic demands for reform. But I must now explain more in detail what is meant by this extraordinary corruption.

Those writers are correct who say that there is no political system in the civilised world—I do not include Russia—so depraved as that of Spain and demand its "Europeanisation." Its combination of "oligarchy" and "Tammany"—the two features on which all agree—is unique, and the depravity is increased by the subservience to the priest. By oligarchy Spanish writers mean that Spain is wholly ruled, not in its own interest, by the group of its highest politicians, without representation of the will of the people. It does not matter whether these politicians are in office or not; there is a persistent mutual understanding between the apparently hostile groups, and the rhetoric flung from bench to bench in the Cortes has an element of comedy. Even Major Hume observes disdainfully that "there is no sincerity or reality in the pretended antagonism of the political parties." They change office by mutual agreement. The spoils must not be retained too long in the hands of one set, or, as has happened recently, the opposition will paralyse its efforts to pass laws.

This is the consistent teaching of the critics I have quoted, and I will make only one reserve. That some of the abler Liberal politicians have convictions differing far from those of the Conservatives cannot be doubted. We shall see how far the convictions of señor Moret and Count Romanones will find expression in legislation. The respectable link between Liberals and Conservatives is, of course, that both are "dynastic," and hold the Republicans, Socialists, and Anarchists at bay.

But how do the ministers return to power after a General Election? Is there not a very wide suffrage in Spain? I have quoted half-a-dozen writers of great weight to the effect that there is "no electoral system" in Spain, and that the elections are largely comedies. Incredible as it seems to English voters, the "oligarchs" settle by agreement how many deputies of each party are to be returned, and manipulate the electoral results accordingly. The procedure is a commonplace in Spain, and is fully described in the work published by the Athenæum.

Here the "caciquismo," or Tammany, comes into play. Imagine Tammany spread over the whole of the United States, and embracing Washington in its corrupt network, and you have an idea of Spain's "political system." All the officials of the country are in it. When we come to examine the evidence against Ferrer, it will be essential to remember this. The *alcalde* (head official) of a small town is not a free agent, deposing out of conviction. He is "appointed," and owes his place to what the Spaniards genially call "His Majesty Recommendation." The Civil Governors are "recommended"; the posts in the army and navy are secured by "recommendation"; from college upward one dreams of "recommendation"—and the price of recommendation is loyalty to the recommender. The whole set of officials in a district is the "cacique," or clique of appointed men depending on the central "oligarchs." This is the most notorious part of the "immorality" and "corruption" which we have heard denounced. And as an "eloquent example" of such a structure señor Costa instances (p. 53) the "cacique at Barcelona"!

The link between the central power and the local body of dependents is the "Civil Governor," an official whom we shall find at work later. I pretend to no knowledge of him, but consult the Athenæum's work on his position. The Civil Governor, señor Costa says, is "the link between the central oligarchy and the peripheral caciquismo." One may add, "and the dutiful servant of the local bishop." Sanchez de Toca says that he is sent down by the central power "on the juridical fiction" that he is merely an agent for the supervision of public order and fiscal matters. This, he says, is a fiction, because he is the absolute tool of the oligarchs and is their "electoral agent." So the system is bound together, and the manipulation of the elections secured. In the large towns such electoral corruption can no longer be practised with impunity, and they send Republican deputies to the Cortes. Perez Galdos, the greatest writer in Spain, is Republican deputy for Madrid; Alejandro Lerroux for Barcelona.

But in the small towns the electoral returns are a mockery. señor Moret describes the candidate hypocritically seeking votes. "It does not matter," he says, "whether they vote for him or not." His real work is the secret and corrupt negotiation with the local cacique. Cases have been put before me in which votes have been cast somewhat in the proportion of 300 for the dynastic candidate and 3,000 for the Republican; but the result was announced the other way round. The whole system is one of deliberate, self-seeking corruption of the

most repellent character. Isern writes of it: "All provincial administration is in the hands of caciques and their representatives, and is profoundly immoral in eighty cases out of every hundred. Yet, of the immoralities which we find in families which pay little or no taxation, in alcaldes and councillors who fill no office, yet live magnificently at the public expense, in politicians who receive more or less considerable bribes from these families and alcaldes—of these the provincial authorities and tribunals take notice only on the eve of elections, and prosecute only when the culprits have given some cause of offence to the Ministry, such as *failing to give beforehand to the governor the forms, signed and blank*, to be filled up on the day of the election with the number of votes which it is thought fit to assign to the 'pigeon-holed' candidate, as they say."

Del desastro nacional y sus causas, p. 123; 1900. Señor Costa quotes this with full approval.

The elections in the majority of constituencies are what J. R. Lowell pronounced them in 1877—"a sham." I am told by a Spanish journalist that less than 200 out of 400 deputies are genuinely elected. The stolid English voter probably wonders why the voters do not violently rebel, as he would, against such a system. And so we come back to the recent trouble in Barcelona. They do violently rebel sometimes. Then English people are informed that they are all "Anarchists," and half the English press commends Spain for promptly suspending the constitutional guarantees, and shooting, or condemning to twenty years in prison without trial, whomever it chooses to represent as the fomenter or the leader of the "revolution."

We may agree with señor Maura—before he took office—that the great fight which enlightened Spain fought during the nineteenth century has ended in "an immense imposture." Two things only need be added to complete the situation. One is that the system, though checked in the large towns by the growth of enlightenment, has steadily deteriorated from an accidental cause. A large number of Spaniards were, before the American War, accommodated with real or lazy or nominal offices in the Colonies. They came back to Spain with their fortunes made—out of the Cubans or Filipinos. All these are now thrown on the "system" and the Church.

The other element to be noted is that these two comfortable dynastic parties now see their power menaced by the rise of Republicanism, Socialism, and Anarchism. Socialism is not a power in Spain. It proposes a new and more concentrated form of central government, and long experience has made the Spanish worker hate the idea of central government. Some of us can understand it, though we do not despair of the Spanish middle class. Republicanism is described by many political writers as "the force of the future." It is already a very powerful movement, openly advocating a new form of government. The point in the indictment which laid stress on Ferrer's aspirations towards a Republic was one of the most shameless pieces of hypocrisy in that unspeakable collection. On the one hand, Ferrer was not a Republican, and was not on very good terms with the Republicans of Barcelona, precisely because he gave them no aid. On the other hand, many of the finest men in Spain, from Salmeron and Perez Galdos downward, are open and insistent Republicans. They form a recognised group in the Cortes, and it is only by the scandalous manipulation of the election returns that their number in the Cortes is kept down. Anarchism the oligarchs fight by the weapons we shall have presently to consider.

The rapid spread of these parties, which menace the sacred system, has an effect on the dynastic politicians which needs no emphasis. The oligarchy-Tammany combination is beginning to rock on its foundations. The State finds itself in exactly the same position as the Church. New ideas sprout in the minds of the Spanish people, as they do in the minds of civilised nations. In civilised communities, with no more than a normal and incidental corruption to conceal, we agree to let the new ideas vent themselves and fight their intellectual battle. But in Spain the two systems, Church and State, with which these new ideas would wage war, are essentially, fundamentally, and incurably corrupt. Hundreds of thousands of men, drafted into or dependent on the two great corporations, clerical and political, see the very bases of their economic life threatened. They have, from their youth upward, on the confession of their own leaders, been taught to deal in intrigue, deceit, and corruption. They have been forced to lay aside moral principles, and press unscrupulously in the struggle for "recommendation."

Let the reader ask himself candidly if the leaders and agents of these menaced systems are likely to be scrupulous in their methods of removing the danger from their path. Let him reflect that one of the most formidable opponents of these systems is the man who would open the eyes of Spain and teach the workers to think. I have grave facts to relate of the agents of these systems, graver than any that this or the preceding chapter contains. The most adequate proof will be given of them, but I felt that it was necessary to describe the systems, in their own language, before I proceeded further. We are now ready to return to the noble-spirited man who is passing from Paris to Barcelona to dissipate the ignorance of Spain. Assuredly Francisco Ferrer is bringing dynamite with him; but the dynamite of Spain is a gift of the gods in any honest and civilised community.

Chapter IV. The Modern Schools

FERRER returned to Barcelona at the opening of the twentieth century to find the confederate systems I have described flourishing vigorously in an atmosphere of dense ignorance and illiteracy. "Our social condition," the President of the Madrid Athenaeum wrote in 1903, "is barbaric, in harmony with our barbaric form of government." The census of 1903 returned 11,945,971 out of a population of 17,667,256 as entirely illiterate. Spain had been far more literate under the Romans 1,700 years earlier; vastly more enlightened under the Mohammedans. Spain in the twentieth century was spending considerably less than two million pounds a year on elementary education, while retrograde clergy and corrupt officials prospered on the general ignorance.

Such education as there was had the express aim of supporting the existing *regime*. All the authorities agree in describing middle-class education as narrow and heavily biased. The educated class, says Dr. Dillon, betrayed "a monumental ignorance of contemporary history and foreign languages." With something of the quaint conceit of the Chinese, they tried to convince themselves that the traditions of Spain were too precious and splendid to be lost by the process of "Europeanisation" which their deeper thinkers were demanding. The last chapter gives the real meaning of this "Spanish pride." Happily, as far as the middle class was concerned a fine spirit of revolt was spreading. Brilliant writers like Perez Galdos endeavoured to bring Liberal Spain back to the splendid aspirations for which it had made heroic sacrifices in the first half of the nineteenth century. Blasco Ibanez, another distinguished novelist, shamed it with pictures of its lamentable fall from Moorish splendour to Catholic debasement. Of forty books that the educated Spaniard reads to-day thirty-five are Rationalistic.

But the corrupt practices of Church and State could not be abolished as long as the overwhelming majority of the nation was densely ignorant. When it is said that something over four millions (out of eighteen millions) could read and write, one must understand what this means. I may seem to have been unjust to the Church in so heavily charging it with criminal responsibility for the ignorance of the nation—the acknowledged root of half its evils. Do not thousands of nuns and other conventual inmates spend their lives in teaching? Does not the Church provide numbers of schools, day and night, at its own expense?

It does; unhappily for Spain. These schools are made the pretext for suppressing better schools, and for making no national effort to remove the nation's shame. They are schools of the type we had in England fifty years ago. The religious organisation which, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, counteracted the growing demand for education in England by founding schools of its own, expressly stated that it would be careful to educate children "in their proper station," which was, in the old phrase, a condition of respectful submission to their pastors and masters. That is the direct aim of elementary education in Spain, as will be understood from our study of the character of the Spanish peasant's "pastors and masters." The child was taught to read, with fiery injunctions as to what it should and should not read. The curriculum was narrow, arid, and unstimulating. It was indeed especially devised to meet the old idea of teaching without educating. And the whole period of school-life was filled with fulminations intended to keep the child in its proper station.

Before Ferrer returned to Barcelona little bands of mutinous workers here and there had clubbed together and founded secular schools of their own. Middle-class Rationalists and Republicans took some interest in the enterprise, but the teaching—stimulating enough, in all conscience—was hampered by lack of funds. Church and State looked on with tolerable indifference at the mushroom-growths of revolt. An, ex-priest who had been active in the work returned to the Church, and many little institutions were closed. Those that survived were mainly Republican schools, which have greatly increased in number and grown in efficiency under the inspiration of Ferrer's fine creations.

It is most important to distinguish between these Republican schools and the Modern Schools established by Ferrer. They existed before Ferrer started his work, they differed from his in giving (often) religious instruction and in political tendency, and of late years their leaders have not been on the best terms with Ferrer, because of the absorption of his funds in purely educational work. But pro-Spanish writers—to be quite correct (since I am a pro-Spanish writer), the anonymous and unscrupulous slanderers who have poisoned our Press in the interest of the corruption of Spain—have found it useful to confuse the Modern and the Republican schools. Much that may have been taught in the Republican schools was certainly not taught in those of Ferrer, to whom a Republic was not the acceptable political ideal. But I will anticipate a later discussion so far as to say that the maxims which correspondents of the *Saturday Review* and other journals assert they *saw* on the walls of schools in Spain did not exist in either the Modern or Republican schools in any form whatever. I have questioned on the subject masters of Ferrer's schools; and Alejandro Lerroux, the leader of the Barcelona Republicans, emphatically denies them on his part. A moment's candid reflection would convince anybody that no school would last a week in Spain, or anywhere else, in which injunctions to massacre all officials and the

whole middle-class, and indulge in general pillage, were printed in large capitals on the walls.

The Church and the *caciques* had been content with petty persecution so long as these schools depended on the coppers of the workers. An entirely new era opened when a brilliant professor from Paris, with a capital of £30,000 and a fine capacity to control and employ it, entered the field. The notion that Ferrer gathered about him all the iconoclasts of Barcelona and "literally taught the young idea to shoot," as the *Daily Dispatch* (October 16) said, in an article with the disgusting anonymous heading of "By One who Knew Him," is a grotesque untruth. Ferrer incurred the annoyance of many of his earlier friends, with whom he wished to remain on terms of personal friendship, precisely because he determined to use his funds for his single aim. He refused to spend money on his children, beyond a modest allowance to his struggling elder daughter. He refused to live in the comfort which his new circumstances would have justified. He regarded the money left to him by Mlle. Meunier as a moral trust, and scrupulously expended it in the cause of education and philanthropy; though the money was bequeathed absolutely to him.

A scurrilous letter was contributed on the subject to the Manchester Guardian by a responsible priest, Canon Lynch. He says:—

"The facts are these. Ferrer was teacher of Spanish in Paris. One of his pupils was a very wealthy Catholic old lady. She fell sick, and in her will wished to leave all her wealth to works of Catholic piety. Ferrer induced her to leave him personally the money, and promised that he would conscientiously carry out her wish."

I have already pointed out the stupidity of such a suggestion, but the letter deserves quoting as an example of "Catholic truth." Mlle. Meunier was only fifty years old; she knew Ferrer and his views intimately for three years; she did not leave him all her money (Canon Lynch will find it interesting to discover how the rest is being employed), and she had the keenest sympathy with Ferrer's ideal. The rest of this priest's letter is of a similar character. Happily, the editor of the Manchester Guardian has a sense of truth and justice, and in publishing Canon Lynch's letter he appended a note that effectively exposed its reckless statements.

Instead of calling to his aid the violent revolutionaries of popular legend, Ferrer invited the co-operation of some of the best-known scholars of France and Spain, such as Dr. Odon de Buen, member of the Spanish Senate and a distinguished scientist; Dr. Martinez Vargas, Professor of Medicine at Barcelona; Professor Ramon y Cajal, one of the finest physiologists in America; and Professors Reclus and Letourneau of Paris. Other scientific men were invited to co-operate as time went on, with the result that these schools, which "literally taught the young idea to shoot," had a series of scientific text-books which have no parallel in any elementary school system in the world. Five of them are from the pen of Dr. Odon de Buen, of European repute. They include manuals of reading, grammar, history, all branches of natural philosophy, psychology, and sociology. The reader who would know Ferrer's schools should glance at this fine series of thirty manuals, a set of which has, I understand, been deposited at the British Museum.

It has been stated all over Europe by the anonymous defenders of Spanish corruption, with the aid of simple-minded zealots like Canon Lynch, that these text-books were armouries of insurrection. Let me introduce the subject by a letter received by Ferrer, not in the early days of the Escuela Moderna, when the books were few and critical attention had not been directed to them, but in the spring of the present year. This letter, which was not produced at Ferrer's condemnation, as it would have been if he had had a trial, was published prominently in the *Boletin de la Escuela Moderna* ("The Bulletin of the Modern School") for June, 1909, and was fresh in the memory of the Barcelona authorities. It is from a bishop, unconnected with the Vatican—the "supreme bishop of the Independent Church of the Philippine Islands." It is dated from Manila, March 10, 1909:—

Sr. D. Francisco Ferrer Y Guardia, Director of the Modern School, Barcelona.

Accept, Sir, the assurance of my most distinguished consideration:

My delegate at Barcelona, Sr. Isabelo de los Reyes, has sent me most of the magnificent works edited by you. I have been agreeably surprised by the modern, scientific, and civilising tendency of their teaching. If the Filipinos had studied those works instead of the stupefying treatises of the monks and Jesuits, which betray the evil odour of their cells, they would have learned in a few years what it has taken them nearly four centuries to learn from the fantastic disquisitions of St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Augustine, and others, who were assuredly, in their time, brilliant lights of the Church. But how are we going to teach from their archaic doctrines young people who are the contemporaries of aeroplanes, radium, and the thousands of other scientific discoveries?

Pray accept the warmest congratulations of our Church for your praiseworthy efforts and sufferings in the cause of Rationalism. Our Church believes that reason is directly inspired by God, and that to seek the truth is to seek the Lord.

The Supreme Council of our Bishops, which is composed of twenty-four prelates, has agreed that some of

your manuals shall be established as text-books in our seminaries and schools—namely, the Natural Sciences and Physical Geography of Dr. Odon de Buen (to whom please send an assurance of our admiration), the First Stages of Humanity of Engerrand, the Ethnical Psychology of Letourneau, and Man and the Earth, by Reclus—merely rectifying or explaining the atheistic or anti-religious tendencies by saying that the authors are anti-religious because they, like yourself, have endured savage persecution at the hands of those who ought to be imitators of the gentlest, most humane, most noble, and free in spirit of all masters.

In your person I respectfully salute the whole of the professors of the Modern School in Spain.

Gregorio Aglipay,

Supreme Bishop of the Independent Philippine Church.

It will be seen that a Liberal Catholicism of a remarkable type has evolved in the remote Philippines; but the lack of consecration from, the Vatican does not affect the value of this testimony. Within two months of the receipt of this religious encouragement the Modern Schools were to be closed, on a scandalous pretext, their founder branded through the Press of Europe as "the Fagin of revolt," and savagely murdered in the prime of his life. It is true that the Bishop recognises anti-religious sentiments in the works; but there is not a word about those murderous phrases which Ferrer has been so widely accused of disseminating through his schools.

On the point of Rationalistic teaching the Modern Schools were perfectly open. Ferrer was what we should call in England an Agnostic. In the genial note he appends to the Bishop's letter in his *Boletin* he repudiates the idea that he and his friends opposed religion only because it persecuted. They oppose it, he says, from conviction. The manuals and the teaching were professedly Rationalistic, in the general pervading sense in which the text-books and teaching in a Roman Catholic school are Catholic; and there was a special Rationalistic manual on *The Origin of Christianity*. The idea that the schools could be suppressed on that account by any civilised Government is ludicrous. If an Agnostic cares to use his fortune in establishing schools, he has the same elementary right to have his ideas, provided they do not tend to violent disturbance, taught in them as has a Roman Catholic. Indeed, the contention of our Roman Catholics that, while the State here ought to pay practically the whole cost of their specific education, the State in Spain should not allow ideas opposed to theirs to be taught at private expense, is only remarkable for its audacity.

The children of Ferrer's schools came from Rationalist homes, and their parents desired this teaching. The alternative schools violated their consciences and merited their disdain. There was nothing secret or insidious in the teaching. The Jesuits very loudly proclaimed it. But, while Spanish agents have somehow persuaded many people in England that a State may fitly confiscate schools and shoot their founder because of his Agnosticism—an assumption which we should regard as an outrage on civilisation here—the truth is that, bad as Spain is, such a thing is not possible even there, and a lying pretext had to be invented. Ferrer's schools were closed, his property confiscated, and his life ruthlessly taken, because he was a Rationalist. Let us see what there is in the charge that he "literally taught the young idea to shoot."

I will examine in a later chapter the forged documents and the phrases of anonymous origin which Catholic journals began to publish *before* Ferrer was tried. Not the slightest effort was made to *prove* that these sentiments were ever, in any shape, disseminated in Ferrer's schools. They are indignantly and emphatically repudiated by the men I have examined who taught in those schools. It is, in fact, preposterous to think that the authorities, who have watched Ferrer assiduously since his trial in 1906, would have allowed such phrases, or any remote approach to them, to be paraded in the Modern Schools. English journals of great weight have admitted to their columns statements of this kind which had not a tittle of evidence or authority, and were in themselves wildly improbable. English Roman Catholic priests have seized and employed them with a blind bigotry, a gross injustice, and a disregard of truth that make one wonder how much of the spirit of the Inquisition lurks beneath their professions of humane conversion.

We shall speak of the origin of these documents later. For the moment we are confronted with the statement that the manuals themselves taught anarchy, revolution, pillage, and massacre. We turn with interest to the "quotations" which Catholics have disseminated, and we find that in not a single instance is there a reference, not merely to a specific page, but even to a specific book. We are left to make our way through a series of thirty-one text-books and fifteen other books published by the Escuela Moderna in search of half-a-dozen phrases. Then we are told by Canon Lynch that *we* suppress the truth and misrepresent Ferrer. Until a particular passage in the works is submitted to us, we cannot be expected to take serious notice of such charges. Anonymity of writers is bad enough; anonymity of quotations usually means forgery or falsification.

I have examined many of the works in question; informants of mine who possess the whole series report that no such passages occur in them. Again, one must reflect whether the Spanish authorities would have waited so long to entrap Ferrer, and would have shrunk from a civil trial, if they could have put before a court works

containing the passages alleged. The civil courts of Spain would suffice to deal with schools in which children were taught "literally" to shoot or to pillage. Even before the Military Council these books were not produced, and no allusion was made to them whatever.

The plain truth—and it is the plain truth I submit in contrast to a crowd of anonymous allegations, resting on no proof or authority—is that the spirit of the teaching in some of the manuals was democratic. Ferrer, seeing the political and clerical corruption about him, would have thought it cowardly to conceal his social ideal or his views of religion. His schools were founded to inaugurate the elevation of the Spanish people, and protests against injustice and war had a legitimate place in them. This is a matter on a totally different plane from the incitements to kill and to pillage which have been fraudulently ascribed to him. Not a single word of that nature ever occurred in the Modern Schools, and not the least attempt has been made to prove that it did. The well-known Anarchist, M. Malato, informed me that Ferrer expressly directed him to avoid Anarchism in the one or two works he compiled for the schools. Only such sentiments were communicated to the children as will be found in any democratic school in England. The dissemination of such sentiments in so corrupt a country as Spain is dangerous to the corruption. But even there no law is broken by the peaceful propaganda of advanced social views. The case of the murderers of Ferrer rests entirely on allegations that he, directly or indirectly, incited to murder or the destruction of property. We have shown that this was utterly foreign to the spirit in which he left Paris. We shall see that it is a gross and groundless calumny.

The real spirit in which Ferrer set about his work is made clear in the following passages from his private letters, which I translate from the Italian *Ragione* (of Rome): "As is notorious, the child is born without any preconceived idea, and in the course of life it imbibes the ideas of those who first surround it, modifying them afterwards according to its culture, observations, and relations to its environment. It clearly follows that, if the child be educated in true, positive ideas about all things, and taught that, to avoid errors, it is indispensable that it should accept nothing on faith, but only what science can demonstrate, the child will grow up with its powers of observation sharpened and with an aptitude for all kinds of study. To educate children with freedom from prejudice, and publish the works necessary for that purpose, is the work of the Modern School. The whole value of education consists in respect of the physical, intellectual, and moral will of the child. The true teacher is he who can defend the child against his own will and ideas, making his appeal in increasing measure to the energies of the child himself."

We thus see that this man who has been so grossly misrepresented had a profound theory of pedagogy, which he embodied in a fine constructive system of education. Construction was essentially his aim. He would make a new Spanish race, of upright life—the scurrilous charge that he undermined morality is too frivolous to be considered—informed mind, and scientifically trained judgment. This new democracy would create a new Spain. I have before me the index to the *Boletín* he published from 1901 to 1909. The articles are often by some of the most eminent men of science in Europe. They deal with every aspect of pedagogy and science, and often with religion; but, except in this broad sense, not one article in a hundred deals with social questions, none deal with political questions, and all reflect a serious, scientific temper.

I need only add, in regard to the general principles of his work, that after his schools had been threatened in 1906 his friends co-operated in forming an "International League for the Rational Education of Children." Ferrer was made President, and Professor Haeckel (an anti-Socialist) and Professor Sergi (the great Italian anthropologist) are among the Vice-Presidents. Its spirit is the spirit of the Modern Schools, and is expressed in such principles as: "Instruction is only a part of this education. It must also, in addition to the formation of the intelligence, embrace the development of character, the cultivation of the will, the creation of a moral and physical nature, nicely balanced, with faculties harmoniously associated and drawn out to their full power. Moral education, much less theoretic than practical, must chiefly be given by example, and be based on the great natural law of solidarity."

This ideal—the ideal of progressive teachers the world over—is the true spirit of Ferrer's work. It is repeated in every number of his *Bulletin*, reflected in all his manuals, and informed the whole activity of his schools. Not a line of correct quotation from any authentic document of Ferrer's is out of accord with it. But this is precisely the ideal of education that would soon put a term to the *bulas* and *caciques* of Spain, if it were embodied in a general system of education.

The work commenced with the opening of the original and central Escuela Moderna at Barcelona in 1901. Its classes were first attended by twelve girls and eighteen boys. At the end of the first year the number had increased to seventy, in spite of priestly strictures. Its fine rooms, genial teachers, and enlightened lessons could not fail to win adherents. Ferrer quoted in 1907, from a Spanish educational journal (*La Escuela Espanola*), some unpleasant facts with regard to the schools which the Jesuits thought sufficient for Spain. They were largely, it seems, "without light or ventilation—dens of death, ignorance, and bad training." It was estimated that 50,000 children died every year in consequence of the mischievous character of these schoolrooms; moreover, there were still half a million children without any school accommodation at all, and crowds of

hungry, unpaid, incompetent teachers seeking a livelihood.

The Escuela Moderna continued to gain adherents. Demands came from other parts of Catalonia for modern schools, and Ferrer eagerly co-operated and shared his manuals. The Republican schools received a great impetus, and spread equally. By the year 1906 more than fifty schools had been founded, mainly in Catalonia, on the model of the original Escuela Moderna. In that year Ferrer gave a feast to 1,700 children who were pupils in the various schools set up under his inspiration. Teachers and pupils were devoted to their founder, and his *Boletín* testifies constantly to the keen interest he took in their moral no less than their physical development.

I have so often spoken of Spain as a century behind the rest of Europe that I may complete the parallel. A hundred years ago groups of educationists were plotting to rid England of its degrading condition of ignorance, and one of these, Robert Owen, inaugurated a work very closely similar to that of Ferrer. He built a fine school for the children of the workers at New Lanark, dispensed with religious instruction, paid great attention to the training of character on humanitarian lines, and devised the most advanced curriculum that could then be found in Europe. It was well known that Owen detested militarism, advocated Socialism, and rejected theology. We did not shoot or persecute Owen, even in those days. Queen Victoria's uncle, the Duke of Kent, followed his work with the closest interest. Indeed, the success of his moral training was so astounding that New Lanark drew educationists and representatives of governments and monarchs from all parts of Europe.

Francisco Ferrer was the Robert Owen of Spain. I have met men or women who have known both of these educators, and if there is any difference—besides the ultimate political ideal—it is that Ferrer was less absorbed in large ideas, more quick and direct in human sympathies. His letters, many of which I have read, suggest a man of very warm affections, very genial presence, great generosity and refinement. One letter shown to me recalls a typical instance of his ways. A cultivated refugee from some other country had reached England, and, in great privation, became known to a friend of Ferrer's. As the man spoke Spanish, Ferrer was told of his case. Ferrer at once sent the man's fare to Barcelona, and found him employment. His whole career since 1900 was one of generous giving.

He was a man of medium height, with penetrating black eyes, whitish hair, and roundish face. Gifted with a high intelligence, an iron will, and a fine business capacity, he took pride and pleasure in work. A French writer, who knew him, observes that "it was difficult to approach him without loving him," but that he was reserved, and only responded when he willed. His many intimate friends to whom I have spoken—and had spoken often before the tragedy occurred—felt and suffered as one does only where great charm is associated with great worth of character. Of children he was passionately fond. His work for them had a ground of human sentiment as well as of social and moral principle. It was the peril of a child that caused him, quite accidentally, to break a sojourn in England that was to last some months, and drew him into the death-trap at Barcelona.

Ferrer was a happy man. Quiet and dignified in bearing, he had all the Spaniard's love of life, and in his last decade it found satisfaction. Welcomed in a score of circles throughout Eastern Europe, wedded to a charming and beautiful woman, comfortable in his small estate (a farm) on the fringe of Barcelona, he needed but one further solace—the success of his work, the enlightenment of Spain. And it was succeeding as rapidly as he had ever hoped it would. With warm feeling he watched the rays of his ideal spread slowly over the map of Spain, and nursed the little schools which sprang up on all sides. Here was a pacific victory, far more promising than the silencing of rifle by rifle which he had once meditated. But the reactionary powers were watching with inflamed anger and dread, and he was hardly five years in Barcelona when the first attempt was made to destroy his work and take his life.

Chapter V. The Reply of Corruption

IN order to explain the first imprisonment and trial of Ferrer I must take the reader back ten years in the story of Barcelona. The moment one mentions in England that Barcelona has thousands of Anarchists there is a perceptible shudder in one's audience. This is due to sheer insular ignorance. The presence among us of Prince Kropotkin, the European prestige of Count Tolstoy, should have long ago corrected it. An Anarchist is not a man who throws bombs, but a man who believes that centralised government will always lead to corruption; and therefore decentralised administration, with greater liberty of personal development, is the ideal of social form. A very intelligible ideal in Spain. Occasionally, one in a thousand Anarchists may reach so uncontrollable a pitch of indignation at the existing corruption that he vents his feeling in an isolated outrage.

Anarchism is the most popular social theory among the workers of Barcelona, as Socialism is in North Italy. So long as it does not seek to remove the Government by violent means, it has, in any civilisation, as much right as any other social ideal to existence. It is in the position of the Liberal who plots humanely to overthrow a Conservative Government. The sole question which concerns any civilised Government is, whether

the rebels against it, of whatever school, plainly meditate or use violence. Then they take their lives in their hands, and are the first to admit it.

Now, there have been violent outrages done by Anarchists in Barcelona, but two things must be borne in mind by those who would have a correct judgment on these matters. The first is that most, if not all, the bomb outrages that have occurred in Barcelona for the last ten years or more are due to clerical and political agents. This, we shall see, is now fully established. The second point is to understand the special circumstances which embitter Anarchists in Spain.

In 1892 there was a small rising of the peasants in Andalusia, with loss of life. An Anarchist was arrested, and, under threat of excruciating torture, gave a number of names to the authorities. It was the beginning of the reaction of the corrupt powers on the rising insurrection. Without trial, with gross pretence of military justice, several men were executed. They were known in the district to be innocent, but obnoxious to Church or State. In any case, they had no trial. Worst of all, in order to wring fresh names from the prisoners, the most revolting tortures were inflicted on them. The specific accounts of these tortures were published in the Madrid and Barcelona press. It was the beginning of the Anarchist "propaganda by deeds." On evidence thus obtained by horrible torture men were shot, or sentenced to ten or fifteen years in prison.

A fierce anger blazed through the non-clerical workers of Spain. In the following year a bomb was thrown at, and wounded, the commanding officer at Barcelona. The author acknowledged the crime, and was executed, calling for vengeance. A companion Anarchist—Salvador—then threw a bomb in the theatre, with horrible effect, in 1893. He escaped, and a large number of arrests were made at once, and the constitutional guarantees were conveniently suspended—as the police could find no evidence.

In Montjuich, the grim prison-fortress that commands Barcelona, there are certain cells known as the "zero," "double zero," and "counter-zero." These cells now witnessed tortures as infamous and brutal as ever medieval jail had witnessed. For five or six days and nights (consecutive) the men were forced by the whips of their jailers to keep on the move, without resting or sleeping. During that time the only food given them was bread and dried fish, without a drop of water. They were flogged until their bodies were a livid mass. Cords were tied to their genital organs, and were pulled by the Civil Guards, inflicting the most exquisite torture conceivable. One man committed suicide. Several died. Some yielded, and were conveyed into the next cell, where a lieutenant of the Civil Guard wrote down their denunciation of the men he wanted. Several were shot, and many imprisoned on that evidence. After some weeks of this ferocity, the author of the outrage, Salvador, was caught. He explained that he had acted quite alone, to avenge his friend. To avoid discomfort, he pleaded repentance and conversion, was petted by the clergy until the day of execution, and then laughed in their faces.

What proof is there of these inhuman tortures? The sworn testimony, the lacerated bodies, the atrophied genital organs, of the men themselves. One of them, Cerezuela, smuggled a full account to the Republican journal *El Pais*. The others in time obtained liberty, recanted the evidence wrung from them, and described the tortures. Their letters were collected and published by a Spanish schoolmaster, J. Monsey, in a work entitled *El Proceso de un gran crimen*. He observed that, if in the course of time people were informed that he had retracted, they would know that he was being tortured in prison. At the next "suspension of constitutional guarantees" he was put in prison.

This "suspension" occurred in 1896, and needs very careful examination. In the month of June, on the festival of Corpus Christi, the great religious procession of the Sacrament was marching through the streets of Barcelona. At the head were the chief clerical and military and civic dignitaries; in the tail walked the poorer groups of Catholics. A bomb was thrown from a window, with deadly effect, not at the head, but *at the tail*, of the procession. A strange thing for an Anarchist to wait until My Lord the Bishop, the Civil Governor, and all that he hated most fiercely had gone by, and then throw his bomb at a group of innocent men and women of his own class! The criminal was never discovered, but the Freethinkers and Radicals of Barcelona began to suspect that there were bomb-factories in unexpected places. We shall see that two police-agents have since been caught red-handed, and exposed in civil trial; and that the recent rioters at Barcelona found a bomb-factory in a convent.

What earthly object could civic or clerical authorities have in countenancing such a deed, the astounded Briton asks? I will only say that the throwing of that bomb was singularly profitable to the clergy and their allies. At once the constitutional guarantees were suspended. Jesuits and lay confraternities of Catholics ran about with denunciations of "irreligion" and "anarchy." Within a few days they had under lock and key four hundred active anti-clericals, without the inconvenience of a civil trial. There were Anarchists, mostly of the pacific school, among them, but the great majority were Radicals of other schools. All but one were anti-clericals and Republicans. Professors, journalists, medical and other professional men were included, and were packed in fetid jails under disgusting conditions.

The same tortures were applied to many of them as had been used in 1893. One, whose body was already livid from the lash, was kept afoot for nine days. A youth of twenty-one, Ollé by name, was scourged till he

vomited blood, kept walking for thirty-seven hours, and fed on dry fish. He stuffed himself with all the most nauseous things in his cell, in the hope of poisoning himself. A friend of mine, one of the prisoners whom I will quote presently, saw Ollé in his appalling state as he was being reconducted to his cell. The nails of others were torn off; they exhibited the nailless fingers after their release. One young man, Gana, went to Paris after his release, and was taken by my friend to be examined by M. Clemenceau and other distinguished Parisians.

Professor Tarrida del Marmol was at that time Director of the Polytechnic Academy. He was imprisoned on the pretext of a forged letter (the author of which, it has since transpired, was a convict), but escaped through the influence of relatives of high rank. He has gathered together the testimonies of the tortured men, and described the whole episode—with others of equal discredit—in a French work, *Les Inquisiteurs d'Espagne*. His name will be familiar to many as an able contributor to our chief scientific journals: his profound humanity and honour are known to me. He is under standing sentence of death in Spain.

The emotional reader will pardon me for not suspending my narrative to express my feeling in becoming rhetoric. There is still much to say in preparation for the trial of Ferrer, towards which I hasten. I beg to call attention merely to three facts: (1) The author of the outrage was never discovered. (2) Men were shot, or received long terms of imprisonment, on the "evidence" of the tortured men. (3) The suspension of the constitutional guarantees, or super-session of the civil courts, enabled the authorities to make a sweeping clearance of all the most active rebels against Church and political system in Barcelona. It may also be useful to recall that the President of the Madrid Athenaeum selects "the Liberal *cacique* at Barcelona" as an "eloquent example" of the corruption he so vehemently denounces.

From 1896 to 1906 anti-clericalism and anarchy continued to grow in Catalonia. A new force, a new centre of strength and inspiration, had come into the province—the educational work of Ferrer. Workers were no longer compelled to send their children to learn servility to corrupt priests and corrupt politicians at Catholic schools, or to leave them illiterate. A magnificent enthusiasm ran through the scattered ranks of the rebels. Something tangible, a positive institution, was now before their eyes; and its influence was spreading slowly over all Catalonia and a good deal of Spain. Then, on May 31, 1906, an Anarchist threw a bomb at the young King and his bride. In a few days Ferrer was in jail, and all the Modern Schools were closed.

As the more unscrupulous of the anonymous writers are representing that Ferrer was at least the "moral" author of this outrage—since he stood all the pressure of the Fiscal (Attorney General) for months and had to be entirely acquitted, there cannot be the slightest question of complicity—a few words may be said on the culprit. Matteo Morral was not a pupil of Ferrer's, as the more ignorant of the slanderers have it, nor was he an out-at-elbows desperado. He was a cultivated, well-to-do young man, speaking several languages. Concealing his disposition to use violence, he won Ferrer's regard for a time, and was employed by him to translate some books for the Modern School. What the precise importance may be of the fact that he was deeply enamoured of Soledad Villafranca, and repelled by her, one hesitates to say. Some attribute his act, in throwing a bomb at the King and Queen, to a desire to implicate Ferrer. I do not believe it. He made no effort to do so, and he unconsciously gave this important testimony to Ferrer, in a letter reproduced by Rochefort in *L'Intransigeant*: "I don't trust Ferrer, nor Tarrida [del Marmol], nor Lorenzo, nor any of those unfortunate people who think that words will ever lead to a practical result."

Ferrer offered himself to the authorities, who at once detained him, closed his schools, and sought to confiscate his funds. But the constitutional guarantees were not suspended. They were forced to grant him a civil trial. How he had to be acquitted, after thirteen months' detention, is still remembered. But there are features of the trial which have the greatest interest in connection with the later and fatal charge against him, and I will briefly discuss them.

The Madrid magistrate, before whom he was first brought, declared that he could see no valid ground for keeping him in custody. The fact, which Ferrer fully recognised, that Morral had done some work for him, could hardly influence a civil judge, and there was not the least particle of "evidence" beyond this. The Fiscal (Attorney General) intervened, however, and there ensued a long and extraordinary struggle. Becerra del Toro, the Fiscal, demanded that Ferrer should be garrotted for complicity. The civil court required evidence. All Europe was by this time watching the struggle, and Ferrer's admirers in every country educated the public to see that no injustice was done. For twelve months Ferrer was detained in prison to give time for the "discovery" of evidence. At length, in the month of June, he was brought before the civil judges at Madrid—brought handcuffed every day into court—and Becerra del Toro unfolded the case he had prepared.

Two things are chiefly noteworthy in connection with this trial. One is that the clergy, through their Press and pulpits, as well as through the reactionary Becerra del Toro, were making frantic efforts to secure the condemnation of Ferrer. Writers like Mr. G. K. Chesterton, whose literary faculty has the fullest and most entertaining play when they refrain entirely from studying the facts of the case they discuss, assure you that this introduction of the clergy is unjustified. The Spanish papers of the time were full of clerical comments on the case, *pendente lite*, and published broadcast the evidence to be used against Ferrer; but I need give only one

instance. Before me lies a picture post-card issued at the time by the clergy. In the upper part it represents Morral issuing, bomb in hand, from the Escuela Moderna. He is shaking the hand of someone whose face is not seen. In the lower part is depicted the honest, industrious workman who is turned out "in thousands" from the Catholic schools. Ferrer has lightly written on it that "the Jesuits are not backward," and sent it to an English friend. The date stamped on it is March 2, 1907. In other words, this infamous inculcation of Ferrer was circulated over Spain while he still awaited trial in the prison at Madrid. In England we should know what to do with those Jesuits. In Spain they pursued the same tactics this year.

However, as we shall find ample proof of the guilt of the clergy and of their unscrupulous poisoning of the public mind while Ferrer awaited trial this year, we need not delay. The action of the Fiscal was not less instructive; the evidence he gathered not less hypocritical. At first, in the absence of anything with the remotest pretension to be proof of complicity in the bomb outrage, he demanded that Ferrer be imprisoned for life as "a man who was extremely dangerous on account of his anti-religious views"; and this note was struck repeatedly throughout the trial when evidence broke down. During the twelve months' wait in jail (June 3, 1906, to June 3, 1907), moreover, the evidence for the prosecution was communicated to the Press (as in the present year), and garbled versions of it were disseminated through Spain and the rest of Europe. A Madrid magistrate, Santiago Mataix, showed the case for the prosecution to several journalists, with the express object of condemning Ferrer in advance. One of these, Urales, editor of the *Dicirio Universal*, resigned his position, and exposed the scandalous action in the *Espana Nueva*. Urales also interviewed Becerra del Toro. "Have you any proof of Ferrer's guilt?" he asked. "No," the Fiscal answered; "we have no proof of Ferrer's guilt, but *we have a moral conviction of it.*"

It was the shameful story of 1909 in anticipation. The determination to kill Ferrer was dressed as a conviction that he was the "moral author" of outrages; and the reader may guess whether, in a country where officials do not even need to trouble that the end justifies the means, since the end itself has no justification, the collection of evidence would be conducted with much scruple. In point of fact, the evidence was contemptible. Mysterious documents were discovered which had passed between Ferrer and his former friend, Mme. Bonnard. Were they not revolutionary machinations couched in cipher? Mme. Bonnard, who had long before been alienated from Ferrer, came forward and showed that they were French shorthand. A most seditious letter was found, which purported to be from Ferrer's son, Riego. Riego was four years old. The prosecution had to fall back on the sworn declaration of the Lieutenant of the Civil Guard at Barcelona that he was "convinced" that Ferrer had organised the crime, and similar "convictions" on the part of the police. Remember what Spanish writers have told us of "His Majesty Recommendation."

In spite of forged letters, selected judges, and frantic appeals of Becerra del Toro to stop the work of the Modern Schools, Ferrer had to be liberated. His friends were busy in many lands, and Europe followed the long trial with interest. There was not evidence of a kind even to satisfy judges belonging to such a system as I have described, impelled by the whole force of the Catholic press, which does not seem to be subject to any law of contempt of court in Spain. On June 12 Ferrer returned in triumph to Barcelona.

Few will doubt that, had the constitutional guarantees been suspended and Ferrer been tried by a military council in 1906, he would have been executed. The witnesses would not have been cross-examined, the documents would not have been produced in open court, and the "moral conviction" of lieutenants—of that famous "Barcelona cacique"—would have passed as evidence. But a few more particular reflections of moment will occur to the reader who studies the trial of 1906. In the first place, the action of the Church must be remembered. What the law of contempt of court may be in Spain I do not know, but an elementary delicacy and sense of justice would have restrained Catholics from issuing picture post-cards and publishing anonymous documents and violent assurances of guilt before the court even had the evidence submitted to it, if the clergy possessed any such delicacy and sense of justice. The end justified the means. Whatever Catholic theology has taught on that principle in the abstract, Catholic priests have unceasingly acted on it in the concrete. The history of the Spanish clergy, even in the nineteenth century, shows it on every page. The Modern Schools were to be suppressed; and if this could be effected only through the suppression of their leader, so much the worse for him.

It will be noted further that some of the remarkable documents and "proofs" which have been produced this year were not produced in 1906. This is a point of the greatest interest. Where were the phrases impelling to violence in his text-books? Where was the extraordinary inscription, inciting to pillage and murder, which anonymous "travellers" now declare they themselves saw posted up, in large capitals, in all the Modern Schools? These would have been invaluable to the prosecution; yet, though Ferrer's papers were ransacked and his schools exhaustively discussed, they do not appear until 1909. Does anyone imagine that Ferrer, with the sword hanging above him after 1906, with police spies openly watching all he did, set up these things after his narrow escape? The supposition would be childish. These things did not appear in 1906, because the witnesses would have had to submit to cross-examination by Ferrer's able advocate.

An attempt had been made, before Ferrer was tried and acquitted, to induce the French Government to suffer the confiscation of his property in Paris, but it was warmly repelled. Ferrer's deposit in the Bank of Spain had already been confiscated, but it had to be released. In defiance of all justice, however, the central Modern School was closed, and has been ever since. It was a piece of spite and malignant injustice.

Ferrer passed to Paris and to England, to thank the friends who had worked for him, and returned to continue his perilous mission in Barcelona. Fresh Modern Schools were opened in various parts, and a new institution was founded in Barcelona. This foundation was designed to become in time a "popular university." In the brief space that remained for Francisco Ferrer, it developed into a fine and successful publishing business, disseminating cheap literature in Catalonia. On the very eve of the tragedy Ferrer set forth an ambitious programme for his "Encyclopædia of Higher Popular Education." Its aim was, he says in the *Boletín* for June, 1909, to provide the public with "sound and nutritious intellectual food." It was professedly Rationalistic in spirit. The Church was vitally interested in this project of "socialising science." But lest any should think that the aim was ineptly or fraudulently expressed, let me quote the titles of the whole of the projected works:—

- The Evolution of Worlds.
- The Story of the Earth.
- The Origin of Life.
- The Evolution of Living Things.
- The Factors of Organic Evolution.
- The Origin and Development of Man.
- Thought.
- The History of Civilisation.
- Religions.
- Law and Morals.
- Social Organisations.
- Economic Systems.
- The Evolution of Technics and Art.
- The Factors of Social Evolution.
- Man and the World.

The conception brings out once more the fact that Ferrer was a serious and very thoughtful teacher, and the idea recurs throughout the manifesto that this popular dissemination of science had for its aim "the improvement of the moral and physical condition of mankind." English readers must remember that the mere idea of "evolution" is anathema in Catholic Spain. To a Spanish priest this innocent and excellent programme was a plain emanation from the pit.

This manifesto was published, as I said, in the *Boletín* for June, 1909. At that time Ferrer was in England, and I must deal fully with his intentions and movements. We are within the advancing shadow of the great crime.

It was stated in the indictment against Ferrer that he made frequent visits to criminal and dangerous characters in other countries, chiefly Belgium, France, and England. I have had pleasant hours with his criminal associates in Paris, and I believe that the most dangerous of his Belgian *habitués* was the distinguished and fine-spirited Brussels barrister, M. Furnemont, whom I have occasionally met. But it will be most profitable to designate the dangerous criminals we harbour in this country, to whom Ferrer made his English visits. Most of them are personally known to me. I need only name them:—

Professor Tarrida del Marmol, an acute student of mathematics and astronomy, formerly Director of the Barcelona Polytechnic and Professor at the School of Arts and Crafts, cousin of the Marquis of Mont-Roig, a personal friend of mine.

Professor Portet, of the Liverpool School of Commerce. Prince Kropotkin.

Mr. Ward, a well-known Trades Union worker, of Sheffield.

Mr. W. Heaford, of London, who is neither Anarchist nor Socialist.

Those who have pictured Ferrer as frequenting obscure rooms in Soho for the purpose of concerting plans with bomb-throwers have made a ludicrous mistake; but the insertion of that stupendous piece of folly, or fraud, in the indictment against him is on a level with the whole document.

Ferrer came to London with his wife this spring, for two purposes, both of which are expressed in the extant letters of his intimate friends. The first object was rest and recuperation. On arriving at his hotel in Russell Square, he wrote as follows to Professor Tarrida del Marmol:—

21/4/1909

FRIEND FERNANDO,—We are here for a time to rest. We have had so much to do lately that we do not wish to see anybody just yet. Naturally, that does not apply to you. Do not make a special journey to see us. Merely drop in on us, when you come to the City, at 9, or 5, or 6 o'clock, and we will have a chat.

Kind regards, etc.,

F. Ferrer.

He had, he told his friends, the design of staying some months in England, which he greatly liked and admired. To the secretary of his International League for the Rational Education of Children, M. Albert, of Paris, he wrote on June 9 that he did not know when he would return to Paris. If M. Albert (I have seen the letter) did not see him before the end of the month, he must act, in the matter in question, on his own responsibility.

Letters to his friend Mr. Heaford show that the work he was doing in England was something very different from that attributed to him. The moral education of children always preoccupied him. In this country an important League has been formed (the Moral Education League) for furthering this education, and has had its ideas embodied in the curricula of a large number of our educational authorities. It was a study of the results and methods of this League that occupied Ferrer during the time when he is alleged to have been plotting revolution at Barcelona. He was struggling with the asperities of the English tongue, and examining a series of works for the moral training of children which Mr. Heaford had suggested to him. Barcelona politics he did not discuss. I have shown that he held aloof from the subject; and we shall see presently that the violent outbreak at Barcelona was purely spontaneous and unforeseen. He even threw out the idea that his school system was now so firmly rooted in Spain—there were then ninety schools of his and of the Republican model—that he might soon be able to entertain the idea of living elsewhere. But when his friend, who had known the horrors of Montjuich, begged him never to return to that land of corruption and official crime, he shook the suggestion lightly aside. Had he but remained in London two months longer, as he intended, he would be living to-day.

His plans were interrupted by the news that his sister-in-law and his niece were seriously ill. I have before me the last letter that he wrote in England, to his friend Del Marmol. It is a letter-card, stamped officially with the date June II. Even a military council could not have questioned its genuineness. It runs:—

Friday, 11/6/09.

DEAR FERNANDO,—We hear from Mongat [his brother's farm] that my brother's wife and my niece are seriously ill. We leave by the first train to-morrow, and shall not be able to bid you all goodbye. The supper must be postponed until the next time. I will send news from Mongat. Cordial greetings to all from Soledad and yours,

F. Ferrer.

He reached Barcelona on June 19. No one at that time had the faintest presentiment of serious trouble, and Ferrer's attention was divided between his sick relatives, the translation and publication of a work of Prince Kropotkin's for his new library and his English books on moral instruction. His niece died in his arms, and he was presently free to return to France or England. Towards the close of July, however, a friend in Paris, M. Malato, who related the incident to me, sent him a request for information in regard to certain Spanish stock, and he delayed in order to obtain it. By sheer accident he was in Barcelona when the riots broke out, and his bitter and unscrupulous enemies closed on him.

Why, the reader will ask again, was not this evidence put forward on his behalf? There is surely not a court in Europe on which it would fail to make an impression. Why were not these letters I now reproduce sent to be used in his defence? Why did not Mr. Heaford, with his ample documents, prove on what business Ferrer was engaged? Why did he not rebut the abominable charge that Ferrer corrupted his pupils' morals with the plain evidence of Ferrer's preoccupation with the literature of moral education? Why did not M. Malato send documentary proof of his queries to Barcelona?

The reply to the first question is that Professor Del Marmol is one of the Barcelona refugees of 1896, and knows the ways of "military councils." He produced the letters at a public meeting at which I presided, and said that if they were sent to Barcelona they would be "lost in transit." He entrusted them to me, and I warned señor

Maura that I held them. The answer to the other questions will show that my friend was right. Ferrer was to be shot. The letters would at least help his memory.

Mr. Heaford and M. Malato, like M. Naquet and others, sent valuable documents to Ferrer's advocate at Barcelona, to be used in Ferrer's defence. They have not been heard of since. Further, the parcel of English works on moral education which Ferrer took back, together with his notes and plans on the subject, are in the hands of the police at Barcelona. They were refused to his advocate, who wished to account for his visit to London and to prove what subject it was that really pre-occupied Ferrer during the months of June and July.

But here we enter upon the shameful story of the "trial" and execution of this high-spirited idealist; and I must relate what was happening in Spain, in Ferrer's absence, to lead up to the violent outbreak in Barcelona.

Chapter VI. The Indictment of Ferrer

WE have seen the true story of Ferrer's movements and preoccupations in the period immediately preceding the riots at Barcelona in July. It rests on the evidence of a dozen witnesses of known character, and letters which were not entrusted to the Spanish post. The officials of the Spanish postal service are expert at tampering with the service. We shall see more of their activity. And they are dependent on that "eloquent example" of Tammany, "the Barcelona cacique." Now we must follow the development on the Catalonian side, which just as plainly excludes Ferrer from the slenderest complicity in the riots.

Let me first bring before the reader two earlier facts in the recent experience of Barcelona. By the adroit use of the British Press certain anonymous writers have contrived to convey an impression that Barcelona is honeycombed with "Anarchist" dens, in which deadly explosives are daily manufactured, and so measures of unusual rigour have to be adopted. The real truth—I mean the demonstrable truth—is that since the fatal and horrible crime of Salvador in 1893—sixteen years ago—not a single Anarchist, out of many thousands, has been convicted of throwing or possessing bombs in Barcelona! The remarkable thing is that the horrors of 1896, the attempt on Ferrer in 1906, and the prevailing corruption did *not* evoke violence earlier, if Barcelona is such a city of desperadoes.

Two men have been convicted of placing or possessing bombs in Barcelona since Salvador criminally avenged the execution of Pallas in 1893. Those two men were agents of the police or other officials. Lieutenant Morales, of the Civil Guard, was caught red-handed in 1907. The case was fully reported and aroused intense interest—though it was not worth mentioning by our foreign correspondents—at the time. The police of Barcelona do not love the Guardia Civil (Civil Guards, or gendarmerie), and they promptly arrested the lieutenant of the rival force, with his bombs. He was put on trial, and, though he threatened to incriminate high officials, they were compelled by the publicity and flagrancy of the case to sentence him. He was not long in prison.

The other case is more recent, and just as notorious. Juan Rull, a Barcelona hooligan, was executed in April of last year (1908) for placing bombs. His trial lasted over a fortnight. He, with a small gang, was convicted of five outrages. Were they adherents of the Escuela Moderna? No, they were adherents of the clergy. It was proved in the course of the trial that Rull had received sums from the police amounting to at least £215. The ex-Chief of Police, Tressolo, declared in court: "I am fully convinced that Rull placed the bombs, but I must also state clearly that I believe Rull is only the arm and instrument of a terrorism with which the Anarchists are in no way associated, and that behind Rull there are persons of high station, who are not in the prisoner's dock." Who these "high-placed persons" were was indicated plainly enough in the course of the trial. They were the leaders of lay Catholicism in Catalonia, nobles who were sustaining the evil repute of Barcelona, for the purpose of repression, by making use of such scoundrels as Rull. He had to be sacrificed in spite of his threats. The whole evidence conjured up an appalling intrigue of clerical and political authorities.

English readers will find a full account in an article by Mr. Ward in the *Sheffield Independent*, April 18, 1908,

Where were the bombs fabricated? By one of the most singular pieces of hypocrisy in the whole sordid campaign for the support of an acknowledged corruption, the crowd which broke into the Jesuit convent at Barcelona found the shells of bombs therein! For a long time this was widely suspected in Barcelona, where the Jesuits are known to be capable of any enormity. It is not many years since a drama—*Paternidad*—was staged at Barcelona, in which the Jesuits were loaded with all the most shameless and criminal excesses that any Protestant ever believed them capable of perpetrating. At an enthusiastic call for the author, a Catholic priest, Segismondo Pey-Ordeix, walked before the curtain. I have, therefore, made the most careful inquiry in regard to this reported finding of bombs. When I am assured most emphatically by a schoolmaster who was present in the attack on the convent that he saw and handled these objects, there is no room for doubt.

The hesitating reader must remember two facts. The first is that not a single bomb was used by the rioters,

though they would have found them most useful in attacking the powerful convents or the troops. The second is that since the riot a remarkable number of bombs have been found by the police at most opportune moments, in situations where they were finely calculated to kill nobody. Do Anarchists work thus? But the constant announcement of such discoveries sustains in the Press of Europe that fictitious repute of Barcelona which enables Church and State to suspend civil law, and put thousands of men and women, who are known to be restive, in prison without trial. The bomb which was thrown at the *tail* of a procession in 1896 enabled the clerical and political controllers of Barcelona to rid the town of four hundred Freethinkers and Freemasons without trial. The bombs of to-day afford a pretext for maintaining the suspension of the constitutional guarantees, and keeping three thousand men and women in jail without trial. I am content to put the facts. The reader may judge.

This is the Barcelona in which señor Costa finds the most corrupt *cacique* in Spain; in which the hundreds of wealthy convents stand out amid a bitterly hostile population. Let a spark fall on the inflammable material, and there will be a terrible conflagration.

The spark fell in July. The inner history of the war which Spain has entered upon in Morocco will one day be written. It is sufficient here to note that the workers of Catalonia believe that the war is waged solely in the interest of certain wealthy Catholics. A great many people in Europe besides the workers think so. The war was very unpopular, and indignation meetings multiplied. The Government forbade the holding of meetings, and increased the resentment. The reservists were called out; families were robbed of their bread-winners. The King was hooted in Madrid. At Barcelona, when the wealthy Catholic ladies went on board the troopships to distribute medals and cigarettes to the soldiers, the men threw their gifts into the sea. The Government had enacted that young men would not be called out whose families could pay 1,500 *pesetas*. The poorer mothers were aflame with anger.

On July 23 the Socialists and Trade Unionists decided that there should be a general strike, in protest, over the whole country on August 2. Under pressure of one group the date was anticipated, and a committee was formed to inaugurate the strike at Barcelona on July 26. I am quoting the authentic statements of the officials. Three bodies were represented on this committee—the Socialists, Anarchists, and Trade Unionists. They worked with secrecy and energy, and completely outwitted the police, who were intensely angered to find the town on strike on July 26. The crowds gathered in the streets, stopped the trams—women everywhere taking the leading part in the work—and cut the telegraph wires. The strike drifted towards riot, and there were collisions with the police. The troops were then called out, and, on the crowd appealing to them, refused to fire. All organisation was now broken, and no step that was taken after this point was in the least premeditated, as the Protestant ministers of Barcelona have written. The crowd developed, under the influence of its own passions and the stupid provocation of the Civil Guard, into an insurgent mob.

To understand the situation entirely it is essential to note that the more serious revolt did not begin in Barcelona. Some sixteen miles off is Sabadell, an industrial town of 18,000 inhabitants, the chief manufacturing centre of the province. Intensely Republican and disdainful of the corruption of Church and State, Sabadell lost its head in the whirl of news of riot from all parts of Spain. It cut its communications, disarmed its police, and proclaimed the Republic. In the afternoon messengers arrived from Sabadell in Barcelona with the news, adding that 1,500 armed Sabadellians were ready to come and help to found the Republic. It is profoundly pathetic to picture these few thousand badly armed men, feverish and reckless with anger, cutting the wires which might have informed them that Spain was not rising. Over the country beyond were thousands of trained troops concentrating on them.

The morning of July 27 found everybody in a state of perplexity. There was no plan, no leader, no definite aim. The anger of the people was, however, quickly revived, the barricades were manned—and womanned—the guard were engaged in bloody conflict. It was an old tradition of Spain that when you rioted you burned convents. A Catalan popular song commemorated the burning of seven Madrid convents seventy years before because the authorities had provided spiritless beasts for the bull-ring. The Barcelona convents, so sleek and prosperous in a land that largely disdains them, are particularly hated, and before night forty convents and churches were in flames. Eye-witnesses speak with wonder of the curious mingling of reserve and passion.

See, for instance, the accounts written by Protestant ministers in the Protestant Alliance Magazine (November, 1909) and the Methodist Recorder (August 26, 1909). The correspondent of the Times confirmed this.

The buildings, hateful to the Catalans for so many reasons, were ruthlessly set aflame, but the ailing and infirm religious were assisted out of danger by the assailants, who had generally given notice of their intention. From conflicting accounts I gather that only two inmates were killed. One was shot, rifle in hand, in the defence of his home. One was asphyxiated with smoke, obstinately refusing to leave. Money and valuables that were discovered were cast deliberately in the flames by the rioters. It was a new form of revolution.

Catholic journals have stated that Ferrer and his friends took "hundreds of innocent lives and violated the

bodies of nuns." Of Ferrer's position at the time I speak presently. The rioters unintentionally took, or were responsible for, two lives in the attack on the convents, though some communities naturally met rifle with rifle, and the most sinister rumours were current among the heated populace. It was widely believed, not only that the bombs of 1896, 1907, and 1908, which had strengthened the arm of despotic corruption, were Catholic bombs, but that the religious were even then provoking the reluctant soldiers to fire on the mob. A circumstantial account by a creditable eye-witness of one incident was submitted to me. A group of men were firing from an elevated position at the troops. Up to this point the troops had taken no part. Infantry refused to fire, and cavalry to charge; the whole riot was on their behalf. The shrewder spirits among the people saw the danger and criminality of this attack on the soldiers, and dislodged those who were firing on them. The witness emphatically asserts that they were from the convents.

The "violation" of the dead bodies of nuns is an unscrupulous misstatement. In one convent an iron bed was found, with gas-fire underneath its perforated sheet. Was it an instrument of torture? Well, the Catholics say that it was a philanthropic apparatus for warming the beds of ailing nuns. The reader may form his own opinion. It was, remember, a sheet of iron, perforated, with burners immediately beneath. At all events, the bodies of recently deceased nuns were disinterred solely to examine if they bore marks of torture, and were subjected to no indignity. I am further assured by a schoolmaster who entered the Jesuit convent with the crowd that, as was reported in the press, not only the shells of bombs, but apparatus for coining money was discovered. He declares that he examined this, and smiles at the Catholic suggestion that it was for making medals for sale. It was a time of great turbulence and intense passion. The reader must balance the probabilities from what I have previously described as to the known condition of the clerical and political authorities. One thing is certain. R. Thirlmere, in his authoritative *Letters from Catalonia*, said four years ago that the Church was doomed in that province, if not in the whole of Spain. That is beyond question now.

To conclude with the outbreak. By July 28 the insurgents were masters of the Town Hall and most of Barcelona, and the question now arose of forming a definite plan of action. The whole episode had been an unthinking release of pent-up anger against the war and the clergy. The Republican and Radical leaders had kept entirely away, the committee of the strike were appalled at the turn of events, and the people had no leaders and no plan. The notion that the outbreak was organised, by Ferrer or anybody else, is grotesquely untrue to every account we have of the course of events. The slightest acquaintance with Barcelona politics shows the absurdity of such a notion. Advanced bodies in Barcelona are so fundamentally opposed to each other that the moment a question of construction arose it would be utterly impossible to take a single step. The Separatists would demand the autonomy of Barcelona; the great body of the Republicans, under Alejandro Lerroux, would oppose it (because the Separatist movement has a suspicious proportion of Catholic adherents); the Socialists would plead for an entirely new economic system; the Anarchists would strongly oppose all their plans.

But the spontaneity and aimlessness of the outbreak are palpable. I will add only two curious testimonies. I was permitted to see a letter written secretly from one of the Anarchists of Barcelona, who had eluded the police, to a sympathetic leader outside Spain. In this candid and intimate account the working-man writer says, exultantly: "The *people* did the whole thing, without anybody's help." The next witness is the South American Anarchist daily, *La Protesta*. Writing to this journal from Barcelona on July 30, *before the reaction has begun*, Alejandro Sux remarks on "the absolute lack of aim" in the disturbances. No leaders were seen, he says. It was a spontaneous outburst of "the indignation of men and sorrow of the women" on account of the corruptly engineered war, which fell on the poor. Anselmo Lorenzo tells exactly the same story.

The sequel need be recalled in few words, before we return to Ferrer. Fresh troops were introduced, and the insurgents were at once repressed. The barricades were swept with artillery. The number of rioters and soldiers killed is differently reported, and may be roughly set down at about a hundred. Then the "white terror" set in. The constitutional guarantees had been already suspended, and there was no pretence of seeking evidence. Within a few weeks 3,000 men and women and some children were packed in the jails of Catalonia. In many cases, the official journal (*Correspondencia Militar*) admitted, there was "no time" to frame a charge before the arrests were made. The arrests were made, notoriously, from the lists of names of obnoxious persons supplied by the police, the clergy, and the Catholic ladies who visited among the poor. At night especially the civil guards went from house to house, arresting all the more active members of the advanced political or anti-clerical organisations, working-men's clubs, and every institution that had been set up apart from the orthodox political bodies or the Church. Their schools and halls were closed. A special installation was made of powerful arc-lamps, to prevent escapes in the night; and, according to the *Matin* (the *Daily Mail* of Paris), September 28, all were arrested "who could not give a satisfactory account of their means of subsistence *and their opinions*." As in 1896, the outrage was made a sheer pretext for suppressing every institution and body that opposed the corruptions of Church and State, and intimidating Barcelona from setting them up afresh. All the jails of Catalonia—for men and for women—were crowded to suffocation; and weary, haggard bands of

men and women were dragged on foot over the provinces to more distant jails. Every message that has since appeared in a Spanish journal or been telegraphed abroad has been rigorously censored. Europe, which knows not the ways of Spain, was cynically deluded by the Home Secretary, La Cierva.

Mendacity is essential and habitual to the pro-Catholic and pro-Spanish writers. As far as they are concerned, I know that my plainest words will be completely misrepresented. But I will make it plain, nevertheless, that I have no sympathy with the burning of convents, however corrupt, no leaning to the political Anarchist ideal, and no inclination to criticise Spain for punishing violence. What I say is that the violence has been made the pretext for imprisoning thousands for totally different and corrupt reasons. Many have been shot, many condemned to imprisonment for life or for twenty years without trial. What the value of a condemnation by "military council" is we shall now see in the indictment of Ferrer.

The founder of the Modern School was in Barcelona on the Monday, June 26, when the movement was at its height. It is quite true that he was "seen talking to leaders of the people." I have before me a letter of this "leader of the people" (with whom, moreover, I have spoken on the subject) in which the fact is admitted and explained. señor Moreno was at work in the organisation of the strike, and adds his testimony that it drifted into riot solely under stupid provocation. "On the Monday," he writes to an Anarchist friend, "I had a note from Ferrer making an appointment for half-past eight, in the railway station of the Paseo de Isabel, *for the purpose of discussing the creation of a new school*, for the 'Alliance,' a society affiliated to the Solidarity of Workers." There are previous references to this school in Ferrer's published letters. Moreno adds that he then told Ferrer about the organisation of the strike, which had been conducted with great secrecy. Ferrer had not worked with any of the groups co-operating in it, and they would not have dreamed of taking him into their confidence.

This entirely agrees with Ferrer's account of his movements, in a letter published in the *Daily News* on October II. He explains that, as we know, he had much work at his publishing office, especially in connection with a forthcoming history of the French Revolution by Prince Kropotkin. He spent the whole day in visits to printers and publishers or in his office. He went to the station to take the train for Mongat, where he was staying with his brother, at ten minutes past six. The line was up, and he returned to the printer's house. Prudently, however, he concluded that Barcelona was unsafe, and he walked on foot to Mongat, where he arrived at five in the morning and remained until the 29th.

In another letter he describes his occupation during the period between his return from England and the outbreak. He was occupied solely in studying English works on the moral instruction of children—such works as Miss Alice Chesterton's *Magic Garden of Childhood* and Mr. Waldegrave's *Teacher's Handbook of Moral Lessons*. These and other works were read and annotated by him, and selected for publication in his schools. "Where are these dear books now?" he writes, before his condemnation. "They have been seized by the police at my house, Mas Germinal; but I shall, no doubt, have them returned to me later."

Even Ferrer doubted the full guilt of his persecutors. He requested the authorities to put at the disposal of his advocate, Captain Galcerán, this important batch of notes and books. They would have met the charge that he sought to corrupt children, as well as show his real occupation after his return to Spain. The request was refused, and they were not put before his "judges."

At Mongat, a farm a few miles from Barcelona in the direction of his native place, Alella, he presently heard that the authorities had taken over and searched his publishing house in Barcelona. Next a message came from Alella that a young woman, a nurse, was informing the authorities that she had seen him lead a band to burn one of the convents at Premia. No convents had been burned at Premia, as Ferrer afterwards discovered; but he saw that the affair of 1906 was to be repeated. He, therefore, concealed himself, and eluded the police for five weeks, though, he says, he "suffered much from reading the charges made against him in the papers." On August 29 or 30, he adds, in this interesting letter to Mr. Heaford, he read that the Fiscal (Attorney-General) had declared, after making an investigation at Barcelona, that "Ferrer was the director of the revolutionary movement." This atrocious declaration on the part of the first legal official of Spain, condemning Ferrer even before an elementary case had been made up against him, drew him from his hiding-place. He resisted the entreaties of his friends, and went out to give himself up. He was arrested on his way to Barcelona.

At once Ferrer began to experience the ferocity which disgraces the whole of the rest of the story. He demanded that he should be conducted forthwith before the magistrate who was to make the preliminary inquiry. They took him instead to the military governor, who assured him that he was responsible for the outbreak by reason of his schools. He was then taken to the Prefecture of Police, and made to submit to a singular procedure, which astonished even the officials. The whole of his linen and clothes were taken from him, and he was dressed in fresh cheap linen, a "ten shilling suit of clothes, which were too small for me, and the rough cap of a hooligan." All these details have transpired through his being able to bribe a jailer to post a long letter to M. Malato, at Paris.

Facsimile pages of this letter are given in the life of Ferrer which the Committee of Defence have just published at Paris.

In this guise he was the same evening brought before the examining magistrate, or military man acting as such, who questioned him as to his movements during the outbreak. This magistrate, he observes, showed a spirit of justice and honesty, and Ferrer concluded that his detention would be brief. Witnesses to his story could easily be procured. Apparently this magistrate *was* a man of honour. The case was taken out of his hands, and Ferrer never saw him again. He spent nearly a week in a squalid dungeon, without air, warmth, or light, and infested with swarms of vermin; and he was refused soap and water for several days.

Five days later he was again summoned. It was a fresh military magistrate, a polite, correct Spanish gentleman, but—we shall see what happened. The first day was spent in a fruitless attempt of the military surgeons to find marks of fighting or burning on his person. Another delay, and then the magistrate discussed his movements in Barcelona, and laid great stress on certain revolutionary sentiments which were attributed to him in a Freethought Almanack published in Brussels in 1907. Ferrer at once pointed out that this passage referred to his youth, and that in this very article he expressly avows that an adequate education of the people is now the sole work of his life. He had written the notice—which I have before me—himself. But from this and certain letters they had obtained, and were wholly misrepresenting, he saw what kind of a case was being made up.

The next visit completely opened his eyes. While Ferrer was hiding, the police had, on August 11, searched his house in the presence of his family. After twelve hours' search by a band of twenty agents only three articles were thought worthy of removal—a letter from a Paris friend to his brother Jose, a key belonging to Lerroux (a leader of the recognised Republican party), and a note indicating that he had lent some £30 to a working-men's society. Of this Ferrer was aware, and felt some security against misrepresentation. To his astonishment, at the third visit to the magistrate, a month after the search at Mas Germinal, that officer produced a faded document of a violently revolutionary character, and said that it had been found among his papers. Ferrer at once protested that no such document had been found at his house during the official search in the presence of his wife. Soledad also wrote an emphatic denial of the "discovery." The magistrate politely promised to incorporate a due report of his denial, but nothing of the kind was done.

What was the origin of the document, with its incitements to murder and pillage, of which so much has been made in certain British journals? The band of police found no such document on August 11. But on August 27 they returned to Mas Germinal. This time the family were not invited to be present, as an elementary instinct of justice and even the Spanish practice demanded. For two days a band of military engineers ransacked the house, and, as we know from the betrayal of a disgusted official, the search was controlled by continuous telegrams from the Home Secretary. In view of the guilty refusal to have witnesses present in Ferrer's interest, any documents alleged to be found in such a search have no legal value. In view of the "profound immorality"—to quote again authoritative Spanish writers—of the whole civic and political system, they have not an atom of moral value. In view of the repeated declarations of Ferrer, published before the trouble and addressed to revolutionary friends, that he had abandoned all revolutionary action, the documents must be regarded as gross forgeries.

I may add that the alcalde of Alella has been decorated since by the late Home Secretary, and a sum of £120 has been distributed among the country police who arrested Ferrer.

These documents, moreover, were communicated to the Catholic press *before* the trial. They began to appear in *El Mundo* and other reactionary journals on September 17. The Church was egging on the willing officials with all its power. Not only did the orthodox press scatter over Spain, and over Europe, these scandalous documents, without a word as to the real story of the "search," but the prelates of Catalonia publicly demanded that the outrages should be visited on the founder of "the schools without God." Writers like Mr. Chesterton, who treat the charge against the Church as an idle one, have not taken the least trouble to, ascertain the facts. The *Heraldo* of Madrid published on September 4 a letter addressed to the Prime Minister by the prelates of Barcelona. They assured him that the evil was due to the promoters of the Modern Schools, declared that the late outbreak was only the prelude to worse, and trusted that "his piety, his patriotism, and his compassion for the Church in its misfortunes" would move him to rigorous action. "Pious" señor Maura replied (September 7): "I hasten to assure you that the Government will act in the spirit of your letter and follow the line of conduct that you indicate." Mgr. Guitari (Barcelona), interviewed by a *Matin* correspondent after the murder, said (October 13) that "the principal character of the outbreak was that it was essentially anti-clerical," and that, quite apart from his "alleged" participation in the outrages—the Bishop obviously doubts it—Ferrer "deserved to be punished because he had prepared the way for them by his doctrinal propaganda."

Let us return to the manufacture of evidence. The magistrate had discovered another revolutionary document. He had, he told Ferrer, "sat up until three in the morning studying its real significance" (to quote Ferrer's letter)—which does not say much for its revolutionary value. This document is genuine; but it belongs, as the magistrate quite admitted, to 1892! It was sent by Ferrer to a Congress at Madrid in his early revolutionary days. The date was thus fixed so plainly that the magistrate did not attempt to alter it. He admitted

it as "evidence" because there was "a curious coincidence" between the words, as he read them at three in the morning, and the actual outbreak at Barcelona, seventeen years later. In spite of Ferrer's protest that his ideas had, as we saw, utterly changed, it was made a formidable point in the indictment. I may add that this is one of the documents published, with suppression of date, by the Catholic Press of Spain and this country.

Ferrer now felt alarmed, especially as the magistrate told him the preliminary work was over, and he must choose an advocate for the military council. Ferrer protested that he had still most important evidence to lay before him, including proof that the police were offering money to his servants to testify against him, and explaining the real motives of the Republican witnesses who were appearing against him. The reader must remember that there was to be no cross-examination. The magistrate refused to hear him, declaring that "military law was not civil law," and closed the inquiry.

This important account of the manufacture of the case is from a long letter, smuggled out of jail to Paris by Ferrer, and published in full in the work issued recently by the Committee of Defence. Facsimile sheets of the letter are prudently reproduced.

The sitting of the military council—I cannot call it trial—was fixed for October 9. Europe was being informed, in spite of the expulsion from Barcelona of every journalist who told the truth; and the Cortes was to assemble on October 15, when the Liberals might give trouble—as they did. Meantime the foul conspiracy hampered Ferrer at every point. The indignities to which he was subject, in the refusal of decent clothes, handkerchiefs, etc., were bad enough—he was told that his things were "confiscated"; but the unscrupulous thwarting of his efforts to put material in the hands of Captain Galcerán, who had been appointed his advocate, is appalling to read. He had been hitherto *au secret* (forbidden to communicate), but this had now to be removed. The official, however, tried to render this liberty useless by refusing to let him touch any of his money for postage and telegrams. With less than three weeks to gather material for his defence, surrounded by corrupt officials, the hunted man made his last struggle. He sent a letter to a lady at Paris, with a full and important analysis of the case against him. The letter was stolen.

We know of his sending it by a reference to it in a later letter which managed to get through.

He sent to England to have the material proofs of his innocence forwarded to his advocate. Mr. Heaford and others sent a number of important letters and documents. They were all suppressed. He demanded that the moral instruction books should be given to his advocate. They were refused. Friends in Paris sent him 300 francs. One-third of the sum was stolen. Thus was engineered the "trial" which the correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* described as having been conducted with perfect honour and honesty.

Chapter VII. The Death of Ferrer—and the Echo

THE defenders of the memory of Francisco Ferrer would be justified in declining to examine the proceedings of the military council which condemned him. What was its legal value? A lieutenant-colonel and five captains, utterly untrained to judge the value of evidence, were his judge and jury. Those six officers, moreover, belonged to a political system unique in its corruption and immorality. The counsel for the prosecution was an officer whose work gives evidence of considerable ability and intense effort, and who had the full resources and the warm blessing of Church and State. The counsel for Ferrer was an officer to whom success or zeal would mean ruin. I hasten to say that he behaved nobly, but we have seen how he was prevented from obtaining material evidence. The witnesses for the prosecution, many of whom were allowed to be anonymous, were not cross-examined, and the incriminating documents were not discussed. No witnesses for the defence were admitted, although Captain Galcerán demanded this.

From what we have seen, it is plain that an imposing mass of documents and witnesses could have been produced in Ferrer's favour if there had been a legal and free trial. Every paragraph in the indictment would have been torn to shreds, and it would have been made absolutely clear that Ferrer entirely modified his views after 1892. It could, in particular, have been demonstrated that he knew nothing whatever of the proposed strike in Barcelona, and took not the slightest share in the outbreak. Very interesting facts would have been elicited in regard to the character, motives, and interests of the witnesses against him.

The most elementary sense of justice demands that the defence should have had this opportunity, but it was refused. Not justice, but death, was the end in view throughout. The prosecution was sustained with the full power of the corrupt service of Spain; the defence was hampered by the same agents; the procedure was barbaric. I do not see the force of the arguments of those who, like the Madrid correspondent of the *Daily Telegraphy* plead that this barbarism was Spain's habitual usage, and was carried out "correctly."

Yet I will glance at the proceedings, the witnesses, and the documents. The court opened at 8 o'clock in the morning of October 9. Ferrer, pale, worn, clothed with deliberate ignominy, the intense black eyes flashing forth the last reserve of energy and hope, faced the six military men to whom his life was entrusted. He

courteously bowed to the court, and sought to explain his disreputable appearance. The president curtly interrupted him, and called the prosecutor to read his lengthy "act of accusation."

This extraordinary document ran to more than fifty pages. It seems to have been constructed on the belief that if you poured bold, untested allegations against a man into the ears of a group of officers for a few hours, without intermission, they would be able to persuade themselves that he must be guilty of something. Let us examine such points of evidence as we have not already discussed.

I take the account from the full report gives in *Gil Blas*, October 14 to 22.

The first witness—quoted, not tested—is the chief of the Barcelona police. He testifies that Ferrer is a "fervent Anarchist"; that after his escape in 1906 he went to Paris, where he became "one of the most active elements in the Confederation of Labour"; that he made many journeys to London to confer with "the most noted revolutionaries and Anarchists"; and that he returned to Barcelona, most suspiciously, just before the outbreak. The first charge is a deliberate attempt to mislead; the second statement is wholly false; the third statement is silly lying, after what we have seen; and the fourth is a gross concealment of the known fact of the illness of his niece and sister-in-law. And this was all that the head of the Barcelona police had against Ferrer.

Then came four witnesses to say that Ferrer had tried to stir up the inhabitants of Masnou, a village near his home, to insurrection. The first, a policeman, is bold enough to say that Ferrer "harangued the crowd." The second, the barber Domenech, gives a minute account of Ferrer's incitation, from which it appears (1) that Ferrer was endeavouring to inflame everybody, and (2) that Domenech at the time so little understood Ferrer's motives that he went about with him all day in perfect amity. This witness, with his glaring contradiction, was the chief witness to Ferrer's participation in the outbreak. The truth is that he shaved Ferrer on that morning, as he did thrice a week, and had a talk with him, as barbers do; the police helped his memory afterwards. The next witness admitted that he had not seen Ferrer for twenty-five years until the fatal day; he did not add that, as we shall see, he was himself arrested for helping to burn convents; the press has not added that he was released after witnessing against Ferrer. The fourth Masnou witness (an officer of the Civil Guard) testified that "he knew from *confidential communications* that Ferrer had taken an active part."

The next witnesses, of the same character, came from Premia, another coast village of the district. The young woman who saw Ferrer burning convents, where none were burned, has not survived the preliminary inquiry; but no less a person than the alcalde (or "mayor," as English journals put it) gives evidence that Ferrer incited him to rebel, and he refused. Premia being a village of 1,500 souls, the alcalde may be no more than a peasant. However, we need not press. Alcalde Casas merely says that "an individual calling himself Ferrer" (possibly a police-agent) did this. There is evidence that a police-agent was impersonating Ferrer. In fine, the court was not informed that, as we know, Alcalde Casas was himself arrested, on the oath of his own councillors, for complicity. He was released on testifying against Ferrer, as Captain Galcerán boldly but fruitlessly reminded Ferrer's judges.

Then a "municipal judge" of Premia (1,500 inhabitants) gives witness that "it was *rumoured* that Ferrer had brought a group of men with dynamite to Premia," and several men depose that they know Ferrer spoke to their alcalde; which Ferrer admitted. Then no less than nineteen citizens of Premia depose that two men came to Premia on the 28th, that the pillage and incendiarism began immediately after, and that "they *learned subsequently* that one of them *called himself* Ferrer." Then another Republican patriot, who was himself arrested for complicity (on the testimony of nineteen witnesses) and was released after his deposition, declared that Ferrer had incited him. Then another citizen solemnly deposed that Ferrer had asked him, "What do you think of events?" This witness, whose deposition was utterly worthless, was ostentatiously confronted with Ferrer.

These statements of suspicious, or futile, or anonymous, or utterly illegal witnesses are interlarded with the simple denials of the accused. Three or four of them were brought before him by the prosecuting officer, and the farce of bald affirmation and denial repeated. There was no cross-examination, and Ferrer presumably knew nothing of the arrest of these men. Counsel was not allowed to him till all the witnesses had been discharged; and then not a lawyer, but an officer. On the other hand, two or three witnesses entirely confirmed Ferrer's account of his movements in Barcelona on the 26th, and said they knew nothing of his guilt. Soledad Villafranca is allowed to admit that Ferrer was in Barcelona on the 26th, but not to account for his movements, and call her witnesses, for the 27th and 28th.

The *Dépêche* for October 31 published a letter in which Soledad gives a minute account of Ferrer's movements from July 26 to 29. It entirely agrees with our story as to the 26th, and adds that he remained studying at home on the 27th and 28th. It was with the greatest difficulty that she induced him to take a serious view of the matter. All this would have been proved in a trial, as there were others at the house.

Next two soldiers solemnly depose that on the evening of the 26th they told an individual, whom they later recognised as Ferrer, to "move on," and he indignantly replied that he was reading the civil governor's proclamation! At this point, however, my source of information, *Gil Blas*, fails. After having given at length the

depositions of these witnesses in its columns, it dismisses the rest with the disdainful observation: "At this point the reading of the report presented to the tribunal loses all interest." The writer had a shorthand copy of the whole before him. He merely adds that, when Ferrer was asked to choose an advocate—of course, from a list of officers submitted to him—he said that he knew none, and trusted none, of them; but he selected one whose name resembled his own (Francisco Galcerán Ferrer).

The "act of accusation," however, is followed by the "fiscal accusation," the real speech for the prosecution. The former had been a simple recital of the statements made by witnesses on examination. The latter is a very long and oratorical manipulation of the evidence in the interest of the prosecution. It would have needed a trained magistrate to follow with balanced judgment its appalling sophistry, its wilful confusion of positive and hesitating witnesses, its culpable quotation of letters without saying if they belonged to Ferrer's earlier or later period. As *Gil Blas* editorially comments (October 14): "The process went on with a brutality of procedure rare even in the annals of courts-martial." I will notice such new scraps of "evidence" as are introduced in this venomous speech.

With Captain Raffles's lengthy proof that the events of July constituted a rebellion we are not concerned. The sole question is whether Ferrer was, as he claimed, "the head of the rebellion." To prove this he unblushingly quotes the evidence of "witnesses who are beyond suspicion because they have themselves been arrested"—as we saw, they earned their liberty; of witnesses who depose "on information that they have not the means of controlling, but believe to be exact"; of witnesses who (being in prison for burning convents) "share the general opinion" of Ferrer's guilt; and of witnesses who merely declare that the tumult increased after Ferrer's visit to Premia—as if it would not naturally increase after the early morning. These "fifteen witnesses" are declared to prove Ferrer's guilt. Then comes the egregious barber, who offered Ferrer drinks and lunch, and went about with him, not noticing, until he was asked by the police, that they were engaged in revolution; his testimony "proves" that Ferrer was head of the insurrection. The evidence of the soldiers that Ferrer (or someone they afterwards believed to be Ferrer) protested when they wished to disturb him as he read the proclamation just posted up is pressed as "of evident importance whereas it is not disputed that Ferrer was in Barcelona on the 26th. For the 27th we have the Masnou and Premia witnesses I have already noticed nineteen of whom merely testify that Ferrer did speak to their alcalde (which he did not deny), the subject being unknown to them. Most of them only recognised Ferrer when the police submitted a photograph to assist them. Of the fresh witnesses introduced one has "a moral conviction" that the rioters were instigated by Ferrer, and the other heard rioters declare that they were so instigated. All of them merely retail the gossip of the crowd.

These are the fifty witnesses for the prosecution. With their private interests at stake—most of the chief witnesses are purchasing their liberation from prison—their hearsay evidence, their moral convictions, and the complete irrelevance of more than half of them, a cross-examining lawyer would have had an easy time. Even as it is, not a single witness testifies that he personally saw Ferrer commit violence; every witness who assigns Ferrer an active leadership does so on hearsay evidence: the rest report conversations with Ferrer, which he entirely denies, and which secured "provisional liberty" for themselves.

The prosecuting orator (or Fiscal) turns to the documentary proof. First is the revolutionary document (quite clear of suggestions of pillage and assassination) which Ferrer acknowledged drawing up in 1892. In face of the mass of evidence as to his change of feeling, it is quite irrelevant. Then we have two type-written circulars (of unknown date) with the now familiar suggestions of plunder and murder. How are these forgeries brought home to Ferrer? We notice that the prosecution does not make the least suggestion, as later writers did in the English Press, that they were "posted up in Ferrer's schools." That would be too stupid a thing to suggest to a group of Spanish officers. The whole case for the prosecution—as they could not pretend that these were found among Ferrer's papers in the presence of the family—is that *three letters* are corrected in ink, and that certain "experts," not named or presented, declare that the written letters are like letters in Ferrer's writing! This is followed by an undated, unimportant letter to Odon de Buen, one of the most distinguished men of science in Spain. Not the least reference is made to those supposed revolutionary phrases in Ferrer's school-books, of which his later calumniators have said so much. And on this sorry evidence the prosecution demands, and obtains, sentence of death and confiscation of property!

Captain Galcerán, with his fate in his hands, made a noble effort to arrest the sordid course of injustice. He told how the prosecution had built largely on anonymous declarations; how they had "refused the testimony of all who would have thrown light on the life, habits, and work of the accused"; how, after submitting the charge to him, they had refused to give him the documents of Ferrer's with which he could have been defended; and how, when he cited witnesses for the defence, he was told that they could not delay the cause by hearing them. All this was plainly and indignantly exposed to those six officers of the Spanish army. Captain Galcerán painted vividly the elements of reaction that sought the life of Ferrer because his work of enlightenment menaced their corrupt interests. He had, he said, in the preparation of his case experienced so much "fraud" and "vile passion" in a single week that he was "completely overwhelmed."

At this point, *Gil Blas* observes, the official report ceases to be verbatim; and we may add that the subsequent fate of Captain Galcerán is wrapped in impenetrable obscurity. He is said to be in prison. He went on to point out the utter worthlessness or untruthfulness of the witnesses, and boldly reminded the court that the principal witnesses had obtained their own liberation from prison "by the influence of high-placed personages," when they gave their testimony against Ferrer. He describes the real work and movements of Ferrer, which he was prevented from bringing witnesses to prove. He points out that the "two young men" whom the prosecution in the anonymous proclamation represented as experts on Ferrer's writing were falsely reported by the Fiscal as saying that the letters "must have been" written by Ferrer. A reference to the original shows that they merely said the letters "might have been written by Ferrer, but they could not affirm it categorically." He reminds them that, though the houses of the insurgents have been thoroughly searched, not a single copy of this circular has been found. In fine, he concludes, Ferrer is at the bar solely because he is a Rationalist; and he makes an impassioned demand for justice.

The magnificent audacity and honesty of the officer took the court by surprise. His speech redeems the honour of Spain to some extent, and brands the prosecution with all the marks of a preparation for judicial murder. The civilised world should interest itself in the obscurity that has fallen on that brave officer.

Ferrer followed with a quiet protestation of innocence. He was immediately rebuked by the President for "manifestations," and was content to rebut the charge in few words, insisting that since the beginning of the century he had been occupied solely with education and moral culture. He was plainly conscious of the overwhelming forces of iniquity that were concentrated in that room. His doom was written, and a few hours later it was decreed.

I note a point of interest to English readers in the account published by the Paris Committee, Francisco Ferrer. The writer says: "On the day after the trial all the journals of Europe, except the English, reported that the witnesses had been regularly cited and confronted, and the accused interrogated." A Spanish agency, under the control of the Home Office, had sent out this mendacious report. The Times alone told the truth—that the depositions of the witnesses were simply read.

The trial took place on October 9, and the Council passed its sentence about six in the evening. It could not be made public, however, until it was signed by the Supreme Council of War and the Council of Ministers. Ferrer remained in the Model Prison at Barcelona until Monday night, the 11 th. Then, with an escort of nearly a hundred mounted soldiers, he was conducted through the town which he had spent the best years of his life in educating and transferred to the grim fortress of Montjuich. Witnesses describe him as smiling and cheerfully discussing the case with his guardians. He was lodged in a separate domicile within the precincts, and the soldiers gathered about the place. Barcelona was in a fever of speculation. And near midnight they saw passing to Montjuich the sinister procession of three carriages of religious brothers, who were summoned to minister to a condemned man.

Natural as any other conduct would have been, Ferrer behaved with full restraint and politeness to the priests who pestered him constantly after that hour. He listened with serenity to the sentence of death, and was taken back to his cell. There he courteously begged the chaplain to depart, and commenced writing his will. Jesuits and other priests incessantly interrupted him. "I have my convictions, as you have yours," he said. "If you come to argue, we will talk. Otherwise leave me." Not a word of reproach was made to them for the foul crime that they had instigated the State to commit. He worked until five in the morning at his will, thinking wholly, in that appalling hour, how the rest of Mlle. Meunier's money might still be saved for the enlightenment of Spain, and how he might make some provision for the loved ones from whom he was torn.

Let me say a word on this will, the full provisions of which have been read to me. The executors are Cristobal Litran, of Barcelona, and Mr. W. Heaford, of London. Morally, they are trustees for the carrying on of the work of education. Ferrer had always told his daughters that he would leave them a small sum, but he trusted they would not accept it, as it was sacred money. His eldest daughter not only refuses to touch the 2,000 francs he assigns her, but refuses all aid, and earns a laborious living, in the noble spirit of her father. The younger will probably do the same. For a young son, Riego, he set aside a small group of shares. They are in the hands of the police. For Soledad Villafranca he appoints a very modest annual income. The rest is to be used in the cause for which he laid down his life, and which he believed to be the truest cause of Spain. He worked for the Spain that murdered him, without a word of bitterness, in his last hours.

The original property in Paris was mortgaged repeatedly to find capital for the building of schools. Probably seven or eight thousand pounds still remain of its value. Ferrer was an excellent business man, and largely increased the legacy. His little house at Mas Germinal and his funds in Spain, with his school, publishing house, and all stock, have been "confiscated." A little moral pressure from other nations might induce señor Moret to reconsider this sordid robbery.

Calmly, devotedly, he went over the intricate details with his notary during his last night on earth.

"I desire," he adds in that noble document, "that on no occasion, either imminent or distant, under no

pretext whatever, shall there ever be manifestations of a political or religious nature before my remains, since the time which one gives to the dead would be better employed in the service of the living."

They had put him into a room converted into a chapel. His work was over at five in the morning, but he neither ate nor slept. At a quarter to nine they told him to prepare for death. He replied that he was ready. The chaplain stood by his side, to walk to the place of execution. For the last time he requested the clergy to respect his convictions; but, as the chaplain said he was bound to accompany him, Ferrer answered: "Very well." When one reflects that they were murdering him for his Rationalism, as his advocate said, one can admire his forbearance. His relatives had not been allowed to see him. Ferrer broke down only when his advocate came to say farewell.

I will not prolong the story. When the *cortege* reached the governor, he asked Ferrer if he had a last wish to express. "I desire," said Ferrer, "to be shot standing, without a bandage over my eyes." After a long deliberation, they consented that he need not kneel, but that his eyes must be bandaged. He was taken into the trench. With head erect and feet firmly planted, he faced the row of rifles. "Look well, my children," he cried to the soldiers; "it is not your fault. I am innocent. Long live the School." The crack of the rifles, at the officer's signal, interrupted his last splendid call for the education of Spain, and he fell dead. The authorities refused the body to his relatives, and buried it in the "common ground."

* * * * *

That rifle-volley has echoed through the world, and the thunder of its echo has penetrated the dense air of Spain. The world has realised the corruption of its politicians and the contemptible devices of its clergy. The notion that only Anarchists resented this foul crime is a libel on Europe. At Paris a long list of barristers, men and women, signed an indignant protest against the execution of a man "on such a caricature of justice"; and a solemn procession of 60,000 men and women marched through the town. Fifty towns of France have decided to give the name of Ferrer to one of their streets. At Brussels an imposing list of lawyers signed the indictment of the Spanish Government, and a monument is to be raised to Ferrer. In England Conservative journals like the *Times* and *Spectator* protested against the way in which the execution was secured. In Germany a number of the leaders of culture headed the protest. Even in Spain a politician with such authority as Count Romanones declared that "the Government committed a grave blunder in acting as it did with Ferrer."

But Ferrer is dead. Some weeks ago I sat in a London café with a small group of men who knew Ferrer and knew Spain. Someone entered with the news of Ferrer's arrest. Then, said my friend, he is doomed. He pleaded that I knew Spain well enough to understand that. I did not think they would dare to perpetrate so palpable a murder, and I worked hard in the education of English people as to his danger. The corrupt servants of Spain moved too quickly for us. Ferrer is dead. A man of fine character, high ability, and intense devotion to his ideals; a man who loved the sunlight, but was not happy save in the consciousness that he was bringing the sunlight into the darkened homes of the poorer Spaniards; a man whose work has stood the fiercest searching that his embittered enemies could devise, yet has proved to be one of peaceful devotion to a noble ambition—this man has sunk under a burden of calumny and hatred, and lies in the grave of a criminal. I trust I have vindicated his memory.

But I have a further trust, and a further purpose. Many besides Ferrer have been shot, without trial. We have no idea whether they were innocent or guilty. About three thousand men and women are suffocating in the jails of Catalonia, without trial. Soledad Villafranca, against whom it would be stupid even to manufacture evidence, is "detained," broken-hearted and seriously ill, her heritage confiscated. Hundreds upon hundreds of men and women have been torn from their homes, and condemned to long imprisonment, solely because they were known, in one way or other, to oppose the corrupt political system and the corrupt Church of Spain. I trust this brief account of that State and that Church, and of the infamy to which they stoop in the protection of their interests, will move men and women of England, whose land was purged of such corruption by the Ferrers of past days, to follow the life of Spain with closer and more informed interest.

Printed by Watts and Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

A Selection from the R.P.A. List.

Benn, A. W.—Modern England. A Record of Opinion and Action from the Time of the French Revolution to the Present Day. xxvii-519 pp.; cloth, 2 vols., 7s. net, by post 7s. 6d.

"A masterly record Modern England is a book to keep you up late at night. It tells you in a delightful way all that is best worth remembering in the history of the eventful period it covers."—*The Clarion*.

—Revaluations: Historical and Ideal. XV.-320 pp.; cloth, 3s. 6d. net, by post 3s. 10d.

Cassels, Walter R.—Supernatural Religion: An Inquiry into, the Reality of Divine Revelation. Popular Edition, thoroughly revised by the Author. xvi.-920 pp.; paper cover, 2s. 6d. net, by post 2s. 11d.; cloth, 6s. net,

by post 6s. 6d.; half morocco, gilt edges, 10s. net, by post 10s. 6d.

A really great work, pronounced by Matthew Arnold to be "learned and exact," and by John Morley to be "decisive, trenchant, and far-reaching," the author stating "his case with a force which no previous English writer on the negative side can have the smallest claim to rival."

Conybeare, F. C., M.A. (late Fellow and Praelector of Univ. Coll., Oxford; Fellow of the British Academy; Doctor of Theology, *honoris, causa*, of Giessen; Officier d'Académie).—Myth, Magic, and Morals: A Study of Christian Origins. xviii.-376 pp.; cloth, 4s. 6d. net, by post 4s. 10d.

In his Preface the Author states that his object is to inquire carefully who Jesus of Nazareth was, what were his real aims and ideas, what the means at his command for realising them, and how the great institutions connected with his name originated and grew up. The investigation is conducted in a simple and straightforward, and at the same time scholarly, manner. Mr. Conybeare insists that we must face the problems of our age and adopt the solutions which an enlightened criticism provides. (Highly praised by the Press.)

Gorham, Charles T.—The First Easter Dawn: An Inquiry into the Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus. xii.-320 pp.; cloth, 4s. 6d. net, by post 4s. 11d.

"The book is well written, is marked by conscientious study, and takes a wide survey of the field."—*Edinburgh Evening News*.

"An impartial and clear-headed summing-up of evidence."—*Scotsman*.

Gould, F. J.—The Children's Plutarch. With six full-page Illustrations by Walter Crane. viii.-286 pp.; cloth, 2s. 6d. net, by post 2s. 10d.

—A Concise History of Religion. 3 vols. Vol. I., 3s.; Vol. II., 3s. 6d.; Vol. III., 5s.

No work of the same size and dealing with this important theme contains such a mass of information. All the highest authorities have been carefully consulted, and the book gives the main results of Biblical criticism, together with other valuable matter, in what is, by comparison at least, a nutshell. The First Volume treats of the superstitions of savages and primitive man, and delineates the characteristics of the religions of America, Finland, China, Egypt, Arabia, Chaldaea, Syria, India, Japan, Persia, the Kelts, Greeks, and Romans. The Second Volume takes to pieces the whole of the Old Testament literature, and explains the origin of the various parts. The last chapter describes the Religious Environment of early Christianity. The Third Volume traces the growth of the Christian movement, the lives of Paul and Jesus (with due separation of the mythical elements), and affords a Rationalistic analysis of the whole of the New Testament books.

Gould, F. J.—The Children's Book of Moral Lessons. First Series. Cheap Edition; with design by Walter Crane; 128 pp.; paper cover, 6d., cloth 1s., by post 1s. 3d. Second Series ("Kindness" and Work and Duty"); 204 pp.; cloth, 2s., by post 2s. 3d. Third Series ("The Family"; "People of Other Lands"; "History of Industry, Art, Science, and Religion"), 203 pp.; cloth, 2s., by post 2s. 3d. Fourth Series ("Justice," "The Common Weal," "Our Country," "Social Responsibilities," "Political and Industrial Progress," etc.), 216 pp.; cloth, 2s., by post 2s. 3d.

While theology is strictly excluded from the lessons here reproduced, they are constructed on such a humanitarian basis as to fit them for use in homes and schools of all classes and creeds.

—Stories for Moral Instruction. Supplementary volume to *The Children's Book of Moral Lessons*, containing additional stories illustrative of the topics treated in the four volumes of that work; also "The Story of the Nibelungs." viii.-202 pp.; cloth, 2s., by post 2s. 3d.

Hird, Dennis.—A Picture Book of Evolution. Part I. (Astronomy, Geology, and Zoology), with 182 Illustrations, viii.-201 pp.; cloth, 2s. 6d. net, by post 2s. 10d. Part II. (Comparative Anatomy and Embryology, and giving the Pedigree of Man), with 194 Illustrations, viii.-219 pp.; cloth, 2s. 6d. net, by post 2s. 10d. The two Parts post free 5s. 6d.

"We know of no work which tells the whole story of the development of man in plainer language than this, and can recommend it to all who desire information on a subject that ought to interest us all."—*Westminster Review*.

McCabe, Joseph.—Life and Letters of George Jacob Holyoake. With two Photogravure Portraits and eight other Illustrations. 2 vols., medium 8vo, xviii.-716 pp.; cloth, gilt tops, 16s. net, by post 16s. 9d.

"Mr. McCabe has done his work carefully, sympathetically, and well.....It is a valuable record of one of the most useful lives of the Victorian era. Mr. Holyoake came into contact with many of the most noteworthy persons of his time; but there were few, even among the best, who could be compared to him for nobility of character, unselfishness of aim, courage of conviction, or who rendered more useful services in their day and generation."—*Review of Reviews*.

"It is a fine figure of a man which stands out from the pages of this well-written and interesting biography."—*Daily Telegraph*.

Robertson, John M.—A Short History of Freethought, Ancient and Modern. In 2 vols., xxvL-935 pp.; 21s. net, by post 21s. 7d.

—Courses of Study. New, revised and enlarged, edition, viii.-540 pp.; cloth, 6s. net, by post 6s. 6d.

"An encyclopaedic book by a well-known scholar, and likely to be of much value."—*Times*.

"Ought to be in the library of every student, and, indeed, of every person aspiring to knowledge."—*Leicester Mercury*.

"Forms a valuable book of reference for reading men, and should have a place of its own in every well-stocked library."—*Scotsman*.

"The best book of its kind."—*London Opinion*.

—Pagan Christs: Studies in Comparative Hierology. xviii.-442 pp.; 8s. 6d. net, by post 9s.

"The book is of intense interest to the student of comparative religion, and it is marked by the industrious ability which has enabled Mr. Robertson to gain the ear of many who dissent widely from his views."—*Literary World*.

—A Short History of Christianity. 400 PP.; cloth, 6s. net, by post 6s. 4d.

—Pioneer Humanists. 399 pp.; cloth, 6s. net, by post 6s. 4d.

Watts and Co., 17, Johnson's Court, Fleet Street, London, E.C.

Truth for the Time Is Prayer Compatible with General Laws?

BY IRENÆUS.

M. L. Hutchison, Glasgow Book Warehouse 305 LITTLE COLLINS STREET, Melbourne 1904

And All Booksellers. *Price: Threepence.*

Preface.

Whether Prayer be a reality or a make-believe is a serious question, for a man or a community. That we should have access to the august Centre of the Universe, must, if true, be of inconceivable moment. If prayer be a real thing, then, to neglect it will be a loss; while, to disdain it, must be offensive to Him to whom it should be addressed.

But why should the working of prayer be incredible, any more than the sending of a message in a few minutes to the opposite end of the earth? That a man should stand beside a wall, take a little instrument off a hook, and, putting it to his ear, listen to the very tones of a voice many miles away, would, not long ago have been held to be impossible: but yet it is fact to-day. Is it then unbelievable that the ear of the Omnipotent should attend the petitions of the humble believer, and grant or refuse them according to what is best for him?

That it is denied is notorious, and the following pages are offered to meet one point of difficulty, sincerely existing in many minds, namely, the alleged inconsistency of prayer with the principle of general laws in the Universe.

What is prayer? Whatever else it may be, Prayer is an intelligent creature's expression of dependence upon the Creator. God alone is sufficient to Himself: every creature, whether he acknowledge it or not, is a dependent being. Man, revolted, has lost the sense of this dependence: he has slipped his moorings, got away from the Blessed Centre of the Universe, and, wandering in darkness, thinks it the finest and grandest thing to be *independent*. On the other hand, the Gospel comes to effect a reconciliation: it encourages the confidence of man and restores him to intelligent and becoming intercourse with his Maker, one mode of which is—Prayer.

MELBOURNE,

August 1904.

ADDRESS :

IRENÆUS,

CARE OF THE PUBLISHER,

305 Little Collins Street,

Melbourne.

Is Prayer Compatible with General Laws.

Rationalism has not been afraid to lay its finger upon Prayer, alleging that the existence of general laws precludes the possibility of requests being granted for particular objects. But this overlooks a very simple principle, namely, that God, if supreme, must necessarily be superior to laws of His own making. Rationalists would persuade us that He has divested Himself of power to intervene in His own Creation; that He has thus

become subordinate to His own handiwork, and virtually resigned His supremacy.

"With them God—hallowed be His name—is a dead God: the Almighty Being who created the Universe has exhausted His powers in the effort, and now can do nothing! He has made a Universe, but cannot interfere with it. Your artisan shall make me a clock which he can control—it shall go for its limit of time : he can quicken, retard it : he can stop its action; can smash it to pieces—God alone has become powerless! It is useless to pray to Him or humble our souls before Him. His Creation has got out of hand, and He cannot touch it."

"Truth for the Time on the 'Subject of Death and Beyond.'" London : A. Holness, Paternoster Row. Melbourne : M. L. Hutchinson, Little Collins Street. Price 3d.

This notion that God cannot answer prayer is based on assumption. It assumes :—

- That its author knows everything as to the powers that subsist in God; and
- That in instituting general laws, the Creator made no reservation to Himself, of authority or power with respect to those laws.

Now a set of views based on assumption may be clever, imaginative, or bold; but they are *not* rational. For assumptions *may be* wrong; and if they be, then anything built upon them, is but a house of cards. The so-called Rationalist, like the Sadducee of old, errs through "not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God" (Matt. 22: 29). Thus it is stated that God could not cause the sun and moon to stand still for a day, because He had made a general law for their motion. The man of humble mind, however, reflects that the same power which caused the motion, could also stop it. But, it is replied, that would derange the entire mundane system, if not the celestial. Certain effects flow from the sun's apparent motion, and to stop that movement would produce results incalculable. The Christian replies: The same power and wisdom which created this great Universe, with all its marvellous inter-lockings of cause and effect, can certainly provide for any and every consequence which would arise from interrupting a portion of its mechanism.

The following remarks, drawing attention to a point generally overlooked in this notable miracle, are well worth attention :—

"Another thing not a little remarkable is that on this occasion Joshua addresses not merely the sun (a bold enough thing to do, to bid the sun stand still), but the moon also. It was not that the moon could give any appreciable increase of light when the sun thus ruled the prolonged day. There must therefore have been some other and worthy motive why the moon should be joined along with the sun in Joshua's command, if, as I have not the slightest doubt, Joshua was guided by God in so singular an appeal to the sun and moon, when divine power was exerted to arrest the apparent course of the sun. We all know, of course, that it is the earth that moves; but Scripture does not speak in the technical language of science which not only would have been unintelligible to those for whom it was intended, but unnatural in the ordinary language of the greatest philosophers. Sir Isaac Newton talked about the sun's rising and setting just as much as the simplest countryman, and quite right. The man who does otherwise has no common sense. Here then Joshua employed so far the only language proper to his purpose. But this does not explain his call to the moon. Not only was no knowledge then possessed by Jews or Gentiles, but one may doubt whether our men of science would have thought of it even now: at any rate one has never heard of it from them. Yet, if there had not been an action of the power of God with regard to the moon as well as the sun, the whole course of nature must have been deranged. How could Joshua, or any Jew who wrote the Scripture, have known this? There was no astronomic science for two thousand years afterwards adequate to put the two things together; and mere observation of phenomena would certainly have been content with the light of the sun alone. But so it was. He whose power wrought in answer to the call guided his voice, and the pen of the writer of the book. If there could have been an interference with the sun without the moon; if the moon's course had not been arrested as well as the earth's, so as to give this appearance to the sun, there would have been confusion in the system. It seems to me therefore that, so far from the sentence affording a just ground of cavil against God's word, it is none of the least striking instances of a wisdom and power incomparably above science. So faith will always find in Scripture."

LECTURES INTRODUCTORY TO THE EARLIER HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. BY W. KELLY. London: T. Weston, 53 Paternoster Row.

"The object was not simply a means of discomfiting the army; it was a public testimony before the world that God interfered for His people, and would answer and put honour upon Joshua. And the sacred writer speaks of it in this way: 'The like was never known,' he says, that the Lord hearkened to the voice of a man; for the Lord fought for Israel.' The miracle is as plainly stated as physically true.

Moreover, it can hardly be doubted, that Joshua was ignorant of the rotation of the earth; and it is remarkable that he should have claimed not the stopping of the sun, but of sun and moon, the necessary effect of that which was wholly unknown to him, and yet he asks for that which, unless indeed God had disturbed the whole creation by unnecessary miracle, must have been the effect of the intervention of His power. Untaught by God, Joshua would have said, Sun, stand still. Taught of God, he asks for sun and moon to do so, which is just

what God's power acting in the simplest way would do; He could not have answered precisely as to a man fully taught of God, if Joshua had asked for the sun to stop and not the moon, without a very extraordinary derangement of the celestial system. To make the moon go on in its just apparent course when the earth was stopped, would have put the moon really out of its place. To have stopped the moon unasked, as well as the sun, would not have been the same testimony to Joshua, though a wonder. But Joshua is taught to ask both. The rotation of the earth is arrested, and all is done at his word, though Joshua never knew the earth turned round, and that sun and moon would thus stop together."

THE IRRATIONALISM OF INFIDELITY. BY J. N. DARBY. London: G. Morrish, War wick Lane, Paternoster Row.

It is however, not alone by stopping the action of law in a given case, that God can answer prayer. He can act within the limits of the laws themselves. He can employ their workings in the way He wishes; can accelerate or retard their operation, vary their incidence, diminish their force, or impart additional force. Thus then, there are two distinct ways—apparent even to our minds—in which God may, if He see fit, answer prayer, to say nothing of ways and modes which we do not know of and cannot conceive. That is :—

- He may be pleased to interrupt the action of laws in particular cases: Or,
- He may work through the instrumentality of the laws themselves, to bring about a different result, from what would have been, if He had not interfered.

The latter of these is seen in the case of Elijah's famous historic prayer for rain, after Israel had been afflicted with three years of drought, as a judgment from God. (See James 5: 17, 18; I Kings 18: 42 *et seq.*) When rain was given, no miracle was wrought: God acted through natural instrumentalities: He did not miraculously cause rain to fall from a clear sky; but, after prayer, Elijah said to his servant :—

"Go up now, look toward the sea. And he went up, and looked, and said, There is nothing. And he said, Go again seven times. And it came to pass at the seventh time, that he said, Behold, there ariseth a little cloud out of the sea, like a man's hand. And he said, Go up, say unto Ahab, Prepare thy chariot, and get thee down, that the rain stop thee not. And it came to pass in the mean while, that the heaven was black with clouds and wind, and there was a great rain. (I Kings 18 : 43-45).

Thus, in answer to prayer, existing means are used to accomplish the desired effect—the cloud, small at first; a wind which spreads the cloud until the heavens are black; and there is a great rain.

Both modes however, are illustrated in the case of Hezekiah, as recorded in 2 Kings 20: I-II. When the shadow was made to go back on the dial, a law of Nature was, in that case, reversed. When he was sick unto death, and he prayed, the prayer was answered, and he was recovered; but there is no need to suppose that, in doing so, God went beyond the limits of natural law, which was utilized to accomplish His will. He is the Master of His own machine, surely as fully as an engine-driver is of his. Suppose a train is started to go at a certain speed. It is in full force for the purpose, when a man appears on the track with a danger flag : now the driver can apply a break, can shut off steam, can cease coaling. The law of steam engines is not changed; but at the request of a man with a flag in his hand, all that mighty force is stayed, and two hundred people in carriages behind, are interrupted in their progress, they know not why. Again: when, say an obstacle upon the line has been removed, and the train is re-started on its way, the driver can apply greater force by increased coaling, so as to obviate the loss of time on the journey, which otherwise would have resulted from the stoppage. Has God less power over His Universe than an engine-driver over a train? Let the devout Christian then, not be dissuaded from prayer, but rather encouraged. God can, and *if consistent with His purposes*, will interfere, even in temporal affairs, at the humble deferential prayer of His child.

Hezekiah's case in 2 Kings 20: I-II, is an example full of meaning, as showing the actual working of prayer, its potent influence with the Divine Governor of the Universe, and the value which He gives to the heart-exercises of the humble. Notice that Hezekiah is cast for death: "Thou shalt die and not live" is the message of the Prophet Isaiah (verse I). Had this been received in the fatalistic spirit of Modern Philosophy, the history would have closed: Hezekiah would have died. But the element of prayer enters the case, and all is changed. The decree had indeed gone forth; but Hezekiah prays and weeps; and before Isaiah had reached the middle city (*i.e.* from the inner city, the city of David on Mount Zion) he is told by the word of the LORD to return to Hezekiah with the comforting answer:

"I HAVE HEARD THY PRAYER, I HAVE SEEN THY TEARS: behold I will heal thee : on the third day thou shalt go up unto the house of the LORD. And I will add unto thy days fifteen years." (2 Kings 20 s 1-6).

Notwithstanding this definite prediction, Isaiah employs a remedy—a lump of figs was to be laid on the ulcer (verse 7). That is, no miracle is wrought, but God acts within the limits of already existing means, imparting an efficacy, but not changing the law. The lump of figs would have been all-unavailing without Hezekiah's deep exercise of heart, without his prayer, and God's gracious response.

How much more probable, more rational, is such communion with our Creator; how much more consonant with the nature of man, and any idea we can form of a living God, than the prayerless, dumb, fatalism of so-called science! Better for the heart and soul, signed indeed with the signature of Divinity, is the declaration

of the Bible:—

"Thus saith THE HIGH AND LOFTY ONE THAT INHABITETH ETERNITY, WHOSE NAME IS HOLY; I dwell in the high and holy place, with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones." (Isaiah 57: 15).

Amidst the complex agencies—spiritual or material—at the command of the Almighty; forces of Nature which He has created, or can create; instrumentalities and powers perhaps utterly unknown to us, what presumption it is for mortal man to say what God can, or cannot do!

To whatever disabilities then, the man of Science, or of the World, may subject himself, the Christian sees no difficulty about praying, nor in expecting that he will have his petition, *if he ask anything according to the Divine will*. He recognizes God as supreme; that laws and created things, are under His feet; FROM ETERNITY TO ETERNITY HE IS GOD (Psalm 90: 2). Such is the God whom Christians worship; but the deity of Rationalists is bound hand and foot, a captive in His own Creation!

So far, as to objections drawn from the physical constitution of the Universe: the brief answer to all of that class, is—God's Omnipotence. But there is a pro-founder difficulty which the philosophers have never discovered. God can indeed make worlds upon worlds, or unmake them; but there is one thing which He cannot do: He cannot deny Himself. "God is Light." (I John I: 5.) His nature is holy: how then can He, as the Holy One; as moreover, righteous Governor of the Universe, dispense good to sinners? Doing so, inconsistently with justice, would be giving countenance to evil. Philosophers make great ado about the stopping of the sun and moon—a mere exercise of physical power—but how the mountain of sin can be removed which stands between every child of Adam and his Maker; how the stained life can be cleansed, which otherwise cannot appear in the Courts of Holiness—these are things they never trouble about. But unless means had been found of meeting the dread claims of Justice, blessing could never have been granted to sinful man; and the most sincere prayer ever breathed, would then have been but an anguished and unavailing wail.

Here however, Christianity triumphs: it shows the difficulty, yet meets it. It reveals an obstacle that men of science had not dreamt of, but announces that God has provided for it. He gave His Son, who became Man, in order to offer in human nature, a sacrifice such as God could accept. That sacrifice is so vast, that upon it, as a basis, God can enrobe with glory, honour and peace, every sinner who believes in Jesus. The barrier raised by Righteousness is gone, and now, divine favour at present, and sublime hope for eternity, are the portion of everyone who does not remain in his distance and enmity, but who becomes reconciled to God through Christ. Faith is needed to lay hold of this, but the work of Christ upon the Cross supplies the righteous basis, without which, even the prayer of faith could not be answered. Neither faith, nor humility, nor any amiable quality in us could have drawn down an answer to prayer while Righteousness stood in the way to forbid it. But by the work of the Cross, Righteousness is more than satisfied; and with that wonderful propitiation before Him, God can accept the returning sinner, and hearken to his prayer. Hence all prayer must be in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. "I am the Way . . . NO MAN COMETH UNTO THE FATHER BUT BY ME" (John 14: 6).

It is a most marvellous thing, this meeting, on the side of God, of all real difficulties regarding man's approach to Him. But more than marvellous it is, that when He has done this mighty work for our behoof, men should raise quibbles about His power to answer prayer, assuming to limit the capabilities of Omnipotence! Let us notice in passing, that as all difficulties between God and man are removed in respect of those who approach through Christ, so also the reverse holds true, that difficulties remain, confirmed and intensified, as regards those who ignore Him. He who presumes to address God otherwise than through Christ, violates the immutable principles of the Universe: he disrespects God's righteousness, and acts in defiance of His very nature, for "God is Light." Strange is it not—that 'man should be so particular about physical law, so indifferent about the moral!

It has been said however, If God is willing to act in a certain manner, why should we need to pray Him to do so? This brings us to a point which it is important to see—the moral end of all His dealings with us, namely, to have man restored to loving, intelligent communion with Himself. Intercourse with God is the privilege of moral and spiritual beings; at least of those upon their normal plane. Inanimate creation naturally is incapable of this. It may passively reflect the glory of its Maker, according to the Psalm:—

"The heavens declare the glory of God

** * * * **

Day unto day uttereth speech,

And night unto night sheweth knowledge" (Psalm 19).

Which of course is figurative. Likewise the merely animal creation cannot know God. The life (or soul) of an animal may include affections, and in some, a most appreciable intelligence; but a brute has not the spiritual nature by which alone communication can be held with the Creator. "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and truth" (John 4: 24). But in man are combined, the three constituents of spirit, soul and body

It is worth remark that the creation of man was not only separate, but different in mode from that of the

mere animals. These were simply the product of the earth, under the fiat of the Almighty : "Let the earth bring forth." (Gen. 1: 24). In the creation of man, the material part was formed out of the dust of the earth, but Jehovah Himself breathed into his nostrils the breath of life. (Gen. 2: 7). It was in that way that man received life: *he* is not merely matter made living by creative edict, as the brutes : his existence has a different origin : not indeed evolution from anthropoid apes, but a creation both distinct and different. No evolution could bridge the gulf which separates man from brutes. They are described in the inspired word as "the beasts that perish" (Psalm 49: 12); by implication therefore, man does not so perish : for ill or well he exists for ever, and is capable of communion with his Creator, though, through sin he may become, morally, like the beasts that perish. (Psalm 49: 12).

(I Thessalonians 5: 23). In Paradise he held converse with God, who visited, and spoke with him (Genesis 3:8 *et seq*). But he has fallen, and lost the knowledge of God, though not the capacity to know Him. In Christianity this divine knowledge is recovered, through repentance and believing the Gospel.

"And this is life eternal, that they might know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent." (John 17: 3.)

Now the idea that man cannot pray to, or know God, would really degrade him from that which is the highest privilege of his being, and place him, *in this respect*, on a level with the brutes, or even the inanimate creation. But from the stand-point here presented, prayer is an exercise of the highest element of man's constitution. The opposite view would make of him, a mere joint in a piece of mechanism.

The Christian however—restored to God—perceives the hand of his Divine Father in the good he receives : he takes it, not as the blind working of a machine called Nature, but traces it up to its Source, and gives thanks accordingly; his very meal-table becomes a table of thanksgiving: thus God is glorified: He and His intelligent creature are in happy relationship; and the Christian, having actual knowledge of the living God, naturally goes to Him about his wants, his desires, his trials and difficulties: hence prayer; and hence He will be moved to bless, by the prayers of His people. In other words, in hearing and answering our prayers, God is dealing with us as His beloved and intelligent children. And what man that is a parent does not understand this ? His child comes to him with a request: does not demand impudently but submissively, and with intelligence. A father is delighted to hear his child thus pleading: far from being an offence, its naive confidence in him is, really, a compliment to his paternal character; to give audience to the entreaty is a pleasure, and to grant it is another, if only it can be done with advantage to the petitioner. And if we have come to the Saviour, God is *our* Father—how welcome then to Him are the voices of His children coming before Him in prayer! This is finely shewn by the inspired figure of the Apocalypse:

"Golden bowls full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints." (Rev. 5 : 8 Gr.)

—And, as regards ourselves, the exercise is blessed in itself, independent of the granting of our requests.

But prayer is also one of the first symptoms of true repentance. Thus when good Ananias was sent to Saul of Tarsus, the reason of the sending, the unmistakable evidence of new life in Saul, was, that he prayed:

"Arise, and go . . . and enquire . . . for one called Saul of Tarsus; for BEHOLD HE PRAYETH." (Acts 9: II).

The new life in man's soul—the normal life of a moral creature—is a dependent life: indisputable proof therefore, of that life in Saul, is the record "Behold, he prayeth." Yesterday he was breathing out threatening and slaughter! Now he is upon his knees. Man, in this instance, has got back to his bearings: the creature is humbled before, and reconciled to his Creator. Thus, prayer is one of the earliest, truest instincts of divine life in man; and in this view it may be said that the first genuine breathing of the soul to God, is the beginning of an eternal communion. A stream has started which will flow, and flow, for ever; like that water which Christ gives the soul, and which is in him, a well of water springing up into everlasting life. (John 4: 14).

SUCH IS PRAYER! fruitful and sweet in the devout Believer, and sign of grace in the returning Sinner! Let us not only refuse false theology and sceptical objections, but beware lest the spirit of them unconsciously infect our minds, and cramp our hearts in this holy exercise.

"Go when the morning shineth,
Go when the noon is bright,
Go when the day declineth,
Go in the hush of night;
Go with pure mind and feeling,
Fling earthly thoughts away,
And in thy chamber kneeling
Do thou in secret pray."

W. Ransom, Printer, Brunswick, Vic.

Moral Essay No. 2.

[By Coleman Phillips.]

Every feeling of gratitude of the human heart, at present directed to Christ, can be better and more easily given to God, our Maker. We are all His children, and our eyes and brain, form, as it were a camera, placing us in direct touch with His infinite mind, which pervades the Universe. We but see and act as He wishes, yet has He given us the moral consciousness to know when to act rightly. For nineteen centuries we have forsaken Him, to worship one of His erring children, Jesus Christ, the creation of the Alexandrian creedmongers. Time it is to turn back to Him and bow our heads in all humility to the first Commandment, "Thou shalt have no other Gods but me."

The present inferior moral standards from the New Testament may be divided into two parts (1) objectionable lessons (2) unsound doctrine. These should not be allowed in our Sunday schools, as they are detrimental to the childrens' welfare and harmony.

There is no hope of harmonious relations between capital and labour under present trinitarian standards. The classes are not equal when there is only one "lawfully begotten son of God"; the female sex is not considered in the Trinity, and the doctrine of the Virgin birth is contra virtutem.

The Anglo-Saxon work people very properly no longer tolerate gospel teaching. The Church, from its foundation has always joined the State in oppressing or exploiting the poor for war purposes and church aggrandizement, and unless its teaching is very materially altered it always "will do so. On the other hand the poor have always been foolish in bringing more children into the world than they could support.

What I have to say in this essay is not to give offence to anyone, but to ward off from New Zealand the grave future danger of religious intolerance and sectarianism. I have no wish to see Roman and Protestant flying at each other's throats; and I respectfully contend that New Zealanders should abandon Trinitarianism in favour of God's simple worship. There is already keen rivalry between the sects, and many of the late second ballots were fought upon the sectarian issue.

I object to no mans religion, Roman or Protestant. My objection is against the doctrine of the Trinity; (1.) As being beneath the dignity of mankind, seeing that we are all God's children, and; (2) As against the wants of the British Empire, seeing that the nations comprising it are but brother men and sister women who should worship God alike. There is but one God for any battleship or army corps, but He has no wish for men to slay each other. Our view to-day of the Creator is different to what it was and He must look with pity upon nations slaying each other. Who but the church has so hurled them for its own aggrandizement ?

What possible use is there for Peace Conferences at the Hague, or an Andrew Carnegie, or European Federationists to lessen armaments, when the policy of the chief christian churches is to keep nations not only divided from each other, but each internally torn with dissension and domestic strife, in order that they may rule. This is why I say now that the flag of Humanity must float above the Cross, in order to stop the rebarbarisation of Europe. To say it is not barbarisation, spending three hundred millions (one fifth of our income) annually upon the armies and navies as Europe is doing, is folly. Far better the poor to have a ghastly war every two or three years than that this awful expenditure should be annually incurred in the cause of peace.

We have an army of half a million christian clerics, the majority of whom are secretly glad to see the world in arms. The face of God is the mirror of joy, but Christianity revels in blood, misery, and slaughter. I charge the Roman Curia, not the Roman Laity, with secretly encouraging the Dreadnought policy to punish France for throwing off the christian yoke! I charge the Procurator of the Holy Russian Synod with sinking Russia in horror, shame and bloodshed, in order that the masses may be kept in ignorance. What I wish to tell the European Laity is that their present church leaders are not the gentle shepherds they wish to be taken for, but the most bitter enemies the Nations have; wolves in sheep's clothing, secretly delighting in the re-barbarisation of the Nations, because that is the only way for them to stop now the modern spirit of advancement and improvement, and the relegation of their gospel myths into obscurity. If this is not so, why have we a world in arms, with half a million clerics preaching peace two or three times a dry on Sundays ? And if they are not the guilty organisations I charge them with being, of what use are their hollow protestations to humanity ?

Poets, hymn writers, artists, sculptors, and now the press have all been urged to how themselves to a mistaken worship, and it is left to a few individual writers to proclaim the truth, and preserve human liberty and advancement. These only derive odium, and no personal advantage from so doing, but they carry out God's behests.

Sectarianism is not diminishing, but strengthening in New Zealand, and soon it will have the whole people in its horrid grasp. If we have shown the way in useful civil laws, and a wider Imperialism, let us try and amend

the present inferior moral laws for all our good King's subjects. We are a new nation, and surely we can appeal for a wider religious cult !

Moreover Christianity is too sad a religion. It is too full of sorrow—sorrow, sin and death. There is more light than darkness in the world : more sunshine than storm; more happiness than sorrow, and it is these great gifts of God the people want to be told of. Hope is our lifelong blessing, not sorrow. We have kept the Bible out of our schools so far. Let us continue to keep it, seeing that we can better train the children in truth, harmony and virtue; three lessons Trinitarianism does not inculcate. There is no room in the Trinity for a female, and the Churches have never stood for female rights.

The Hag of humanity must float above the Cross. Readily would I say, "Have the bible back in our schools, with all its human imperfections but the Cross is fatal to human progress and truth. There are a hundred thousand fallen women in London alone, whom the churches have never attempted to save, because the New Testament has never inculcated virtue; and its marriage law has not made for human happiness. The Salvation Army has done better rescue work than all the churches combined. We want to lead more inexpensive lives so that our young men and maidens may marry earlier and not fall away from virtue. Fatherhood and motherhood are holy things, and two or three children are God's blessings in any home, no matter how lowly. I write what I do to save my sisters from falling. Truly our moral laws have been too hard against those who have but obeyed, too blindly perhaps, Nature's laws. Christ's own birth, as I say, was *contra virtutem*. Moreover the utter sadness and despair of New Testament teaching is against God, who wishes us to be merry and joyful, or why has he given us laughter, which is often the best medicine ? What is more cheery than children's laughter ! And are they not God's gifts to us ? Yet the Churches manipulate the marriage laws for their own advancement. The sects are not to be allowed now to intermarry. And after death we are rigidly divided in our graves. Goodness, love and happiness form a better Trinity than that of the Cross. But what has the Book of Matthew to say regarding these great things ? Nothing ! Its whole gospel is full of devilry and gloom, and its divorce law is derided by the nations.

Now as to objectionable Gospel lessons, which should be excluded from our Sunday Schools.

- The No-License movement is a direct rebellion against Christ's encouragement of wine drinking. The children must be taught to entirely abstain from strong drink. This Mahomet taught.
- Christ came not to bring peace but a sword, and the Nations have been hurled against each other for centuries. It is absurd therefore to call him the "Prince of Peace," or to say that he loved his fellows; and no child should be so taught. He never truly loved his fellow men when he said "he brought the sword." The poor in all European nations suffer greatly from this teaching, and the consequent growth of armies and navies. Buddha and Confucius counselled peace, not war. There was not a battleship or standing army corps in all Asia until we forced these terrible things upon them. Under the Cross we are forcing every nation and colony to resort to arms. Our war tax here will be very heavy directly, and further raise the cost of living. There is no true happiness in men devoting their lives to war. The Nemesis of forcing China into Christianity, and a consequent war policy, will be a second Tamerlane. Is German armament directed solely against England ? How do we know but that the clerical party there, which supports naval expansion, is not urged on, as well as in Austria, Italy, and Spain, to build Dread [*unclear*: oughts] to crush France, seeing that Germany has no fleet in the Mediterranean. In this way the Church "brings the sword" upon any recalcitrant nation. In this way Trinitarianism is the canker worm of God. and the curse of the poor. Nelson's "Victory" cost £100,000. A Dreadnought two millions ! Are the poor twenty times better off now ? No I Indeed, no I God asks no Nation to light the other ! But France has to be punished and she will be.
- His command "to give all we have to the poor" is so opposed to justice that we have the curse now of "the trusts" as against his teaching. Buddha and Mahomet taught "Give the surplus you have to the poor." Why have not our capitalists been similarly taught ? It is the only way to make them considerate to others. Andrew Carnegie follows Buddhist teaching.
- The parable of the unjust steward thoroughly deserved the derision of the Pharisees, seeing that nothing more immoral could be taught by any man (Luke c. 16 vi. to II.) Under this teaching (granting of rebates) the trust monopolies have reared their hidious heads. How can the poor be content if capitalists grasp everything ? It is so easy to sink into poverty. Christ should have warned people how to avoid poverty, in place of encouraging them to become paupers.
- His parable "of the payment of labourers" was absolutely unjust, viz:—to pay all alike. No one follows it. We pay according to work done, or there would be no enticement to good work.
- His command to "Resist not Evil," is most harmful. Our duty is to resist evil all our days, to our dying breath.
- He taught the doctrine of non-resistance which places the meek at the mercy of the strong. Every boy at school should be brave, and resist wrong doing. His teaching should have been "Ye who are strong, be

merciful to the weak ! Do not increase your strength to their disadvantage !"

- His command "not to strike back, but to turn the other cheek," would only breed a race of bullies and cowards. The teaching should have been, "strike no one without just cause !"
- His encouragement of vagrancy : That New Zealand swaggers, without a swag, are the best Christians. This is as bad as hoarding wealth, and not dividing it with the poor. To be virtuous and happy one has to work for a living, seeing that wealth and idleness entail many evils. There is no record of Christ ever doing a single day's work, so that it is absurd to depict him with a carpenter's kit in his hand. Between the ages of 12 and 30 nothing is known of what He did ? Fancy having a God whose whole life is so unknown ! Moses, Buddha, Mahomet and Confucius lives are well known, and they are not Gods. It is exceedingly doubtful whether Jesus Christ really lived here at all. (See the "Resemblances to Buddha" later on.)
- His teaching, "think not of the morrow;" 'shows anything but love for humanity, seeing we are all bound to teach our children differently. They must think of the future, so as to avoid the pitfall of poverty and to be good men and women.
- Improvidence and thriftlessness are special Gospel lessons. Children must be provident and thrifty. The command "to give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn thou not away," no one follows, as its observance would only create an army of loafers and spongers. Poverty is very rightly avoided and despised. Yet the whole New Testament teaching is one of pure vagrancy. England under "The Friars," who followed Christ's teaching to the letter, was a disgrace to human civilization. Wherein did he love humanity by giving such commands? The Sermon upon the Mount is absolutely impractical.
- His direct discouragement of our laying up any provision for our old age, our parents, our wives, or children or times of sickness. We all very rightly disobey this teaching, in our life insurance societies, and savings banks and other proper ways.
- His command "Think not what ye shall wear," when we all do so. Even insects are beautifully arrayed by God.
- Similarly as to what we shall eat or drink, when our duty is to be very careful in that respect.
- His denial of his mother a most pernicious lesson; (Mat. C. 12 v 8.) Children should not be taught that, as their highest duty on earth is to honour and obey their parents. In face of this terrible lesson, no child should regard gospel teaching with anything but dislike.
- His cursing the fig tree because the poor tree had no fruit out of season. It is wrong to curse anybody or anything. Why the poor fig tree ?
- His injustice to the Gadarene swine, by chasing the devils out of the afflicted men, into the pigs, and causing the latter to rush into the water and be drowned (Mat. C. 5 13.) No child need believe in devils, as there are none. African children believe the devil to be white.
- His constant reference to a personal devil or devils, whereas there is no devil, but ignorance or fear. Goodness is knowledge, and evil is ignorance. As we learn more of God's laws, evils disappear like fog in the morning sunlight.
- His constant driving out of devils, is the practice of African witch doctors. No medical man follows it, or even allows its correctness. It is quite wrong to injure children's minds by devil teaching of any kind. There are devil worshippers even in Europe to the present day.
- His constant reference to a distinct place of torment called Hell, whereas all sensible people have quietly dropped that teaching. Under the "Hell and Purgatory" dogmas the Clergy have levied their heaviest toll upon humanity. What joy of life can there be in Hell and Purgatory ? (The ladies are now forming optimistic clubs as a revulsion against Gospel teaching.)
- Similarly to a distinct place in the sky called Heaven, yet inconsistently saying that "Heaven is within us" (numerous pictures are extant of his ascending into Heaven.) God himself and Heaven and Hell are here. The children would grow into far better men and women if they were taught that New Zealand, or any special habitat, is their only Heaven and their only Hell, just as they make it.
- His command "to give our cloak if we lose our coat at law" is pernicious, and no one thinks of following.
- Similarly not one of us would go two miles if another forced us to go one. All such lessons are untruthful and therefore immoral. What true love for humanity is there in allowing some bully to drag us two miles when we refuse to go one.
- His advice "to cut off a hand or foot," and therefore go through life halt and maimed, was cruel teaching, and has been literally followed in scores of thousands of instances, entailing much human misery. (Mat. 18. 8.) The Spaniards, the true christian cross bearers, used to baptise the gentle inhabitants of South America, and then slay them in thousands.
- Similarly as to plucking out an eye (Mat 18 9), and cutting a man asunder (Mat. 24. 51.) This was pure

savagery—Many of the first Caliphs actually had men cut in halves. The Roman Church also followed this immoral law to a terrible extent. Bishop Odo of Bayeux regularly plucked out the eyes or cut off one hand or foot of his English captives.

- Similarly as to his advocacy of torture (Mat. 18 34 .) The whole of Matthew is tilled as I say with cruelty, devils, horror, and torture. There is hardly a ray of joy or happiness to mankind in it. Yet it is upon this book that the doctrine of the Trinity is chiefly founded.
- Similarly his teaching "For unto everyone that bath shall be given, and from him that hath nothing shall be taken away" (Mat. C. 25, v. 29.) This was very cruel teaching for the poor. Why should those that have plenty still get more ? The teaching should be "Give to those who hath naught, and who are deserving of it."
- Similarly as to his curses, "Ye Serpents ! Ye generations of Vipers ! How can ye escape the damnation of Hell ?" (Mat. c. 23 v. 33.) Were such curses of benefit to mankind ? Children should curse no one !
- His teaching that "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," is subversive of all feelings of reverence for our Creator. (Mat. c. 22 v. 32.) God is God of everything in the universe.
- His failure to condemn the practice of slavery led to all the horrors of the Negro slave trade. England and the Northern United States of America had to adopt a more moral humanitarian view (The Clerics say we are not to be humanitarian, but servile followers of this extremely bad teaching. They always stood by the slave owners. Yet slaveholder are usually themselves slaves.)
- His condemnation to hell tire for saying "Thou fool" is absurd. Nearly every child uses the term to another in perfect innocence. Indeed, he uses it himself (Mat. 23, 17), as well as his immediate disciples.
- His doctrine of Faith is totally opposed to our necessary enquiry into the Natural Laws of God, and threw Europe into a thousand years of darkness, from which it is only just emerging Christianity still wishes us to have "faith," and live in darkness and danger as at Messina and other Italian cities, where images of Saints were carried in procession to ward off earthquake damage. This, in place of building secure houses, properly wired or cramped with iron bands.
- His doctrine of the "Keys of Heaven," gives the Roman Catholic Church its claim for supremacy; divides New Zealand into two hostile camps of Roman and Protestant, and will cause our children, in coming years, to fly at each other's throats in civil strife, as has already been the case for centuries elsewhere. Children ! Love one another, no matter which Church your parents attend, and allow no Priesthood to divide you ! Whenever you are told such a one is a Wesleyan, or Roman, or Presbyterian, make friends with him !
- His utter want of any scientific or refined knowledge is very objectionable, as there is no incentive under the Cross for any child to be refined or scientific. Indeed scientific knowledge is tabooed by the Church, which has always stubbornly stood in the way of human progress and advancement.
- His subjection of women. These have suffered for 1800 years in consequence. Never having had a wife, he could not appreciate a woman or a daughter's love. What her man (if he really lived at all) would have repudiated his own mother.
- His law of divorce "the woman, not the man to be divorced for adultery; the husband, not an independant judge, to grant the decree." Divorce also only to be granted for one sided adultery, and not for cruelty, incompatibility, or desertion. Every true woman should recoil with indignation from such a command. As a result we have the far too easy divorce laws of the United States. The world simply recoils from such teaching. We have now the Roman and Presbyterian Priesthoods prohibiting mixed marriages. The proper answer to that is for the different States not only to cancel the clerical licenses to marry, but to forbid them becoming Registrars of births or deaths. The whoie of these are civil rights, with which the clergy has nothing to do. They arrogate these rights to themselves, for clerical domination, but the people will do well to keep their necks from the clerical heel. The Roman Laity in New Zealand, are as good staunch men as any in the British Empire. It is their Priesthood, equally with other Priesthoods I object to, as anxious to bring this fair new land under the clerical heel.
- But the most shocking teaching was that of division in the family, viz : that the father should be divided from the son, the mother from the daughter, the mother-in-law from the daughter-in-law, and that a man's foes should be of his own household (Mat. 10, v. 35-36) No human teacher has ever said worse than that. Dumb animals are more loving to their offspring. Children must obey and reverence their parents and live in harmony with their fellows.
- Similarly his offer of a "hundred-fold and eternal life" to anyone "who would forsake brethren or sisters, father or mother, wife or children to follow him," was the most awful bribe ever made to the human race. Let no child follow it. Any cleric teaching such a doctrine can only feel himself a degraded human being; contemptible in the sight of his fellow men. Let no child aim at being such a preacher, or joining such a Ministry. How can it be said that New Testament teaching is superior to that of the Bible, because it

shows more love to mankind, in face of such a deliberate bribe as this to break up the home ? The clergy condemn the Bible because the lex talionis—(an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth)—is preached, in a few verses. The Psalms of David contain no such doctrine. Why condemn the whole book, on account of one of its laws, and extol the beauty of Christ's teaching in condemning his own mother, and tearing parent and child, or husband and wife asunder ?

- In the parable of the "Talents" usury was directly and specially encouraged (Mat. c 25.) This is a very bad moral lesson. The Bible showed far more love for the poor in speaking against usury and decreeing a jubilee year.
- The clergy now call Christ the ideal socialist and depict Him with a modern carpenter's kit in his hand, in order to capture trade unionism. But it has not yet been shown that he really followed his trade. His father was the carpenter. He appears rather to have followed the true vagrant life, prophesying—"Nowhere to lay his head"—to his poor mother's intense sorrow and regret. Trade unionists cannot trust the clerics in this matter, who will naturally say anything to advance their special religious organisations.
- He did not marry; a very bad example to mankind. Young people should marry as soon as they can reasonably afford to do so. No unmarried person knows the real joy of wife, husband and children, and the holiness of fatherhood and motherhood.
- He preferred the company of wine bibbers and sinners to honest people. People should keep away from drinkers and sinners, as they will do them no good. What do they think of public house loafers to-day ?
- He lived upon the hospitality of his friends and would even take food from an enemy. It is better to be independent and earn your own food supply.
- He abandoned John the Baptist, and fled directly that teacher of his was imprisoned. It is better for people to be loyal to their teachers and never to desert a friend !
- When he wanted an animal to ride he did not consult the owner. Our social laws severely punish anyone stealing a horse or mule.
- He preached forgiveness, yet damned his enemies. Children will do well not to think bitterly of anyone, and try and conquer hate with love.
- The lesson "If a man come to me and hate not his father, mother, wife, children, brethren and sisters, yea his own life also, cannot be my disciple," should certainly not be allowed in our Sunday Schools, as the most degraded races of mankind, possess higher moral teaching. An Australian Aborigine was never taught to hate his father, mother, wife and children. Where is the love in this ? How can men be expected to attend Church where such teaching is given as Holy Gospel. Even, the women will see directly that such lessons are injurious to their children.
- His claims (A) That all things are delivered to himself alone; (B) To be the only true Mediator; (c) That God revealed himself only through him; (D) That every power is given alone to him; (E) That he was equal with God; (F) That everything, God could do he could do; (G) Higher knowledge; (H) To be king of men's consciences; (I) To alter the moral law of the Ten Commandments; (j) That no man could convict him of sin, etc., are all quite untenable and unworthy to be taught in the Sunday Schools. Dr McConnell of All Souls Church startled the Episcopal Congress in Boston lately, by stating, "that nothing but a tissue of lies was taught in the Sunday Schools and strongly combated the opinion of Sunday school committees, "that it was unsafe to teach otherwise." There is no danger in teaching God's love and saving grace for us. The danger lies in continuing Christian paganism, blood-thirstiness and sectarian enmity. The German Emperor prides himself upon being a Christian clergyman, and doubtless the Russian Emperor does the same. Thank God, our good King Edward never essays such a roll. The Church of God is for the whole earth, not for any one people or sect. The teachings of Buddha, Confucius, Mahommed, and others are vastly superior to gospel claims—and in some things they are worse. But God's love for us is superior to all. It is this Old Testament love the clerics preach now, yet tumble over each other in calling It Christ's.
- The absence of merriment, joy and happiness from Trinitarianism, as I have repeatedly said, is non ethical, seeing that God wishes us to be really merry. Instead, the churches rule by threat, tyranny and fear, the very garb of some of its nuns being a shame in God's sight. No woman should be compelled to submit to so much suffering all her life, as to see nothing but funereal trappings surrounding her. Our duty is to be optimistic and not to look upon the darkest side of life. Matthew contains 44 references to the devil—a non-existent being. The Bible Society is absolutely unjustified in distributing such a book among ignorant nations. England's great task is to uplift the dark races; not to sink them lower into devil worship or fear.
- The absence of any law of land sub-division from Christ's teaching, and the Christian Church is highly immoral, and the chief root of non-harmony in the classes. It would have been quite easy for him to have commanded the excellent law of "land sub-division at death (Gavelkind)" ruling amongst the Teutonic Nations in his own life time, had he been a good law giver, which he was not, as hardly one of his

commands bears modern investigation. Instead, Pope Hildebrand (Gregory VII) insisted upon feudalism in Europe, which directly led to all the horrors of land accumulation in Britain and the oversea dominions, so that the Roman Church is directly responsible for all the land evils Australasia suffers under now. The atrocities of Ireland would never have happened had it not been for the essential christian teaching of feudalism, which has ruled now for nearly eight centuries. The land never sub-divided amongst the people. Hence their rebellions. But they should have rebelled against their priesthood, not against England, seeing that Gregory VII had brought on the huge estates. No one else is responsible but the vaulting ambition of that one Pope. Not one of the Christian Churches has ever asked for land sub-division, or the abolition of the drink traffic; or the amelioration of the lot of the poor; proving that there has never been any true love for humanity in New Testament teaching, (See Gravelkind, trans. N.Z. Inst. Vol. XVI, 1883.)

- Patriotism is entirely absent also from Trinitarianism. There is nothing in the New Testament about it. People are taught to be loyal to their church before being loyal to their King. Why should they not first be loyal to the King ?
- Paternal and ancestral reverence is also absent from the New Testament, as Christ totally ignored his father Joseph, and denied his mother Surely a spirit of patriotism and reverence for our parents should be taught the children in our Sunday Schools ?
- The total absence of any moral precepts inculcating education or mental improvement is greatly against the Gospels. Under Confucius the whole Chinese nation improved itself in this respect, and then remained stationary : proving that the good in any religious cult only lasts a certain time. Whatever good there was in Christianity ended when William the Norman conquered England, for it was about that time Pope Hildebrand brought in all the evils of land accumulation—or feudalism—from which the Anglo-Saxon people have suffered since. It has been not only powerless, for but absolutely hostile to human good since. The charge against it at present is that Europe is reverting to barbarism. Not, a single one of the churches has attempted to stay the reversion. A mistake has been made in New Zealand in allowing the Roman Catholic Priesthood to establish separate schools, which enables that body to apply it's old, old maxim "Divide to Rule," and so keep the people at enmity with each other. It is manifestly unfair to the Roman Catholic Laity, thus to mark their children for separation among their school fellows. The Church policy of keeping each nation at enmity, and the people of each individual nation in domestic enmity, has succeeded admirably, and the only hope for escape is for all peoples to abandon Trinitarianism, and turn back to the worship of God, as inculcated in the Bible. Protestant clergy in New Zealand, should combine to keep the schools strictly secular, and refrain as much as possible from Trinitarian teaching in their pulpits. If they do not care to do that, let them at once declare themselves Roman Catholic, and then we shall know how we stand in educational matters. What they are doing is to bring in the "Nelson" system, which simply means all the evils of denominationalism. The more religions any people are, the greater number of criminals they furnish. The ratio of criminals in the United States of America is, 2.7 per 1000 including the clergy; but among the clergy themselves the ratio is 13.3 per 1000, or very nearly five times as many. In 1898 the criminal convictions in New Zealand were 26.92 per 10,000 (practically the same as in America) under secular, education : and 66.00 for New South Wales under denominational or theological education, or 2½ times as many. No clergyman should be elected upon any school committee, or entrusted with the education of the young until Trinitarian doctrines are abandoned. At present they only make hypocrites of the children, as two thirds of them don't believe, or do not understand the pagan myths they teach.

Let anyone quietly read the Gospels at home for him or herself, apart from any cleric, and see whether the above objections are not fully justified. At the same time all the good teaching we find in them (mostly borrowed from other teachers, especially Buddha, and interpolated by subsequent dishonest clergy viz., the Alexandrian creedmongers), we need not give up. That is ours by right, and we can certainly take any advantage from all previous human philosophy. Whatever good thoughts Christ gave utterance to, these also are ours. He was only a Jewish peasant and the philosophy ascribed to him does not approach that of Moses or David in the Old Testament. There is not a newspaper in New Zealand which does not utter at times equally good thoughts for our guidance. But we do not deify the newspapers ?

Furthermore, I do not say there are no good men in the ranks of the clergy. There are many such, but they would be far better Ministers of God than of Christ, if allowed so to be by their Bishops, Presbyteries or Assemblies. But they are not allowed, they are compelled to bend the knee to a most harmful Trinitarianism, harmful in the light of modern thought. This is God's earth, not Christ's'. The nations are God's children, not Christ's; and we should have but the one Church and the one God.

RESEMBLANCES TO BUDDHA.—Of all the ancient philosophers Moses stands pre-eminent; Buddha and Confucius following next in importance. The creed mongers of Alexandria, who chiefly wrote the books of the

New Testament, in the opinion of able critics manufactured Jesus Christ from start to finish by plagiarizing Buddha, but their alterations and departures, as I have above shown, will not bear modern criticism. There were the two Trinities (Brahma Vishnu and Siva; Father, Son and Holy Ghost.) Both had genealogies from Kings. Both had virgin mothers. Both promised salvation. The conception of each was announced by a divine messenger (Platos' mother, Perictione immaculately conceived him by Apollo—the Goddess mother of Æneas often appeared to him. The Roman Rhea Sylvia by Mars, etc., etc. Homer and Greek history are full of immaculate conceptions.) Both were visited by wise men with gifts. Both were presented in the temple. Both children grew and waxed strong in spirit. Both discoursed before teachers. Both fasted in the wilderness. Both were tempted. Angels or devatas ministered to each. Both bathed in the rivers for baptismal purposes. The mission of each was proclaimed by a voice from Heaven. Both performed miracles. Both sent out disciples. In calling these disciples the command of each was "Follow me !" Buddha preached on the Holy Hill, Christ his sermon upon the mount. The phraseology of both sermons is practically the same. The story of the Prodigal Son is in both scriptures, so is the account of the man born blind. In both the mustard seed is a simile for littleness. Both referred to the house or city built upon sand. Both speak of the rain which falls on the just and unjust. Both received distinguished visitors at night (Nicodemus and the wealthy man.) A converted courtesan follows each. Each has a traitor. Both made triumphal entries. Both proclaimed kingdoms not of this world—their fundamental error, as God, Heaven, and Hell are here.) The eternal life of Christ is the same as the eternal peace of Buddha. But Buddha never made the terrible list of 53 blunders I have referred to above in his dealing with humanity. It was left to the plagiarist creed mongers of Alexandria to compose the four Gospels and Acts, and the slightest investigation shows what slovenly, illogical and conflicting writers they were. Christ's genealogy is utterly different in the Gospels, and the account of his burial and resurrection from the four books, would not be accepted as evidence by any J.P. in New Zealand. From start to finish the Alexandrian creed mongers purposely jumbled their work so as to cover their plagiaries from Buddha's life. The nations should therefore alter the date of the world, by conceding to modern knowledge, and cease counting the years from New Testament history. In place of B.C. and A.D., I advise adding to our thousands, in deference to former human history, the figure one; thus making the present years 11,909. That would throw back human history another ten thousand years, which it should be.

Buddha's gentle teaching and avoidance of war, was not acceptable to the fierce Alexandrian zealots, who specially brought the sword in their gospels, and well have the Christian and Mahomedan Churches followed their lead. It was the black Monks of Alexandria, the followers of the creed mongers, who tore the gentle Hypatia limb from limb, as the New Zealand clerics would tear me to-day, for writing as I am doing, save that I am protected by section 150 of The Crimes Act, 1908." There is no love for humanity in the New Testament or the Churches of to-day. (The Salvation Army is an organisation especially humanitarian.) Our Liberal legislation in New Zealand is humanitarian; but by no process of reasoning can we say that Christ's teaching, to give all we have to the poor," "not to lay up anything for our wives or children," "to despise our mothers," "I do not bring peace but a sword." "To break away from our parents, wives, and children" so as to be the foolish followers of absurd commands—by no process can we say that that teaching is humanitarian.

As to the Errors of Doctrine.

The following are the present alterations suggested by leading clerics or committees of churches, so that it is very wrong now to continue their teaching in our Sunday Schools :—

ANGLICANS—(1) A revision of the Lectionary. (2) The optional use of Eucharistic Vestments. (3) The optional use of the Athanasian Creed. (4) The optional use of the words "in remembrance that Christ died for thee" in the Communion Service. (5) Immersion to be optional in the Baptismal Service. (9) A new Alternative Burial Service of great beauty and simplicity.

The above alterations contain a direct abandonment of Trinitarianism and blood sacrifice. It is pleasant to realise that at last there is to be an abandonment of some of the Paganism and Heathenism (human blood sacrifice) upon which Christianity rests. Space does not allow me to fully explain what these alterations mean. Present theological training is for the special purpose of continuing these errors and debasing the human intellect. Let there be no more theological colleges in New Zealand. I am pleased to think that the Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury is trying in a quiet way to bring in some of the Reforms I aimed at in 1886.

PRESBYTERIAN.—Dr. Denny, the eminent Presbyterian cleric, now frankly admits that : (1) The Virgin Birth; (2) the Consubstantiality of the Father with the Son; and (3) the personality of the Holy Spirit are non-essential for church membership. Ex-Moderator Gibson Smith, of Wellington, New Zealand, very rightly takes strong exception to the past views of the Doctrine of the Atonement.

CONGREGATIONALISM—Mr R. J. Campbell, of London, totally disagrees with the Doctrine of "The Fall";

stoutly and properly maintaining that man has always advanced or ascended from a savage state, which we all know to be the natural process of evolution. No greater insult was ever offered to God, than the claim, that His chief product, man, is base at heart and merits damnation.

WESLEYANS.—Dr Adam Clarke was strongly opposed to Athanasius and Trinitarianism, and Wesley himself would not allow a cross upon any of his chapels, and there are none to-day. Unfortunately, Methodist preachers of to-day vie with the Roman Catholic clergy in grovelling in Trinitarian worship and, with the Presbyterian and Anglican clergy, rather despise the God of the Bible. Strange to say the Roman priesthood do not despise God; but, whilst reverencing God, they still insist upon harmful Trinitarianism worship for purely priestly domination. It would be easy for any of these churches to conform to modern enlightenment and drop Trinitarianism. Wesley, as I say, would not have the cross upon any of his chapels, neither is there any Church Service Prayer Book in his or the Presbyterian Church. The spirit of true democracy breathes in Presbyterian Church government. The pity is that their preachers are like the Anglicans, hurrying to Rome as fast as they can go. Not a cleric dare do otherwise, or the Presbytery or Bishop would quickly have him by the heels.

To effect any great reform, the Cross must be removed from the New Zealand flag, as the flag of humanity must float above it. (India and our oversea dominions are all asking for distinct flags.) The Lion can be fittingly substituted in its place. The mode in which Russia carried the Cross against Japan was a disgrace to civilisation. I would ask our soldiers and sailors not to fight again under that standard, but to allow the Lion of England to be the Flag of Humanity; the distinctive emblem of each dependency to be quartered upon it. The Lion is one of the Royal Standards, and an excellent flag to fight under, so long as men wish to slay each other, and be pawns, in the papal game of divide to rule. The number of Christians, Moslems, Mahommedans, Brahmins, and the like in our good King's Indian Army is endless, but the thoughts of the men in the moment of battle and death usually turn to God. The Queen's chief nurse also tells us that the poor of London, of all denominations, usually die with God's name upon their lips, not Christ's. Following my reverence for God, my parents, and ancestors, sincerely and heartily do I reverence the Union Jack, and what it has done and stands for. It has been a glorious flag, the battle flag of human freedom. But just as we say "One Flag, One Fleet, One Throne," for the Empire, equally should we now say "One People, One Church, and One God." A greater Union is required now than the Union Jack implies, viz., "The Union of the Empire and its Common Humanity." Let the single or triple lions of England be the one Imperial Flag. But in the name of our Common Humanity, the time has come for the Cross to be removed from the flaps of all the nations. There is a growing and terrible danger in dividing British children in the oversea dominions into Roman and Protestant. Let us throw down Trinitarianism, and make these children truly brothers and sisters. The Cross is the canker worm of God, and should not be upon any flag. It must be replaced with a religion of morality, love, and humanity, not of division and enmity. Every child's mind is pure and straight, until distorted by fossilized dogmatic teaching, which has failed to adapt itself to our greater knowledge. The Church of God of the British Empire could become the one Church upon this earth. Modernism has no time for a thousand churches, dividing the people of this one earth under the plea that all roads lead to heaven. Heaven and God are here, and there is no "way" to them, as God is ever at each of our elbows. For Christ to have said that he was the way, the truth, and the life was the most nonsensical egotism any man ever uttered. There is but the one Universe, and the one God, who has given us a beautiful home if we but cease our religious differences, and consequent social enmity.

Burial Service.

It would be well if some private friend of the deceased read a burial service (determined by Parliament) at the grave side; but no clergyman should be allowed to officiate until the present sectarianism is abandoned. When once the rule of God is accepted we need not be divided after death, and it does not matter who reads the service, providing he is a reputable person, such as an army, navy or marine officer, Unitarian minister, Worshipful Master in the Masonic Craft, or any J.P. It will tend to uplift humanity for each citizen to take his turn in reading such a service, seeing that it will remind him of his own brief span of life. But death now is robed in too much sorrow—oftentimes death is a blessing.

The Last day.

The last day is an absurdity, there being no last day in this universe. Supposing our sun and planetary system suddenly disrupted, ill place of quietly dying out—our most probable destiny—other suns and planet systems will still go on.

The day of Judgment.

The idea of this terrible day people can abandon, as God judges us every day, and we are rewarded or punished according to our daily actions. It is sad to think that painters and poets have so long prostituted their divine gifts to chain humanity to perfectly wrong ideals. The words of most of our oratorios and church hymns are a travesty upon our civilisation: It is much the same with the subject matter of a considerable number of our great pictures dealing with the Resurrection, Ascension, Heaven, Hell, etc., etc. The whole of Europe has bowed itself to a mistaken worship. Are we not in error in Australasia in following it? Christianity totally lacks four great essentials—(1) Harmony in the community; (2) virtue; (3) family reverence; and (4) respect for home life "I am come to set a man at variance against his father, the daughter against the mother," etc., etc., (Matthew, e.10, v.35) and v. 37—"He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me." What wonder our girls, forsake home and parent and become non-virtuous under such teaching? Or take v.34—"I am not come to send peace, but a sword." How can there be any harmony amongst us? (This Chapter 10 should not be read in any church of God.) It is therefore not necessary to look to any future day of judgment for following such teaching. The immorality and home disruption of any of our Australasian cities is a sufficient present punishment. In this we should call what is best from Chinese life, where every girl is taught to respect home and parent, and even the dead must be buried in the family sepulchre. Confucius was a great moral and virtuous teacher.

The ten Commandments.

A strong attempt is being made now by foolish, ignorant, or too zealous clerics, to dispense with the use of the Ten Commandments, owing to their inculcating the worship of one God. The whole effort of modern churches is to drag us away from God, and compel us to worship Jesus Christ and his mother, mistakenly styled the Virgin Mary. I advise all people not to give up these excellent Commandments, the foundation of our civilisation, for which we have to thank the Jewish people; but to insist upon their still being taught in the schools.

MONOTHEISM AND POLYTHEISM.—The Books of the Old Testament may be criticised into non-existence (if such proverbs and magnificent prose can ever be lost to humanity), but so long as we have the Monotheism of the Ten Commandments taught in our schools the children will grow up to reverence one God. and have some bond of harmony with each other. The entire obliteration of the New Testament would be of vast benefit to humanity, and from the signs of the times the Nations intend very properly to relegate it to oblivion. Unfortunately, they wish also to throw the Bible away, as the natural revulsion from past clerical teaching. But the Crown and Sceptre of England rests upon the religious philosophy of the Ten Commandments, not upon the New Testament. It is the papal tiara that rests "upon the latter, and the nations very properly intend to throw down the Cross. The Churches in all countries now lead on the Nations to boycott the Jews, but these people have given us our civilisation, and, although Christ and his mother were Jews, it is the Jews of to-day who will not worship them, but insist upon obeying the Ten Commandments. In this they are God's peculiar people and the real light of the world, for their religious philosophy must triumph over all existing religions. The nation, therefore, that tolerates them, and keeps to the Ten Commandments must be first in the world of nations. Asia has nothing better to offer us. On the other hand the nation that allows its clergy to become mere Trinitarians, must sink and decay, like Italy, Spain or Russia, Cromwell, Nelson, and Wellington had simple faith in God. Their dispatches prove that conclusively. The leading Presidents of America (like Washington and Lincoln) absolutely objected to Christ worship. They were truly enlightened men. I cannot remember, as I write, any great soldier, sailor, or statesmen, in the cause of human freedom and truth, who was a Trinitarian only. It is impossible for the Roman Church to day to produce a great layman; only a great ecclesiastic. The only errors the Jews make:—(i) In not dividing their surplus wealth with the poor; (2) In not leading more simple lives. Rot in this the peers and nobles of England are to blame in leading too luxurious lives, thereby setting everyone a bad example.

Additional New Testament bad Teachings.

Whilst the Old Testament is unlike any other book, inasmuch as its chapters contain the inspiration and experience of thousands of years of previous human pleasure and suffering under a pure Montheism, proving

the undoubted fact that we live in a moral as well as a physical universe, the New Testament books are inexperienced speculations of the Alexandrian creed mongers. We know now that the Pentateuch and Psalms were not written by Moses or David, but came to us from Egypt and Babylon through Jewish writers. But that fact does not lessen their intrinsic value. We also know that not a single chapter of the New Testament is genuine, and the slightest enquiry discovers the 53 bad lessons or teachings I have already set out. I ask permission to add the following :—

- Secular and sanitary duties were to be neglected, even the sepulture of the dead, that men might follow Jesus. Fancy any teacher saying "Let the dead bury the dead" ! What would happen in any of our villages if we really followed such instructions?
- Neither by precept nor example did Christ promote respect or reverence for family life. The Chinese or Japanese are a thousand times more careful of their parents and grandparents. Indeed Old Age Pensions Acts have now to be brought into force to remedy Christ's inhumanity. To call Jesus "meek and lowly" is a complete misnomer. No more unhuman great teacher ever lived.
- He said nothing in favour of popular education, the care of the body, or the improvement of the home.
- He was absolutely indifferent to the future of human society. In his opinion society had no future.
- His chief teaching was that "The end of the world was at hand," and consequently it was no use having families or replenishing the earth. His ethics were "end ethics." We know now how we regard the Holy Rollers or Ghosters or any other sect that predicts the world coming to an end next March or September. Jesus was simply one of these. Paul's teaching did not fall quite so low, but the whole New Testament is non-ethical, impractical and unwarranted by human experience. The teachings of Jesus are consequently far behind those of Adam Smith, Herbert Spencer, Jeremy Bentham, John Stewart Mill or Charles Darwin. That is why I advise the people of Australasia to abandon them. A book that inculcates as a chief lesson the absolute neglect of burying the dead is insanitary, and those chapters should not be read in any public assembly. Sir John Madden, Chief Justice of Victoria, has lately exposed the terrible immorality of Melbourne. The Christian clergy, in preaching Christ and not God weekly and daily, are solely responsible for this, as respect for home or parents is not inculcated in the New Testament. In my first Moral Lessons I have endeavoured to provide the children with better aids through life.

Spiritual Life.

This is a harmful form of religious emotionalism or mania, leading people to a vagrant life. It appears to grow upon its lay followers, entailing fanaticism and neglect, or subversion of business, usually ending in the bankruptcy court. The clergy make a living out of it, and delight in playing upon the emotionalism of women, by preaching the charms of a spiritual life, and asking them to throw themselves upon an imaginary Jesus, whereas nothing is more injurious. The only way to check this is to abolish all orders of beneficed or ordained clergy, and for every citizen to take his or her turn in filling God's pulpit, but no one to be allowed continuously to do so. After three years service any man calling himself a Minister of God should return to his profession or trade, as continual religious occupation is detrimental. Theological colleges are the bane of Humanity. On no account should chairs of divinity be established in New Zealand colleges or universities.

The Ascension.

This doctrine falls in face of our present knowledge of astronomy. The last discovered planet of our sun system is estimated at a distance of four thousand million miles from the sun, with an annual revolution of 353 earth years, and our sun is only one star forming the milky way. So that if Christ's body ascended, let us say 1876 years ago, and travelled at the speed of light (186,000 miles a second) It Would not yet have Reached the Bounds of the Visible Universe, where Heaven is supposed to be. It is against common sense to suppose that there are fixed bounds to this Universe, as that would imply other Universes to hold this one. But Unity or Monism is the Great law of Nature, so that there cannot be a Heaven outside this Universe. Just as all sensible people have abandoned the Hell doctrine, equally must they abandon a supposed Heaven beyond the stars.

The Doctrine of the Only Son.

The lessons of Evolution and Natural Selection are planetary, not geo centric. If there are (per exemplum gratia) canal builders on Mars, then clearly there is a similar humanity there to ours here, as we also build

canals. Besides it is monstrous to suppose that of the "50 million star" map now being made, down to the 14th magnitude, that this little earth is the only one inhabited. The Doctrine of the Only Son consequently fails, for there appears to be no practical way for one human body to travel round and visit numberless planets in succession, so as to live and die, and represent the Creator for a time upon each one, in order to save the different races of people upon those plants. (Of course no mere human unit can do that which is God's work.) No human body could possibly last out work like that. Moreover, Mrs Eddy, no doubt, considers herself "The Only Daughter of 'God,'" as she possesses the same powers of Healing that Christ and Paul had. But the doctrine of the Trinity is essentially male, as there is no room for a woman in it. Yet are not women as good as men ?

Christ's Dying for our Sins.

Is not this doctrine an insult to our intelligence ? We are each responsible to our Creator for our own sins. It is only religious hysteria which causes us to look to any human saviour, in place of throwing ourselves completely upon God, whose forgiveness, like a mother's, is always with us, directly "we say we are really sorry for wrong doing.

A man is responsible for his sins—(1) To himself in the first place, as he suffers the most; (2) To his wife, children, and family; (3) To the community in which he resides; and (4) to God, who, condemning no one, requires no Mediator or Saviour. It is utterly beyond our Creator to be angry with us, as He is always merciful; regretting perhaps when the working of His laws bears hard upon us. (If we do not wire or clamp our houses against earthquake damage, surely we ought not to blame Him.) The idea of a poor Jewish peasant, dying nineteen centuries ago, as a human blood sacrifice, must be highly repellent to God, who, in a thousand ways, tells us not to kill each other, and to be responsible for our own sins. (The Jews themselves had to punish him for claiming to be their King and God, but they should not have killed him.) God is not a God of Wrath or Pardon. His forgiveness is not a distant thing; it is always ready for anyone asking it, who quietly says to himself or herself, "I am really sorry for wrong doing, and will try to avoid it in future." Forgiveness absolutely follows true contrition. It is as certain as the air we breathe, so good is God to us. Let anyone try it. It is the saving grace of God that enters our hearts, when we think and do what is right. Christ has nothing to do with that great moral law, which has existed from the Creation of man, and will always exist. It is one of the Natural Laws of God.

NOTE—See "Higher Social Laws." Translations N.Z. Institute, 1897.

The Mystery of the Trinity.

It is pitiable to hear a clergyman of to-day trying to explain the Trinity; constantly repeating "that it is a mystery of mysteries; that he doesn't understand it; that the wisdom of his church has decreed it; that by no force of intellectual process can a man understand it." My answer is: "Away with such mystery, for there is none." That God has given us reason and intellect to inquire into all His laws, and He wishes us to do so. That there cannot be three persons in one, and the Holy Spirit is not a person. There consequently is no Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, any more than the ancient Osiris, Isis and Horus, or any of the Asiatic Trinities. That the wise men of his Church are no better than the wise Mohammedans, Confucians or Buddhists, all of whom blundered. The evils of our Theological Colleges are fully shown now in the pulpit, and the congregations would do well to stop their clergy trying to explain their foolish dogmas. That the Athanasian Creed being condemned, they are now preaching another of the Nicene Creeds—the one as bad as the other. That our minds are not absolutely finite, but part of the infinite mind of God. That the field of salvation and good work is boundless, if they only drop their mysteries and the whole Book of Matthew, and preach God's goodness, joy and happiness to us.

A Delusion of the Ages.

Why have men so readily died in the name of Jesus if the Trinitarian doctrine is a delusion ? My answer is that more have died with God's name, or Mahommed's, or Buddha's, or Confucius upon their lips. That the mind of man is prone to forsake God, and follow strange Gods, as the Bible very clearly pointed out; but our duty is to keep to God alone. Consider how many worshipped Diana, Astarte, or Baal : and the worshippers freely gave their lives for their beliefs. Did they not hack themselves to pieces with knives ? Consider the dancing Dervishes or the ascetic hermits, or the praying monks of Thibet. Did not thousands of Arabs lay down their

lives bravely and manfully at Omdurman, the mistaken followers of the Mahdi? But Kitchener's Maxims relentlessly mowed them down, because the time had arrived to open up Africa. My sole reason for publishing this Essay is to bring men's minds back to God, as the delusions of strange Gods are endless, Yet all honour to those noble Christians who have laid down their lives for their delusion. In a way they have done God's work, but the delusion is now rapidly fading (for Jesus Christ is now dying or dead) and they will be able to do God's work better when the earth is freed from his mistaken worship.

The New and old Testament Gods.

In Remsburg's "Christ" (which reaches me as this Essay is in the press) he quotes as follows :—"We must get rid of that Christ." So spoke Emerson, one of the wisest and most lovable of men. "If I had my way," said Carlyle, "the world would hear a pretty stern command—Exit Christ." "The mighty and supreme Jesus," says Professor Goldwin Smith, "has flown." But priestcraft lives on and conjures up the ghost of this dead God to frighten and enslave mankind. The "Leben Jesu" of Strauss proved that Jesus Christ is a historical myth, and the "Vie de Jesus" of Renan killed Christ worship in France. (I hope this Essay will help to similarly kill it in New Zealand, and we can be one People, with One Church and One God, else we all may as well hand over our consciences, our affairs and our country to the Roman priesthood, and sink into the position of Spain, Italy, Mexico or any priest-ridden nation.)

The Bible on the Scrap Heap.

American clergy and American Universities are condemning the Bible God as injurious to mankind. The Anglican and Presbyterian clergy also now condemn Him as a savage tribal Jehovah; an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth sort of Celestial Czar. In the Supreme Court, at Wellington (N.Z.) there is a heap of thirty New Testaments, upon which to swear Jurymen, and not a Bible amongst them. American Professors say that the God of the Bible is not big enough for us to-day. The British and Foreign Bible Society practically only distribute now New Testaments. Nothing can be more unfair than all this, and proves that Protestantism is dead. I freely admit Bible errors, but not the Mosaic conception of God's Unity and Immanence which is over whelming in the Bible. "He rides on the wings of the wind. He speaks in the voice of the thunder. From the depth of the earth to the stars, God is everywhere." Moses did but give us the inner belief of the Egyptian priesthood of what God was, seeing that he was brought up a young man in the Egyptian Court. The Single unknown God of the Bible is the revolt of the Egyptian priesthood from the many Gods the Egyptians worshipped, and that God is quite big enough for us to-day. We must have a religion, and I say "Keep to the Ten Commandments." But I want no religion of fear. God and I are true friends. I fully trust Him, and humbly try to do as He, through my conscience, commands me. In publishing this essay I do God's work, hoping to kill Christ worship and priestly dominance in New Zealand. It may have been the Egyptian priesthood who founded the Masonic cult upon the Unity of God.

The Christian Spirit.

In the face of the armies and navies of Europe this Spirit is non-existent; the motto being for each nation to be stronger than the other, which the clergy always encourage, as they flourish upon the misery and wrangling of mankind. They especially urge it on, as I have always said, against such a nation as France, which has thrown down the Cross. The whole power of Rome is being utilised now to quietly urge on Germany to crush France for daring to overthrow the Cross. And as Germany has no fleet in the Mediterranean, Austria and Italy are being quietly encouraged also to build Dreadnoughts. A century ago France was dictating law to Europe. To-day the nations are being quietly arrayed against her for daring to throw down the Cross. What the Clerics really mean by "the true Christian Spirit" is the forgiveness and mercy of God. They have never done any good as missionaries, except when they taught Deism, and, of course, in that way they did good. In 1872 I saw in Fiji Anglican, Roman, and Wesleyan Churches set up in Levuka, and the poor natives did not know which to believe. Such a state of things was and still is a disgrace to our Humanity. Why did we so mislead these poor people? In 1874, discussing this matter with Bishop Selwyn, that cleric (as good a minister of God and man as we have ever had, but unfortunately for himself trained in mistaken Trinitarianism)—told me that, to overcome this difficulty in New Zealand, he had agreed with the Wesleyan Missionaries for the Natives to draw an imaginary line, dividing their pahs in half, and for each half to worship on its own side of the pah. Could

anything have been more harmful ? Was it not a crime to teach these people the Cross at all, as it has done them no good; for morally they are now a ruined race. Surely it would have sufficed to teach God to them ! I have the greatest sympathy for those good men who carried the Bible to the dark places of the earth. Unfortunately they carried with it the New Testament canker worm; which directly negated all their splendid efforts. The duty of mankind is to bury the New Testament, and try to forget the whole of its errors and evil doings. After years of mission effort, it is shocking to know how the Tongan chiefs treat their young girls. Trinitarianism does not inculcate real virtue at all : Christ's own birth from a virgin, being as I say *contra virtutem*. Confucius really taught virtue in every line of his writings; but the Confucian cult, like all other cults, has had its day and the good of it must be absorbed in a better cult.

Soul Saving.

The soul saving doctrine of the clerics is the most selfish dogma ever inflicted upon humanity, and merely means priestcraft or graft; body saving being far preferable. "There is a Divinity which shapes our ends rough hew them how we may." Our duty is to live good lives upon this Earth and Heaven Home of ours, and not bother about our souls. God takes care of them.

Saints.

The idea of beatifying men and women and worshipping them as holy saints is preposterous, and an outrage upon our intelligence. The public worship of Joan of Arc has just been decreed in Rome, and the chief Roman Ecclesiastics swung censors of incense before her picture. This was doubtless decreed as one step to win back France to Rome. Veneration and respect for our good ancestors is a totally different thing to this, but not for our bad ones. Many of the saints were shocking people. "The spirit of our fathers still watches over every deep," and very rightly so, for when will Nelson's, Collingwood's, or a hundred other such men's deeds be forgotten ? Yet, what English-man would worship any of them ? All the saints of the church calendars do not equal Nelson, who so readily gave his life for his country; facing death in his best clothes, as a man should die, when his country calls. England therefore has had enough of St. George of Cappadocia, who never did anything to entitle him to the veneration of the British Empire, unless it can be proved that he really was the stout follower of Arius he is said to have been, and that the dragon was Athanasius, now properly slain by the Anglican Church. If this be really so, and the Empire understands that it is so, then let his image remain upon our coins, but let us call him "George of Cappadocia." I advise the dropping of all Saint days from our calendar in order to free the human intellect from a mistaken worship. It was wrong of the Christian Church to impose such a worship upon Humanity. We can see the full evil of it in the Russian and Greek eikon. Let the cross be removed from our coinage. Britannia with a plain shield; the triple arms and Crown, our good King's head, and Edward us VIII., *dei. gra. Brit. Omn. Rex.*, are enough for all our wants.

Of Prayer.

God asks no prayer. This little globe of our is a very Pandora box of treasure, and He does not ask a cent back. He has given all to us. How dare any man say He is not a good God to us. He would rather we honoured and revered our parents before honouring Himself. The whole treasure of the earth is ours and yet He remains absolutely unknown to us. It is the clergy who have set up blatant public prayers, so as to levy their toll upon humanity. One true secret prayer is worth a hundred prayers in public. God's Jaws can be preached to us and we can sing His praise; but the fewer prayers we say the better. (Note.—See "The Amended Book of Common Prayer," 1886, Lyon and Blair, now Whitcombe and Tombs, Wellington, N.Z. In this I tried to minimize past evil theological teaching, but did not go far enough.) All a person need do is to firmly trust in Him, and he will be saved many evils; but on no account to neglect our business or family affairs. The whole clerical aim is to make us do so, and lead objectionable spiritual lives in order that they can more easily levy their toll upon us. New Zealand people will be better men and women if they give up so much praying and aiming at spiritual lives, and keep their money in their pockets. No good can possibly follow being a monk or a nun. If we devote too much time to religion we shall inevitably suffer for it. Serve humanity first, and we shall best serve God. Avoid religious or spiritual hysteria and throwing yourselves in the arms of Jesus as much as ever you can. It grows upon one; weakens the moral fibre and debases the mind, as God does not want it. He would rather that we did good, sought the truth about His natural laws, helped the weak and unfortunate,

cultivated a true spirit of forgiveness, loved one another, and paid our debts honourably, than to be constantly throwing ourselves upon Christ, who never paid anybody, but lived upon his friends and enemies indiscriminately. It is astonishing the number of Christians we have who do not pay their debts. Yet if there be any man, like General Booth, who wishes to preach God's grace by all means let him, only when he has done so let some other take up the work I specially asked the worthy General, during his late visit here, to marshal his soldiery in God's name, and told him his organisation would then sweep the earth; but he declined, and it will not long survive his death. Already it is at a standstill in New Zealand. No organisation—except Roman Catholicism—can long carry the canker-worm of Trinitarianism. The Roman Church does not allow truth and freedom, and it rules by fear. If the nations desire to give up these two great blessings and place their necks beneath the clerical heel, of course the Cross will continue to flourish, and everybody will become Roman Catholic—even my friends the Salvation Army—a most worthy set of people. These sheets of moral lessons I am publishing may assist in saving New Zealand from that fate, which has ruined every nation in Europe that has tried it, and also the nations under the Greek Church. What man is there who will say that a religious life contains now in itself any joy, happiness, progress or human advancement? In truth it is but the negation of these blessings. Yet the happiness of God might be preached to us ! Why should it always be sorrow, sorrow, sin and death ! Why should the world be condemned to follow "A Man of Sorrows" when God really means joy and happiness, beauty and plenty, if we but share what He gives us. As a late poet puts it:—

You can sing a joyful song—
If you cry;
You can help a friend along—
If you try;
You can scatter golden seeds,
You can give to others needs,
You can live in kindly deeds—
If you try.

A wealthy widow of New York has given £1000 a day for the last three years to the poor. In that she did right, and followed Buddha's teaching of giving the surplus she had to the poor. The Gospel asks her to give all she had, in which the Gospel is clearly wrong. God does not ask that.

The Resurrection.

No sensible person can possibly believe that on the last day—which never comes—our actual bodies will be restored from their graves. Myriads of them will be non-existent. For it is not the spirit or soul that is to be resurrected, But the Actual Human Body ! This doctrine only appears in the late Judaism—the Pharisees supporting it and the Sadducees rejecting it. (In this Christ and Paul were Pharisees). To-day there is hardly a person who thinks that our actual human bodies will be restored, but that our Spiritual souls will meet hereafter. That, of course, is not what is meant by Paul's teaching, upon which Christianity chiefly rests. Christians to-day are really Spiritualists, not Resurrectionists; so that the Church for some centuries has been masquerading under false colours (it being ever ready, I must confess, to mould its opinions to suit the times). My object in publishing these essays is to cause the laity to enquire and widen their mental view, especially the women. If they do so the individual clergy will readily abandon what they know to be error, but which their bishops, moderators and assemblies will not allow them, as individuals, to abandon. (The laity is much to blame for allowing their clergy so much license in the pulpit.) We simply know nothing of the hereafter, and the phenomena of the Spiritualists, or Occultism, requires the closest investigation. One thing is certain—that nothing is supernatural. That which we do not understand may be but the simple working of the etherial laws of nature. There may or may not be spiritual beings. Our souls may hover for a time near our homes and those dear to us as distinct entities, and then fade slowly away into the vital reservoir from whence we came; the reservoir being also here. In this God is very good to us. The silence of "the other side" is majestic in its spirit of rest. Is it not unkind to think that our life struggle here continues on for ever hereafter? After seventy years of joy, toil and pain we should thankfully accept the rest of the grave. But, let each of us die manly and womanly, bravely and honestly, and leave the rest to God. Let no one fear death. The priesthoods have cultivated the spiritual side of our nature far too much. There are so many material things to attend to that my advice to everyone is "Leave the spirits alone." (I ask to be pardoned for my brief disjointed sentences, necessitated by the space at my disposal.) I strongly advocate material matters with a humble reverence for God, but spiritual

matters of any kind I have little respect for. I do not say there is no spiritual side to our nature, but it is clearly an offence against our good Creator, who has placed us here, to despise and neglect the material universe we see around us in order to cultivate a shadowy, uncertain and unknown spiritual universe, merely to allow an army of clerics and other spiritist charlatans to make a good easy living out of us. My own opinion is that there is no resurrection either of our body or spirit.

Concerning Relics.

There are no relics in New Zealand, and it is to be hoped the Roman Catholic laity will stop their priesthood bringing any in. There are distinct signs that that laity objects to the rigidity of past church rule, and claims for itself sufficient independence to live upon an equal footing with its fellow New Zealanders. In various churches of Europe the following relics are exhibited :—(1) The cradle of Jesus. (2) His swaddling clothes (a boxfull). (3) The scarlet purple robe worn at his trial. (4) Three or four genuine coats he wore at the crucifixion. (5) The genuine drown of thorns (a large boxfull). (6) Cords of wood from the true cross (of different kinds when examined). (7) One whole column of the Cross is shown at Rome, another at Jerusalem. (8) Hundredweights of nails. (9) A whole bundle of spears. (10) Many sponges, (11) Towels. (12) Phials of blood (some liquid). (13) Bottles of the darkness. (14) Head of John the Baptist. (15) His hand. (16) The table used at the last supper. (17) Some of the bread and fishes miraculously multiplied. (18) The finger bone of the Holy Spirit (Jerusalem). (I regret to have to state that whilst this essay is going through the press Bishop Grimes, of Christchurch, has produced in his Cathedral a portion of the true Cross for the veneration of New Zealanders. I should like to be allowed to examine it to see what wood it is made of.)

As to Miracles.

There are in Wellington as I write two "vital healers" performing exactly the same miracles as did Christ and the Apostles, excepting raising the dead, which, of course, can be done to-day with the apparently drowned, or some of those struck by lightning. In the Wellington Town Hall the palsied, sick, lame, halt and blind went upon the stage and were relieved for a time. Why did Wellington Christians and newspapers revile these men and drive them from the town? Surely if they could relieve pain and misery, if only for twelve hours, they should have been allowed to do so. The Apostles did so. Father John of Cronstradt did so. If they took too much advantage of this simple electrical, magnetic or hypnotic power why cannot some of our medical men follow their methods? Christ certainly did so. In a superstitious age the exhibition of this power of healing was the sole foundation of Paul and himself being regarded as gods. Personally I believe in medical science, and also in mental healing; but there is no miracle in either. Christ was a mental and vital healer, exactly the same as Father John of Constradt, Mrs Eddy, or any of the mistaken worshippers of Lake Zurich. In fact the mental cures of the devil worshippers surpass those of Mrs Eddy. Are we to deify these people? I think not. There for the deification in the Gospels under the doctrine of Trinitarianism is highly objectionable, and is being abandoned now by the churches themselves. The simple fact of so many Christian and devil worshipping people possessing this power of healing proves undoubtedly that it is not supernatural, but simply one of the laws of our Creator, and our duty is to regard it as such, thoroughly investigate it, And Make use of it. But not to call in a doctor when we are ill is folly; only medical men should not seek to accumulate too much wealth from their patients in too short a time.

In order that New Zealand should hereafter be "One People, with one Church and one God" careful enquiry is necessary into the above list of errors. I ask to be excused for making that list, which I do for our future good. There are no religious. sects in my mental vision—only God and humanity. I respect a Roman Catholic as much as a Plymouth Brother, But we have too many railways and steamers now to afford room for more than one religion and one God for this small planet, and it is a complete blunder for the Bible Society to distribute anything but the Bible. The flag of Humanity must float, as I say, high above Cross and Crescent. It is time for us to cast down all sectarian symbols, especially the Cross. We must be but the one people in New Zealand, and if the Roman and Protestant priesthood wish to divide us we must say: "No! We are but the one people, under the one God; we will have but the one Church, and our children shall live in harmony with one another, and be educated side by side!" We cannot expect agreement between capital and labour, between man and man, unless we have harmony in our schools. There cannot even be trade unionism if Roman workmen obey their priests before their unions. I would strongly urge keeping the clergy away from birth, marriage or burial—any civil registrar or J.P. to perform the marriage ceremony or read the burial service. For our" future harmony as one people (and Australasia will be but the one people)—the clergy to be kept entirely away from these functions.

Their interference simply means forging the bonds of Roman or Protestant tighter. The laity must throw off the clerical yoke.

The Title "Reverend."

I would ask all ministers not to allow themselves to be styled "Reverend"—as we should only reverence God—or priests of the Roman Church to call themselves by the hallowed name name of "Father"—which they can never be. The celibacy of that priesthood is against God's command and should be abolished. Individually the clergy, in nine cases out of ten, are good men, wrongly chained to bad moral standards; but once chained there is no escape from their slavery. It is for the congregations to take a wider view of things, and oppose the bishops and church assemblies, and the individual clergy then will be free men to cultivate harmony among the people. At present they are mere bond slaves of their bishops and superiors. It is positively criminal to make any man a celibate. So long as congregations and choirs (especially choirs) sing ridiculous hymns there can only be mental slavery. Choirs should refuse to sing any hymns but those in praise of God. Choir work is most useful in God's name, but most harmful in any other name. The wonder is that the spirit of Hod enters human hearts at all when a poor ignorant Jewish peasant, and his mother, are worshipped or sung to in praise. Yet it does—proving how merciful and forgiving God is to us. Like a loving parent, God tries to warn us, through our consciences, when we worship wrongly—holding himself aloof, but ready to return to us, directly we call upon him.

Sheet No. 1 contained useful moral lessons for school children. In this essay I have ventured to call attention to the bad moral standards from the New Testament. Sheets 3 and 4 will contain useful moral lessons for higher students and adults, being a continuation of Sheet. No. 1. I would ask everyone to take care of these sheets until the whole are published, in order to see their full design. The best that all philosophers have said will be contained in them. We want no more than that, and the comforting heart-warming Grace of God.

I ask pardon for anything I may say herein. I earnestly repeat that this has not been said to offend; but to preserve God's worship and human liberty, and advancement. The clergy know well that the bulk of the people of England do not care a straw for religion now, and are ceasing to attend the churches. Can they expect otherwise, when they themselves are more and more abandoning God's worship in favour of Trinitarian, falsehood and fable? Their whole talk is of Christian ideals, Christian righteousness, Christ's Kingdom, and the like, with a spare reference to God now and then to sugar-coat the pill the people object to swallow. The people are ready, as they have always been, to worship God; but the church leaders will not allow them.

I would ask Parliament, therefore, to remove the Cross from New Zealand's flag as a first step, and it can then be taken down from our churches, which should only exist for the Glory of the the Great Architect of the Universe. As I write, some 1500 Armenians have been religiously slain near Adana by Moslems, exactly as the most Christian of all nations, the Spaniards, wiped out those gentle South American Indians after the discovery of America. Surely t is time for us, as reasonable men and women, to abandon such horrid symbols of religious differences, which God has never asked for. Earnestly I say, let the temples of humanity contain no such symbols, but be built to our Unknown God. Upon the great temple of Diana, at Ephesus, the Greeks engraved the letters "Ei" (Thou art One). It is far better for us not to know God than to know Him wrongly. Therefore let none of us worship His erring children—Moses, Confucius, Mahommet or Buddha, Christ or, Mary. For the advancement of humanity the church bells of the British Empire should ring on Sunday, calling people to worship our Unknown God—our Unknown God alone. Asia cannot then rise in revolt against us, or Moslem slay Christian. It is the Cross alone that inspires Moslem hatred. Like Shakespeare, the King or Queen of the British Empire should belong to no denomination, and our army and navy should fight, whilst they have to fight, truly for God alone : For God and the Right, "Dieu et mon droit." our national motto. The Trinitarian clergy have tried, during the past half century, to submerge this glorious motto and make it "Jesu et mon droit"; but I do not think the people of England will allow them to do that. Good King Edward VII, tolerant as he is, should recognise neither Cross nor Crescent. For this was the great Bible lesson of Moses to humanity, as contained in the Ten Commandments—viz.. the worship of one Unknown God, who should be known only by a name, not by a symbol. Am I wrong in asking that religious faith, other, should be taught in British Sunday schools, to the exclusion of that long list of bad moral lessons and standrds of doctrine contained in the first portion of this essay.

Our School Committees.

The clergy are now getting elected upon our school committees, and bringing the Bible back into our

schools, whereas the leading clergymen in the United States are complaining that nothing but a tissue of lies is being taught in the Sunday schools and important churches there, and they are very properly abolishing Bible class work altogether. I would warn New Zealanders that the only object of the local clergy is to bring back the bad moral lessons above referred to. The youth of any country should never be entrusted to clerical control, unless it be to the one broad church of One People, One God.

Roman Catholicism and Agnosticism.

The current opinion, as I write, by many is that before the end of the present century, people must either be Roman Catholic or Agnostic. My reply is: "Surely people can worship the Great Creator of the Universe, Father and Mother God if people like—but still God. (Able a human unit as Ernest Haeckel is—one of the most notable I know—yet he has done a great wrong to humanity in saying: "There is no God.") We have had some sixteen centuries of Trinitarianism, with the result, that every nation is embittered with some other nation, or kept simmering in civil or domestic strife. It has paid the Roman hierarchy, as I have said, to keep everyone at loggerheads, so as to benefit from the Macchiavellian doctrine—"Divide to Rule." The Anglo Saxon workpeople now very properly begin to see this, and to distrust and forsake the churches. I advise them to go on doing so; but to reverence God in their hearts and acknowledge Him their Creator, as the minimum of religious error, the great lesson of the Ten Commandments. God is very good to us if we only lead proper lives as citizens; those who have giving; to those who have not, and those who have not, ceasing to bring too many children into the world, whom they cannot support. I advise people to be neither Trinitarian nor Agnostic, but to follow the teachings of the Masonic Lodges—a superior morality to anything Christianity contains. It is not because people object to the present teaching, or the palpable errors of the Bible, or the wrong way in which the God of Nature has been taught to them, that they should turn away and say: "There is no God" Our civilisation will go under if they do that, and inferior nations rule. Asia will not subjugate Europe if the latter keeps to the Ten Commandments; but if these are abandoned, Europe must go under. To make our children good men and women we must teach them to reverence God, and adhere to simple truth in all things. The Churches and Sunday schools do not do that, which is the chief reason why men will not go to church now. Yet we cannot have a great soldier, sailor or statesman who, from his childhood, is taught to play with the truth. We must have God-fearing, truthful, simple-minded men for human advancement. A century ago there were many such, but of late years there has been a direct turning away from God by all the churches. Still the laity (Roman and Protestant), as apart from the clergy, are beginning to break away from present Church teaching and to doubt its truth, and I trust, by the end of this century, the world will see many millions of men and women proudly boasting that they are neither Christian nor Agnostic. In the third century it took a brave man to say: "I am a Christian"—it takes a brave man to-day to say he is not one. It is for the men and women (especially the women) of the British Empire now to check the license of the pulpit by saying they are not Christians, but only humble "worshippers of God, our Creator; and to insist that their children shall be educated side by side in God's worship. That virtue, harmony, reverence for home and their parents, and respect for old age be taught them in brief moral lessons, so that they may have some guide through life to cling to in time of mental stress. At present they have nothing—as the Gospel is worse than useless, by advising them to forsake home, parents and children so as to follow Christ. This only allows the different priesthoods to take advantage of their distress in order to benefit their church organisations. At heart, we New Zealanders say we are but the one people. Why then should we not have the one Church and one God, and live in harmony together? Christianity only divides us, and will soon have us flying at one another's throats, in the Same deadly religious strife that has prevailed in Europe for over a thousand years past.

Concerning Death.

Do not fear death, but trust your soul's future to God, its Maker. When you lose a loved one leave him or her to God, as Christ will not help you. The clerics will ask you (taking advantage of your grief) to throw yourself upon Christ. But why bring him in, as he is only the Alexandrian creed mongers' creation. God has mercifully arranged that time shall heal your grief. Do not be solitary, but keep yourself employed and take a change of scene if you can Reverently see to the burial of the dead, or your conscience will blame you for your neglect Do not follow Christ's advice to "let the dead bury the dead." Trust me when I tell you that God is not alone the only guardian of the departed, but your true and ever present comforter. Help those in need. Do good works; but do not rely upon prayers. Have every confidence that, if it should be for your good, our good Creator will allow you to meet hereafter the soul of the loved one passed away. Live your life here, so that when you

die your spirit or soul may face God honestly and say : "Lord, I heartily grieved for the loved ones gone, and tried bravely to live a good life thereafter, in thought, and word, and deed." If you do that, God may reward you, for He ever recognises goodness. If He can govern the myriad electrons forming an atom (a whole world in itself), or the long sustained emanations from a grain of radium, surely to Him, its maker, is best left the care of the soul of the departed, and your future relations with it. Trust in God and do right.

I may be allowed to say in conclusion these parting words:—The Grace of our Loving, Ever Present and Merciful God; your humble reverence for His holy name, and your unselfish fellowship with each other on earth, be with you all, this day and ever more.

Holstein Lodge,

Carterton, Wairarapa, N.Z.

June 1st, 1909.

Ferrer the Anarchist. The Facts of His Life and Trial. The Australian Catholic Truth Society Melbourne, 312 Lonsdale St. Rev. M. H. Macinerny, Op.

Ferrer the Anarchist

The Facts of his life and Trial.

Foreword.

When President McKinley was killed by the Anarchist Czolgosz a thrill of horror ran through the civilised world. Men demanded indignantly why Anarchism was not put down with a firm hand, and why such monsters as the Anarchists were suffered to carry on their murderous propaganda with impunity. Universal satisfaction was felt, accordingly, when Czolgosz was made to pay the penalty of his terrible crime.

But when the Anarchist Ferrer was executed last year for his undoubted complicity in the Barcelona massacres, he was extolled as a "martyr" by a large and influential section of the world's press. Yet the Barcelona atrocities were a thousandfold more horrible than the murder of McKinley, and Ferrer was the life and soul of the Barcelona revolution. Why, then, did the execution of the bloodstained Ferrer evoke widespread sympathy, while the execution of Czolgosz met only with approval? To answer this question, and to show the real character of Ferrer, will be the twofold purpose of the following pages.

Ferrer's Antecedents.

Francisco Ferrer y Guardia to give him his full name, was the son of good Catholic parents of the poorer class in Spain. His father was a small farmer in the province of Catalonia. Despite his humble origin, the future revolutionary inherited a noble name. He was a namesake of the illustrious St. Vincent Ferrer, who was a wonderful preacher in his time, and one of the glories of the Dominican Order. But assuredly the Saint would have regarded his modern namesake as a degenerate, and a criminal of the deepest dye.

Up to his sixteenth year young Ferrer, the future Anarchist, was so remarkable for his attachment to religion as to be regarded almost as a "mystic." At that age, an infidel book fell into his hands, and utterly sapped his faith in Christianity. In due course he became an Atheist, a Freemason, and a tireless enemy of the Christian religion.

It is said that Ferrer was at first employed as a railway servant, after which he seems to have worked, in some capacity or other, in a Spanish inn. This latter occupation failed to satisfy his restless spirit, for presently we find him installed as secretary to Zorilla, the Republican leader. He remained some five years in the service of Zorilla, from whom, no doubt, he imbibed his revolutionary Socialism. It is difficult to determine exactly where revolutionary Socialism ends and Anarchism begins. Certain it is, at any rate, that Ferrer, while still a young man, openly avowed himself an Anarchist.

Ferrer was only twenty-six years of age when he took part in a rebellion in Catalonia, in the year 1885. The rebellion failed, and the young Anarchist-revolutionary fled to Paris. There he made many friends, chief of whom was the Jew, Naquet, whose evil mission it has been to introduce divorce into the French code of law. Ferrer earned his livelihood in Paris by teaching Spanish. At this time he was a married man, with a wife and three children.

Ferrer a Callous Libertine.

We now come to the repulsive story of Ferrer's amours. It is a tale of moral depravity which we should gladly spare ourselves the trouble of telling, were it not for the fact that Ferrer's imprudent friends have chosen to depict him as a model citizen and a "martyr."

One of his pupils at this time was a middle-aged but wealthy spinster, named Ernestine Meunier—the cast-off mistress of an Englishman. This woman fell under Ferrer's influence, and a sordid entanglement followed. From the circumstances of this squalid affair, as well as from its sequel, it is clear that the Spanish adventurer had his eye upon his paramour's money. Ferrer was utterly unscrupulous; he disbelieved in God and religion and honour; he cared naught for justice or the judgment to come. But there was one thing in which he fervently believed, and that was—money. Libertinism and the passion for money were two of the most salient features of his character.

The result of this shameful *liaison* with Mlle. Meunier was that Ferrer callously abandoned his wife and children. A consistent Rationalist, he found it preferable to live with a wealthy mistress rather than a poor but lawful wife. Not content with deserting his three children, Ferrer obtained a divorce from his wife in the French courts of law. This was an easy proceeding, thanks to the Divorce Act which his friend, the Jew Naquet, had successfully piloted through the French Parliament.

That Ferrer's previous conduct towards his unhappy wife had been marked by gross cruelty and callousness is plain from the testimony of Senora Ferrer herself. "My life with this man has been a continuous martyrdom," wrote the forsaken wife to the Paris authorities, adding:

"We have a daughter aged 11 years, whom this 'husband' shipped to Australia when she was only 9 years old, in defiance of my wishes. The loss of this daughter breaks my heart. A month before he took up with the Meunier woman, this 'husband' made over to me a small house in Montreuil-sous-Bois. Afterwards he refused me entrance to the cottage in question. I appealed to the Spanish Consul to gain my rights for me, but he could do nothing. On a later occasion this inhuman husband even tried to kill me. I am now in want and misery, owing to the conduct of this infamous father of my children."

It is impossible not to feel compassion for the un-happy woman whom Ferrer, in his heartless selfishness, had thus abandoned. Exasperated by his cruelty and unfaithfulness, Madame Ferrer fired five shots at her Anarchist husband, and the latter promptly gave her in charge to the police. Ultimately she went to live with a Russian, and her daughters began to earn a precarious living upon the stage. Sordid dramas of this kind are but too common in Anarchist circles.

Ferrer's Ill-gotten Wealth.

It must have been in 1893, or thereabouts, that Ferrer deserted his wife and children for the sake of Ernestine Meunier and her comfortable income. During six years he laboured hard to indoctrinate his paramour with the principles of Anarchism, but in vain. However disedifying her life may have been, it seems clear that the wretched woman repented at the last. We know that on her deathbed she left plenty of money as alms for Masses for her soul. On the other hand, we also know that (in the same will) she left property to the value of, £32,000 to the penniless Spanish teacher. He obtained, and, it is presumed, embezzled, the money left for Masses. Still, the £32,000 which remained over and above were left at his absolute discretion, though the testatrix must have been well aware of his animosity against the Catholic Church. It is reported that she left him this large sum for the purpose of founding free schools—not schools of Atheism and Anarchism—in Spain. It is, of course, quite on the cards that Ferrer may have deceived this woman by a deliberately untruthful description of the schools which he intended to establish.

Anarchism and Licentiousness.

This change in Ferrer's fortunes took place at the end of last century. He had become a man of wealth—by base means, it is true—and the portals of Freemasonry are open only for the well-to-do. In 1901 being by this time affiliated to the Grand Orient in Paris, and having acquired a high position among the illuminated of that secret society, Ferrer returned to Barcelona, where he created those "Modern Schools" which speedily became, and were meant to become, hotbeds of Anarchism and Atheism.

With a zeal and enthusiasm worthy of a better cause, he devoted himself to the task of corrupting the minds and hearts of the young of both sexes. In this evil work he was aided by sundry characters of no enviable repute. One of his assistants was Morral, the Anarchist desperado who threw a bomb at the King and Queen of Spain, thereby causing the death of several spectators. Another was Madame Jaquet, a notorious Atheist, Anarchist, and Materialist, who once conducted a similar school in Egypt, until she was expelled by the British

authorities.

During this period Ferrer gambled with success upon the Stock Exchange, greatly increased his wealth, and consistently applied what could be spared from the private consumption of his new mistress and himself to a well-organised anti-Christian propaganda. He was in constant correspondence with the most dangerous and desperate of Continental Anarchists—with such men as the French Anarchists, Naquet, Reclus, and Grave; the Russian Anarchist or Nihilist, Kropotkin; the Italian Anarchists, Malato and Malatesta; and the Spanish Anarchists, Nakens, Letran, and Odo de Buen, not to mention other revolutionary plotters in France, Belgium, and Italy.

The dastardly attempt to assassinate the King and Queen of Spain again brought Ferrer into trouble. His connection with Morral, the bomb-thrower, was well known. Morral had been Ferrer's assistant for a considerable time, and fully shared his murderous principles. Moreover, he was Ferrer's rival for the favours of a woman whom the latter desired to make his mistress. This was Soledad Villafranca, one of the women who taught in Ferrer's schools. Morral committed suicide after murdering the policeman who had arrested him, and Ferrer was released from prison.

The coast was now clear. Ferrer's rival had removed himself from this mortal scene. In June, 1908, therefore, the Anarchist leader, together with Soledad Villafranca, went to Paris. They took a house in the French capital, where the two openly lived a life of criminal intimacy. Almost daily visitors to their home were such notorious Anarchists as Malato, Letran, and others. At the same time, Ferrer's real wife and one of her daughters were living in want in another part of Paris.

In the spring of 1909 Ferrer went to London, and remained in Bloomsbury, visiting his English friends, in company with the ex-schoolmistress, Senorita Villafranca. His English supporters were mainly Dissenters—a sober, bigoted, middle-class set of men, whose profound ignorance of Spain was equalled only by their unreasoning prejudice against Catholicism.

Ferrer's Crimes and His Doom.

Early in June Ferrer and his female companion left hurriedly for Barcelona, and then came the dreadful July revolution, in which churches, convents, and charitable institutions were sacked and gutted and given to the flames. It was proved over and over in court that Ferrer not only stirred up these riots, but actively took part in them. "Every man, woman, and child in Barcelona believed, from the first moment of the orgie of fire and bloodshed, that Ferrer was the life and soul of the revolt (*alma de la revuelta*)," says a Spanish "Life of Ferrer," recently published, "and such also was the boast of Soledad Villafranca before she began making efforts to save him."

When justice at last triumphed, and Ferrer was shot in a ditch at Montjuich, it was discovered that this unnatural father had made a will in which he disinherited his daughters, leaving £80,000 to his paramour, Soledad Villafranca, and to an Anarchist named Portet, in order that the sanguinary propaganda of Anarchism might be continued after his death.

"Such was the career of this man, whom many ignorant people outside of Spain hold to have been a martyr, hero, and model citizen," says the Spanish "Life of Ferrer," "but who was in reality a rebel against authority, a heartless father, a divorcee, an adulterer, an incendiary, an assassin, and a coward." "He was the embodiment of evil," writes the Spanish correspondent of a Chicago journal, "and even had he twenty lives, the taking of them would not atone for all the sins and crimes done by him while he lived. All the Catholics of Spain, and all the working men and all men who love decency and order, applaud the action of the Government in bringing him to justice. The only persons who took part in the public manifestation in favour of this burner of convents, killer of priests, and dishonourer of nuns were the Masons, Anarchists, and Spanish Republicans, and the activity of these disgusted all the decent-living people of Spain."

For the facts hitherto related I am indebted partly to a valuable article by Mr. Hilaire Belloc, M.P., in the January (1910) issue of the "Dublin Review," and partly to a multitude of newspaper articles, notably one in the Chicago "New World" for February 12, 1910.

Such, in brief outline, was the life-story of the man who, more than any other, was responsible for the horrors of the "Bloody Week" in Barcelona. Let us now see the kind of education which he imparted to the 2000 boys and girls who frequented his "Modern Schools."

Ferrer's Teachings.

"I remember seeing Ferrer, in Barcelona, some few years ago," writes the Rev. James Parle. "I even remember meeting his glance, and turning round to look at him, little thinking that, in days to come, nations would talk so much of him, and that at his death such revolutionary scenes would take place. I know well the

place where his Modern School stood—in La Calle de Bailen. I have passed the door of that school, seen those boys and girls team out, and I can say that if the school taught them history and science, it did not teach them respect or manners."

"Ferrer's school was a Godless school," adds the same writer. "For him there was no God to give an account to; there was no sort of authority. Man was free. Furthermore, man was an animal; hence no moral restraint. . . . Such things as Heaven, Hell, Eternity, and dogmas did not exist, and were created by—Jesuits, of course." Ferrer "was the best type of Rationalist that I have known or read of," continues this clergyman. "He hated authority. He reached anarchy. He was even more the enemy of his country than he was of the Church." Ferrer's "modern" schools "struck out God from everything. Matter was their god, and free thought their method. Books that this country [England] would confiscate were there printed and read; and things took place, and things were said, which we do not find amongst the savages even, but which we may find, if books speak the truth, in the dens of immorality and filth of which we hear in Paris and London."

Ferrer's schools were [*unclear*: dens] of immorality, as well as hotbeds of Anarchism and Atheism. They could hardly be anything else, in view of Ferrer's flagitious principles and of his own scandalous life. To borrow a final extract from the clergyman already quoted:—"Suppose our celebrated Grayson started a school where he made inflammatory speeches against our Royalty, against the Established Church and its clergy. What would England do—or have to do? Close it, or run the risk of seeing its grand old churches burnt, its eminent Bishops insulted, and its esteemed King hailed with bombs. Our love for Church and Royalty would persuade us to close it. Spain did no different. She simply closed a school where religion (Christianity, remember, not merely Roman Catholicism) was not simply ignored, but ridiculed; where monarchy—in a word, all sorts of authority—was hated."

"Catholic Times," October 29, 1909.

Ferrer's school system was meagre and vicious, from an educational point of view. This is asserted in the Chicago "Daily Tribune" of October 21, by Senor Eladio Horns, who was sent by the Municipality of Barcelona to inquire into the educational conditions in vogue in the United States. Ferrer's schools, this Barcelona gentleman declared, were "meagre and vicious, pedagogically considered."

"Ferrer," says Mr. Hilaire Belloc, "taught, in a sort of hotch-potch, both the ascertained truths and the hypotheses of physical science, side by side with the social doctrines consonant to his character; with these he propagated his views upon sexual relations, upon the nature of the Deity (or rather His non-existence), and all the medley of incoherent dogmas which formed the mixed foundations of his philosophy."

"Dublin Review," January, 1910.

This, indeed, is expressing the matter very mildly.

Ferrer Recommended Poisoned Weapons.

The Paris correspondent of the "Sunday Times," who was in frequent contact with Ferrer, speaks more clearly:—"At Barcelona he started his School of Liberty, a title he changed to Modern School, to avoid conflict with the authorities. It was a training centre for the dissemination of Anarchism and Atheism in Spain, and dependent from it he opened twenty branch schools throughout the country. An item, among others of his teaching, was to recommend that weapons should be *poisoned when used for political assassination, so as not to miss the mark*. Just as Ticino was the centre of Italian Anarchy years ago, so Barcelona was, under Ferrer, the headquarters of Spanish Anarchy."

Quoted in "Tablet," October 23, 1909.

The "Manchester Guardian" admits that Ferrer himself described the object of his schools in these words: "To make children reflect upon the lies of religion, of government, of patriotism, of justice, of politics, and of militarism, and to prepare their brains for the social revolution."

Ibid.

Political Assassinations.

It is not too much to say that the man who recommended political assassinations and the use of poisoned weapons (poisoned daggers and poisoned bullets); the man whose schools were dens of immorality, Atheism, and Anarchy; the man who taught thousands of children for a long series of years that religion, patriotism, and justice were all lies, and that government, politics, and militarism were based upon lies:—such a man was one of whom society should have rid itself at the earliest opportunity.

Among those who acted as Ferrer's accomplices in this deadly Anarchist propaganda was Morral, who made the dastardly attempt to assassinate the King and Queen of Spain by hurling a bomb at them. Ferrer himself was arrested, and accused of complicity in the crime, but after a patient trial the court held that the

evidence was insufficient for a conviction, and ordered his release.

Writing in the "Contemporary Review," Mr. H. A. Gibbons very justly says that if Governments could only bring themselves to go after the propagandists of Anarchism, and the instigators of lawlessness and assassination for political ends, with the same relentless energy, and punish them with the same relentless severity which they employ against counterfeiters, these disturbing elements in the peace of a community would disappear. We make no greater error than when we allow individuals or societies which conspire against life and property to assemble, and talk, and publish their criminal tenets unmolested, because of the fear we have of infringing upon personal liberty, the right of public speech, and the freedom of the Press.

More of Ferrer's Doctrines.

We have seen some specimens of Ferrer's detestable doctrines; other specimens, still more abominable, are yet to come. The Paris "Temps"—a journal which cannot be accused of any practical sympathy with Catholicism—gives in its issue of September 18, 1909, a few samples of the sort of teaching which was imparted in Ferrer's schools. In these institutions the children were accustomed to be told that "soldiers and officers are murderers, whose mission is to kill and to sack." The national flag is "a filthy rag put on a pole to deceive the people." The flag of one's country, again, is "a symbol of tyranny and misery." Every year "the Governments of Europe kill more men and women for their simple pleasure than there are stars in the firmament."

The misguided children who frequented Ferrer's schools were further taught that—

"Property has been created by spoliation. Religion is an appalling falsehood—there is no God, no Christ, no future state. Science has proved these facts. ...

"All kings are monsters, who, ought to be uncrowned and punished for their iniquities, as the kings of France and England were punished centuries ago. In the great revolution which is coming, we must destroy the middle classes and the wealthy; we must destroy everything, so as to have a clear table on which to build up a new civilisation. If, amongst the political men of the day, there are one or two who pretend to sympathise with us, do not believe in their sympathy, but kill them when the opportunity occurs.

"We must abolish every existing law; expel and exterminate all monks and nuns and priests; we must expel and slay all magistrates and lawyers; we must demolish every church; we must confiscate all the money in the banks, and all the money belonging to every class of citizen, military and civil. No one must be allowed to go out of Spain, or to take any money or jewels out of the country. The railways must be confiscated to the good of the State, of the Commune.

"All the existing Ministers, courtiers, and persons at the head of the Government must be massacred, and a new set of men elected in their places, who must be of our way of thinking. Long live this revolution, which shall avenge all injustice!"

Mr. Joseph McCabe's denials of the Anarchist character of Ferrer's teaching are as groundless as his calumnies on the Spanish clergy. As will be seen from the present pamphlet, we have converging evidence, from many different and independent sources, to show that Ferrer's schools were hotbeds of Atheism and Anarchism. Even the text-books used in Ferrer's academies were permeated with infidelity and anti-Patriotism. Thus, the "Cuaderno Manuscrito" (p. 182) informs the advanced pupil that assassination has ever been esteemed by human society. In another of Ferrer's text-books, entitled "Patriotism y Colonizacion" (p. 84), the love of one's country is called "a brutal lie." In the same book, the right of the State to legislate and to punish is denied (p. 24). On page 71 of the same text-book, military officers, Ministers of State, and judges are denounced as "men destitute of every human sentiment." The pupil is further informed (on p. 80) that such terms as "country," "flag," and "family" are but meaningless sounds. Another of Ferrer's text-books was the "Compendio de Historia Universal," written by Madame Jacquinet. In this book the pupil is instructed that "it can be believed (se puede creer) that Jesus Christ was a Buddhist monk, who, coming from Mount Carmel, devoted himself to preaching the religion of Buddha to the Jews." Open blasphemies against the Almighty are contained on pages 40 and 41 of the same text-book, and the name of the Deity is written, "god." This precious text-book also tells the child that Christianity has always opposed the course of progress; that it has oppressed humanity with a false morality; that it is a vampire thirsting for blood, to which millions of victims have been sacrificed.—The only wonder is that the Spanish Government should have allowed this pernicious charlatanism to be carried on under the guise of "teaching."

These appalling doctrines were printed in large capitals on placards, and such placards were hung up in every one of Ferrer's schools, so that the children might have them constantly before their eyes! And it is to the propagators of such Satanic principles that Continental Freemasons and British bigots extend their sympathy; they have no word of pity or concern for the 138 victims of Ferrer's sanguinary propaganda. No word of sympathy has fallen from their lips for the priests shot down, the policemen murdered and barbarously

mutilated, and the nuns hunted by Anarchist fiends through the streets of Barcelona.

It is needless to accumulate further proofs of the character of Ferrer's teachings. Still, for the sake of greater completeness, we may add an example or two. That Ferrer was a militant Anarchist is stated by the anti-Catholic journal, "El Imparcial," of Madrid, in its issue of October 23, 1909:—"Senor Ferrer first started his Barcelona institute under the title of 'School of Liberty,' but subsequently changed its name to that of 'Modern School,' in order to escape trouble with the Government. In a few months it became a centre for the diffusion of Anarchism and Atheism, and later he organised similar schools throughout Spain." The same journal distinctly asserts that Ferrer fully deserved the fate that befell him.

Ferrer was unanimously found guilty, after a public and patient trial. In pursuance of the sentence pronounced by the court, he was shot to death, as many a braver and better man has been. But Ferrer thoroughly deserved to be shot, and to die. On July 11, 1906, he wrote over his own signature in the revolutionary organ, "El Progreso," of Barcelona:—"I believe in the principles of Anarchy, and, so believing, I teach that humanity can never accomplish its mission upon earth so long as men credulously believe in a Supreme Being, and bow down their necks to authority. Men can be freed only through the *extermination of kings and rulers of every sort, and priests and parasites of every kind.*"

Take a fanatical Atheist and Anarchist of this kind, and place him beside the most dangerous criminal lunatic in one of our public asylums. Which of the two is the greater menace to the peace and welfare of society? Obviously, the Anarchist of the Ferrer type, for Ferrer was able to deprave and pervert thousands, and perhaps tens of thousands, of hapless children; he was able to instigate whole multitudes of men to the perpetration of murder, rapine, incendiarism, and sacrilege. A desperate Anarchist of the stamp of Ferrer is a thousand times more dangerous to society than the worst criminal lunatic in the land. If the latter is promptly put under restraint, *a fortiori*, the former should be locked up, for the safety of society at large.

It seems passing strange that the Spanish Government should have allowed Ferrer to sow his pestilent theories broadcast during so many years. A Government that allows such sanguinary and subversive principles to be freely propagated can scarcely be acquitted of gross and culpable negligence. In Ferrer's case, the proofs were ready to hand; his offences were numerous and undeniable; a conviction could easily have been secured.

It is the clear duty of the Christian State to protect its children against infection from the germs of murderous and anti-Christian Anarchism, just as it takes measures to shield the public from the bubonic plague. The State suppresses gangs of coiners, and does so with an iron hand; it should use equal firmness, and equal severity, in dealing with gangs of Anarchists. Ten years' penal servitude would suffice to break up the most desperate gang of Anarchists in existence. Unfortunately, in Ferrer's case other counsels prevailed. The State allowed him to sow the dragon's teeth, and they sprang up armed men. To vary the metaphor, the Government allowed him to sow the winds; the whirlwind had to be reaped in due season.

"Bloody Week" in Barcelona.

The Barcelona revolt of July, 1909, has been rightly described as "One of the most frightful exhibitions of anti-Christian fury since the days of the French Revolution, and the most appalling outbreak of Anarchy that the world has ever seen."

Barcelona is a large manufacturing and commercial city, containing some 700,000 inhabitants. Everything seemed quiet and normal there on Sunday, July 25; still, there was an uneasy feeling that something sinister was about to happen. Some organising was evidently going on, especially in the Casa del Pueblo, the central meeting-place of the workmen's societies. Ferrer had been a full month back in Barcelona by this time.

On Monday morning the factories and workshops closed; scouts went out in all directions to warn the men against coming to work. It was then understood that a twenty-four hours' strike had been decided upon, as a protest against the unpopular war in Morocco. For various reasons, this war was highly distasteful to a great number of the Spanish people. It was felt that the lives of Spanish soldiers were being sacrificed for the sake of a paltry mining company, which was in part foreign, and probably Jewish, in backing. Besides, the sending of conscript soldiers to perform foreign service was regarded as an irregular and unusual, if not an unjustifiable, measure. Spain's difficulty was now the Anarchists' opportunity. Whenever their native land is in the throes of a crisis, the Anarchists may be expected to break forth into outrages and assassinations. Patriotism in their eyes is a contemptible sentiment; the national flag is merely "a filthy rag put on a pole to deceive the people" Spain was at this time in the throes of foreign war and domestic agitation. The Anarchists recognised that their hour was at hand.

About midday on Monday, July 26, the shops of Barcelona began to open timidly, but soon closed again, owing to the numerous menacing groups of workmen standing in the streets. The police were armed with rifles, in addition to their revolvers, and stood in pairs along the Rambla, the principal street, about twelve yards apart. The crowds began to hurl stones at the tram cars, and tried to prevent them from running. Then, suddenly, as if

at a concerted signal, the mob set fire to trams, pulled down telegraph wires and lamp-posts, tore up paving-stones, and began erecting barricades, while shots rang out in all directions.

An American traveller thus describes the scene:—"The revolutionists started out to cut the telegraph, telephone, and electric light wires, to sever the gas and water mains, to capture and plunder the banks, public offices, and buildings. They succeeded in paralysing the electric service and gas, stopped all street cars and railway service, and terrorised the peaceful inhabitants, but the public buildings, banks, storehouses, and principal business places were too well guarded by the police and soldiers for them to seize and plunder."

At four o'clock on Monday afternoon General Santiago took over the town from the Civil Governor Senor Osorio, and proclaimed a state of siege. All offences thenceforward committed should be judged! by martial law. But as the majority of the garrison and reservists had been sent to the front in Africa, General Santiago had only 1400 troops of all kinds to face 100,000 Anarchists, Socialists, and Red Republicans. The soldiers and police could do little more than guard the public buildings and banks in the aristocratic part of the town, and afford protection to the largest civil and mercantile establishments. The un-protected portions of the town were completely at the mercy of the revolutionists, who were strongly entrenched behind barricades.

Church Burning and Robbery.

From Monday night until Wednesday masses of flame shot up here and there, causing dire forebodings. On Tuesday firing went on all day between the forces of order and the revolutionists, but nothing decisive took place. Every now and then it became apparent that the latter were burning convents and churches. The revolutionary mob made a series of attempts to capture several of the warehouses in which valuables were stored, but in each instance they were repulsed by the soldiers and police. In like manner, they attempted to storm, loot, and burn the public buildings, and each attempt ended in failure. For the first day or so, in fact, the revolt was a matter of plain rebellion, looting, and incendiarism. The whole tragic series of events shows the incredible baseness and cowardice of the rioters and revolutionists. They did their evil best to carry out Ferrer's doctrines of assassination, destruction, and plunder; but, in many instances, their courage failed them.

During the progress of the disorder some young lads procured kerosene from a neighbouring shop, and managed to set fire to a church in one of the outlying districts. In the confusion, and under cover of the smoke, the young ruffians looted the altar and sacristy of its valuables. This set the riotous mob upon a new track. Beaten off from the banks and warehouses, Ferrer's Anarchist followers proceeded to plunder and burn the churches and convents of the unguarded portions of the city. They knew well enough that the churches contained gold and silver and precious stones, which the generosity of pious donors had bestowed. Besides, their minds had been filled for years with horrid slanders against priests and nuns, and Ferrer had taught them that kings and priests ought to be ruthlessly exterminated.

The Fate of Nuns.

The fury of the revolutionary mob was now directed chiefly against churches and convents. When nuns appeared at the windows of convents, beseeching the rioters not to burn them, their appeals were greeted with volleys of stones. Nuns were seen running, terror-stricken, through streets, pursued by the brutal mob. Schools for little boys and girls, convents of nuns and nursing sisters, were now the special quarry of the rioters, who took care to loot the entire building before they destroyed it. Women, boys, and even girls took part in these ghastly orgies. Women prisoners were brought in drunk, covered with blood, and in a state of madness. In one place a large liquor store was looted, and then given to the flames.

Most of the nuns escaped in disguise, and were hidden in private houses by friends and sympathisers. In one instance a group of helpless nuns, who tried to escape in their religious habits, were pursued and captured by the ferocious mob, amid yells of "Burn them alive! Burn them alive!" Five or six thousand orphans, cared for by the nuns in various institutions, were turned out into the streets before the burning of the orphanages, and went wandering about without food or shelter, until some kindly-disposed people took charge of them in their homes.

Signora Corti, of Genoa, the famous Italian grand opera singer, who was in Barcelona at the time, has given a brief but vivid picture of the savage fury of the Anarchist rioters:—"In the Calle Valencia, quite close to the Calle Arribas, where I was staying, a monastery of the Padres Escolapios and a convent of nuns were attacked and burned by the revolutionaries. I learned that a number of the monks were slain in an underground passage. I myself saw many terrorstricken, more than half-naked, nuns running down the Calle Arribas, under my windows, pursued by a howling, blaspheming mob."

On Wednesday (July 28) 10,000 revolutionists were seen by the correspondent of the London "Daily Telegraph" marching along the streets carrying the mutilated remains of their victims—bodies, legs, and

heads—on long poles. It was a procession worthy of Anarchists—and of savages in Dahomey. General Santiago did not dare to open fire upon the leaders of this gruesome procession, as his reinforcements had not yet arrived. Another horrible episode in the revolution was this: The vaults and sacred resting-places of the dead were desecrated; the bodies of recently-deceased nuns and pupils were "paraded in ghoulis procession through the streets, and afterwards burned in a large bonfire. The Father Guardian of the Franciscan Convent and another priest were murdered in cold blood. One woman boasted that she had killed four Civil Guards (policemen) with her own hands, and wounded several others. The victims of the mob were principally Soldiers and police who fell into their hands, and were barbarously mutilated, either before or after death. The cries and watchwords of these Ferrerite mobs were: "Long live the Social Revolution! Death to the Rich! Down with the Army!"

Brigadier-General H. A. Reed, of the United States Army, who happened to be an eye-witness of these scenes, gives an interesting description of them in the "Journal of the Military Service Institution" (Nov.-Dec., 1909). He declares that the number of killed and wounded among the troops, police, and civilians, as officially reported, was much understated. Of the attacks on priests and nuns, General Reed says:—

"As a rule, the monks, friars, priests, and nuns that, in their own dress or disguised as peasants, had escaped from their church or convent, and sought refuge in the parochial buildings of a neighbouring town, were ejected by the rioters and driven from the town. Some of the priests were inhumanely, even unspeakably, maltreated; they were the victims of the very incarnation of hatred. In Barcelona the incident which most attracted public attention was the barbarous treatment of the dead nuns. The ruffians disinterred sixteen of these. The losses by sacking were, in many instances, great, especially from the convents and colleges. . . . One Mother Superior lost in convertible bonds 40,000 dollars. By the fire very valuable works of art and scientific instruments were destroyed, and the Padres Escolapios lost a magnificent library. About 5000 children were rendered temporarily homeless."

Cowardly Anarchists.

The brutal ruffianism of Ferrer's revolutionists was equalled only by their cowardice. As Mr. Shipman says: "They were a cowardly lot, and dared not meet men in conflict. For instance, they undertook twice to assault and burn the Jesuit college and church upon the Calle de Caspe; the first time, the whole mob took to its heels when three shots were fired at them by some of the parishioners who stood guard, and the next day they again ran when a few shots cracked simultaneously, and spread the news that the Jesuits had mounted a mitrailleuse. But they gave the Jesuits a wide berth thereafter, and confined themselves to carrying murder, rapine, and devastation to convents filled with defenceless nuns and young girls. Even here they were frightened off by a bold show. A few policemen made them leave the Convent of the Holy Angels, and the gardener and two soldiers made them drop everything and run from the Convent of the Black Ladies in San Gervasio, while they gave up the burning of the Church of San Pedro de las Puellas because of the arrival of some determined parishioners. Their courage oozed out the moment they were likely to get the same dose themselves. But the unprotected churches and convents were their easiest prey, and presented the most available plunder. One young ruffian who was shot running away from the soldiers was found to have 600 pesetas (£240) in money and valuables on his person, taken from the various schools, churches, and convents."

The Suppression of the Revolt.

During the first three days it was impossible for the small force of soldiers and police to hold the seething crowds of revolutionaries in check. "Telegraph and telephone wires were cut, there were no conveyances, and even the mails had to be sent by sea. The gas and electric lights were gone, and the streets were in darkness, while paving stones were ripped up and made into barricades, and delivery waggons and street cars were also utilised for the same purpose. Artillery had to be brought in to capture some of the barricades, but finally the revolutionary mob got a taste of what real war was like, and they faded away like mist before the rising sun when the troops got fairly at work. For five days the reign of terror lasted, but at its end there were some 1400 persons who, caught in various acts of murder, arson, and assault, were lodged in the grim prison of Montjuich."

Mr. A. J. Shipman in "America," Jan. 8, 1910.

The Revolution was suppressed with a strong hand, and the thanks of all Spain were deservedly given to the General who had accomplished the deed. The Anarchist outbreak had caused the death of 138 human beings; 68 churches and convents had been burned to the ground; over 5000 orphan children had been rendered homeless; a colossal amount of property had been looted or destroyed; many precious art treasures had perished; a valuable library of 80,000 volumes had been ruthlessly given to the flames, and a large portion of

the working class quarters had been ruined. Add to this the fact that the revolutionary mob destroyed schools which gave education to 3100 young men and women and children. In most of these schools instruction was given absolutely gratis, and many of them were for the special benefit of working men and working women. In a word, it is estimated that Ferrer's revolutionary miscreants have retarded the progress of Barcelona by a full quarter of a century. Similar scenes of horror were witnessed, though on a much smaller scale, in other towns and villages of Catalonia. "Several of these petty places proclaimed themselves republics, after the model, we may suppose, of Bakunin's Free Associations. There was pillage and murder, burning of convents, frightening of nuns and priests, destruction of municipal buildings and documents. But the soldiers, once Barcelona was under control, made short work of the outer towns, and no real resistance was made to them."

"Francisco Ferrer," by Rev. A. Coleman, O.P., p. 10.

The Anarchist Revolution was a thing of the past.

Church-burning Carefully Planned.

Both Mr. Hilaire Belloc and General Reed are convinced that the destruction of churches, convents, and charitable institutions had been carefully planned. It seems clear that if the revolutionists had captured the public buildings and banks they would have proclaimed a republic of some kind at Barcelona, after which the destruction of sacred edifices could be leisurely accomplished. Foiled in the first part of their programme, they went systematically to work upon the second.

"When the ferment in Barcelona," observes Mr. Belloc, "had reached a certain degree of anarchy, there was suddenly delivered a carefully organised attack upon the property of the Catholic Church. Barcelona is full of Jewish usurers, detested by the poor of that city. It is the typically capitalist town of Spain, crammed with warehouses and with merchant palaces, which those who had for years declaimed against capitalism were now free to attack. Not a hair of the head of any individual, whether Jewish usurer among the poor, or capitalist exploiter in his great house; not a pennyworth of the property of either class (the two classes against whom the populace of Barcelona most continually declaim) was destroyed!

"What happened was this. Picked men were seen going from place to place, bearing petroleum, giving orders, and organising an attack upon convents, monasteries, and churches. No distinction was made. Wealthy monasteries and the poorest parish churches, libraries of European significance and the most insignificant and pathetic of little popular shrines were equally attacked. Whatever was of the Church was looted, or its loot attempted."

The exemption of the Jewish usurers is a very notable and significant fact. It recalls the immunity enjoyed by the Jews during the Paris Commune. The burning of the convents and churches was evidently part of the premeditated violence, for General Reed, who was an eye-witness of these revolting scenes, thus describes the method followed: "A comparatively small army of men presented themselves simultaneously at each of several convents or churches. They were provided with kerosene and implements of destruction. Having entered, by force if necessary, the kerosene was thrown on inflammable material by some, while others ransacked the building for valuables, in which they were aided by a lot of women, who followed on the heels of the incendiaries. The sacking concluded, the match was applied, usually before the city guards were aware of the attempt."

The Anarchist rioters were fully prepared for these deeds of sacrilege, robbery, and incendiarism by Ferrer's doctrines: "Religion is an appalling falsehood! There is no God, no Christ, no future state! We must expel and exterminate all monks and nuns and priests! Men can be freed only through the extermination of Kings and priests!" These hideous doctrines were carried into hideous execution by Ferrer and his followers. Their deeds form merely a part of that universal war on God to which Paul Lafargue referred when, at the Congress of the "International" at Liege, in 1865, he thundered: "War on God! Hatred for God! In these sentiments all progress consists. You must demolish Heaven as though it were a ceiling of paper!" At a similar congress, held at Chaux-de-Fonds in 1879, the Anarchist Kropotkin declared: "We stand against God and the State. Hitherto we have talked; we must now begin a propaganda of ideas by means of acts!" The Anarchist Ferrer, in like manner, stood against God and the State. Let us see how he carried on the "propaganda of ideas by means of acts" during the Anarchist revolution.

Ferrer's Guilt.

When the Revolution failed, Ferrer went into hiding, and disguised himself by shaving off his beard. From the 1st to about the 20th of August he lay concealed. Then, fortunately, he was discovered and captured. Prior to the tragic events of the "Bloody Week" he wore a beard; when arrested, three weeks later, in the country district outside the city, he was clean shaven. Had he been an innocent man he would neither have gone into

hiding nor attempted a disguise.

When captured by the Civil Guard, Ferrer told the truth upon the instant, and then attempted to cover it up by a lie. He first admitted that he had been in Barcelona, but, perceiving where the admission would land him, he added that he was a delegate to the Esperanto Congress held there in July. This was a falsehood. All the delegates to the Esperanto Congress were known; they were all photographed at their dinner on the summit of Tibidabo, and Ferrer does not appear among them.

Ferrer's trial lasted nearly a month. It commenced early in September, and was not concluded until October 8, when he was condemned. (This shows the absurdity of the English contention that the trial was a "hurried" one.) Over 60 witnesses gave evidence against the Anarchist leader during the course of the trial. Many of these witnesses were unacquainted with one another, and their independent testimony against Ferrer was absolutely damning.

A witness named Ventura swore that, while the Revolution was in progress, Ferrer had told him it was necessary to instigate the people to burn the churches and convents. On Ventura's remarking that it was not by such means a Republic should be established, Ferrer replied that it did not matter about the establishment of a Republic; what was wanted was a Revolution. Ventura also described how Ferrer attempted to induce the people of a certain locality to rise in rebellion. Ferrer strove to counteract the effect of Ventura's evidence by a denial; but in support of this denial the Anarchist could bring no alibi, and the witness remained quite unshaken in his declaration.

Nineteen witnesses swore that on Wednesday, July 28, Ferrer had endeavoured to instigate an insurrection at Premia. The Mayor of Premia swore that he was approached by Ferrer, who begged him to declare a provisional government, and to rise against the existing regime. This was on Wednesday afternoon, when the Revolution seemed to be winning in Barcelona hard by. Many witnesses who were present at this interview corroborated the mayor's evidence. All those present in an official capacity confirmed the mayor's account of what happened: and a waiter who was present, and was not, of course, directly addressed, gave similar evidence concerning the interview. The evidence of these nineteen witnesses from Premia showed conclusively that Ferrer was an active fomentor of rebellion, that he had urged the proclamation of a Republic and the burning of churches and convents.

Ferrer attempted to meet the evidence of these nineteen witnesses by a denial. He was allowed to cross-examine them, but the cross-examination only injured his own case. The cross-examination of the Mayor of Premia was, perhaps, the most dramatic point of the trial. The cross-examination went completely against Ferrer, whose denials weakened throughout, and the mayor ended by contemptuously having: "A man who would deny this would deny the light of the sun!"

Another Premia witness whom Ferrer challenged was named Espinosa. Against the testimony of this witness Ferrer's denials grew weaker and weaker, until he finally attempted to get out of the business by saying it was only "a random talk." It was elicited in evidence that when Ferrer urged the Mayor of Premia to proclaim a republic, he assured the latter that a republic had already been proclaimed in Madrid and Valencia.

Other witnesses showed that, on the very first day of the Revolution, Ferrer had acted as leader to the Barcelona insurgents in the street called the Rambla. A witness named Calldeforno saw Ferrer leading a group of rioters on Monday evening. He was not acquainted with Ferrer personally, but recognised him from his public portraits. On seeing the prisoner in court, the witness immediately recognised him, and swore positively to his identity with the man whom he had seen leading the revolutionary mob.

A soldier named Ardid swore that on the same Monday evening Ferrer took him aside, and attempted to lead him from his duty. Ferrer at first strove to meet this evidence by saying that he had never been in the place of meeting sworn to by the witness; then he weakened, gradually remembered it, but said that the soldier had misunderstood him.

Two of the prisoners taken on Monday night with new Smith revolvers in their hands declared that the weapons had been given them by a revolutionary leader whom they did not know, but who was dressed in a blue coat and a straw hat. This attire exactly corresponded with that in which Ferrer had been traced. He had been observed by the police, going about among groups of people, dressed in a blue coat, and with a straw hat tilted over his eyes.

Three witnesses testified that they had seen Ferrer urging on the rioters, and had no difficulty in identifying him among several prisoners. Several witnesses testified to his being in various parts of the city during the rioting, and to his meeting with the other revolutionists. It was proved by the Crown, and even admitted by the defence, that Ferrer distributed money to the revolutionary mob.

It was proved by detectives and by the barber, Domenech, that, on the first day of the Revolution, Ferrer visited the two centres where the revolt was being organised. These two centres were the offices of the revolutionary journal, "El Progreso," and the offices of the "Solidaridad Obrera" (the Anarchist Workingmen's Association), from which latter place the general strike was organised. The barber Domenech

This was the only witness of importance whose testimony belonged to the category of "King's evidence." But the reliability of Domenech's evidence is obvious from the fact that he was corroborated on quite a number of points by independent witnesses.

accompanied Ferrer throughout the whole of the riots. His evidence is of great importance; it is full of interesting details, and confirmed on many points by independent witnesses. The barber swore that Ferrer and himself went together to the two centres of revolt above-mentioned, and that at these places the rising was discussed and organised by Ferrer and other Anarchists.

Some witnesses accused Ferrer of being the principal instigator of the outbreak. Witnesses from Masnou showed that Ferrer had initiated the riots in that village; that he had there urged the proclamation of a republic, and given dynamite to the rebels. Ferrer replied that he had never seen a parcel of dynamite in his life. But it was proved that an Anarchist circular, found in his possession, concluded with the significant formula: "Annexed hereto is a recipe for manufacturing dynamite."

Other witnesses proved that Ferrer's presence coincided with the disorders at Barcelona, Premià, and Masnou. During the riots he had displayed a feverish activity, going about from place to place, as was proved by police witnesses and others. A witness who was with Ferrer on a road outside Barcelona, at a certain moment during the riots, swore that on Ferrer's meeting with a group of armed young men, the Anarchist leader said to them: "Well done, friends; everything must be destroyed!"

In Ferrer's possession the police found papers, telegrams, and points of advice which showed how completely he was concerned in the rebellion and rioting. One of the circulars found in his possession set forth the following abominable programme:—"Abolition of all existing laws; expulsion or extermination of religious communities; dissolution of the civil authorities, army and navy; demolition of the churches; confiscation of the Bank of Spain and of the property of such persons, civil or military, who have held office in Spain or its lost colonies; immediate imprisonment of each of them until they prove innocence or are executed; confiscation of railroads and all banks of credit; absolute prevention of escape from Spain of all persons who have held public office."

Another of Ferrer's circulars styled business men, officials, and clergy "thieves and pariahs," and called upon the working men to take positive action, concluding with the ominous formula: "Annexed hereto is a recipe for manufacturing dynamite (plancastita)." In the Anarchist leader's possession was likewise another circular, which wound up with: "Death is a thousand times more honourable than to live under the shameful oppression of a band of thieves sustained by the clergy and exploiters. Up, then, noble and valiant hearts, sons of the Cid. Do not forget that Spanish blood runs in your veins. Viva la revolucion! Viva la dinamita!"

Among Ferrer's papers was also found a letter addressed to him by Lerroux, a dangerous and unscrupulous Anarchist, who had been banished from the country for his open approval of the dastardly attempt to assassinate the King and Queen. In this letter Ferrer's fellow-Anarchist said:—"A new programme, a new ideal, is what is wanting. Let us go to the people and say to them: The rich, the priests, the soldiery, and the judges live on the State, stealing two-thirds of what belongs to us. We will fight until men no longer need laws or government, neither God nor master."

In addition to all this, the police found correspondence and telegrams which showed that Ferrer was in touch with every one of the ringleaders, and in which he gave them advice how to foment and carry on the rebellion. Ferrer at first denied the authorship of these treasonable letters, as well as the authorship of certain Anarchist circulars in manuscript, found in his possession. He alleged that these documents had been put into his house by the police to obtain a conviction. But experts proved that the documents in question were in Ferrer's own handwriting. He then changed his tactics, asserted that these papers were twenty years old, and that he had written them while he was actively engaged in politics.

The defence was entrusted to Senor Galceran, an open admirer of Ferrer and his principles. Counsel for the defence had a hopelessly bad case, and he knew it. Although the case against Ferrer was closed some ten days before the trial was ended, not a single witness came forward on his behalf. Not a solitary witness could be found in any part of Spain who could come forward and say that Ferrer had expressed any disapproval of the dreadful things done in Barcelona, or that he had done the least thing to discourage or prevent those fearful atrocities.

The evidences of Ferrer's guilt were overwhelming and unanswerable. To the strong testimony of the people of Premià counsel for the defence could only reply by suggesting that they must have been moved to perjury by interested political motives. After his counsel had spoken, Ferrer himself addressed the Court, but could only repeat a number of the unconvincing and uncorroborated statements which he had already made. The seven officers composing the Court devoted four days to a careful examination of the entire evidence, and then unanimously decided that the crime of rebellion was proved, and condemned Ferrer to be shot.

It is not too much to say that if one-half of the evidence upon which Ferrer was convicted were brought forward against an Irish Fenian in a British court of justice, the Fenian would be remorselessly put to death,

with the full approval of English journalists and English Dissenting ministers. The evidence upon which Ferrer was shot was a hundred times weightier than that which sufficed for the hanging of Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien.

Pope Pius X. and Cardinal Casanas pleaded that Ferrer's life might be spared; in fact, as the anti-Catholic "Messaggero" noted, Pius X. was the only sovereign in Europe who prayed that mercy should be shown to the criminal. But the Spanish Government decided that justice should take its course, and Ferrer met the doom he had so richly deserved.

Meanwhile, the Maura Ministry fell, and was succeeded by the "Liberal" Government of Senor Moret. The new Premier felt constrained to confess that his predecessors had erred only by their too great leniency towards Ferrer. That Anarchist criminal, in Premier Moret's judgment, ought to have been summarily tried and executed. To a representative of the Paris "Figaro" the new Premier said:

"The case of Ferrer is only an episode in this repression which we regard as a political blunder, but he was certainly condemned in accordance with all the forms of law. The documents of the case, which have just been published, show that the evidence of witnesses and facts clearly proved his guilt, not merely as a propagandist, but as a leader of sedition. Contrary to foreign reports, the trial was public, and the sentence was given unanimously, and ratified by the Auditor of the Capitaneria of Catalonia.

"Those who criticise the procedure are ignorant of Spanish legislation. It was impossible to bring him before a civil court, not only on account of the law—for which I am myself responsible—making courts martial the only competent courts in cases of offences against the army, but also because the Spanish General Code submits all cases of rebellion to martial law.

"Finally, to have pardoned Ferrer would have been an inadmissible measure of exception after the execution of other conspirators. If the Conservative Government violated the rules of jurisprudence, it was by trying to prove too much, *by allowing Ferrer illegal means of defence*, and by prolonging the trial, instead of adopting the summary procedure suitable in such circumstances, in which judgment and execution follow immediately on arrest."

An amazing amount of nonsense has been written in English journals with regard to Ferrer's trial and execution. The Spanish tribunal, which had heard all the evidence, by a unanimous verdict, found the Anarchist leader guilty; a handful of English journalists, profoundly ignorant of the evidence, declared him not guilty. The incident is scarcely calculated to inspire one with reverence for the wisdom or the candour of English journalists.

In Spain, where the facts of the case were known, Ferrer's conviction and execution met with general approval. The Barcelona correspondent of the "Times," writing before the execution, said: "Public opinion here may be divided into three categories. Most of the Conservatives and friends of order consider that the trial was conducted with the greatest possible fairness, and was absolutely conclusive, that no other sentence but that of death can be expected, and that it ought to be carried into execution. Another section does not go quite so far, but believes that I Ferrer was sufficiently seriously mixed up in the occurrences of Barcelona during the last week in July to warrant conviction. A third section consists of members of the extreme Radical party, though by no means all even of them hold that his complicity has not been proved, and that the trial was inconclusive." The only people in Spain, therefore, who even professed to regard Ferrer's guilt as not proven were the representatives of *merely one section* of the Radical Republicans. And it must be remembered that the Radical Republicans are mainly responsible for the spread of the deadly contagion of Anarchism among the people of Barcelona.

In this account of the Barcelona riots and of Ferrer's trial, I have closely followed the valuable pamphlet on Ferrer by the Rev. A. Coleman, O.P. I am also indebted for many important facts and citations to Mr. H. Belloc's article in the "Dublin Review" (Jan., 1910), also to Mr. Shipman's article in "America," Jan. 8, 1910:—Mr. Joseph McCabe's libels on the Spanish clergy are "gross as a mountain, open, palpable." During a six years' residence in the Peninsula I had exceptional facilities for knowing the truth about the Spanish clergy. For many of them whom I knew personally I entertained, and still entertain, the highest esteem. I found that the clergy of Spain, as a body, were earnest, zealous, God-fearing men. Many of them were men of great learning and ability. I have never heard a single scandalous rumour, from any well-informed source, concerning the moral character of the Spanish clergy in general. The first stone should certainly not be cast at them by an apostate Franciscan, who has broken his vows, turned Atheist, and taken a wife.

The Alarming Developments of Romanism By Joseph Hocking

Paper read at the National Free Church Council Swansea, Price One Penny

National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches London, Thomas Law, Memorial Hall, E.C. March 10, 1909

Little Books on the Devout Life.

Edited by F. B. Meyer, B.A.

A Series of Uniform Volumes forming a complete Library of Devotion. Size, extra foolscap 8vo (7 × 4½ daintily bound in cloth boards, gilt back and side, price 1s. 6d. each. Post free.

London: National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, Thomas Law, Memorial Hall, E.C.

Alarming Developments of Romanism

By Joseph Hocking

BACK in the last century Cardinal Manning gave an important charge to his clergy concerning the work of Romanism in England. This is what he said : "It is good, reverend brethren, for us to be here in England. If ever there was a land in which work is to be done and perhaps much to suffer, it is here. I shall not say too much if I say that we have to *subjugate* and *subdue*, to *conquer* and to *rule* an imperial race; we have to do with a will which reigns throughout the world as the will of old Rome reigned once; we have to *bend* or *break* that will which nations and kingdoms have found invincible and inflexible. Were heresy conquered in England, it would be conquered throughout the world. All its lines meet here, and therefore in England the Church of God must be gathered in its strength."

That call has been obeyed, as the following facts will show. In 1851 there were 958 priests in Great Britain; in 1908 there were 4,193. In 1851 there were 683 churches, chapels, and stations; in 1908 there were 2,137. In 1851 there were 70 monasteries and nunneries; in 1908 there were 1,131.

These figures represent an united, determined effort to pervert England, for they are more important than appears on the surface. The monasteries and nunneries, for example, represent educational institutions by which Protestants, attracted by ridiculously low fees, are tempted to send their children. They represent an organisation with millions of members and untold wealth. They represent activities too numerous to mention. These activities are seen in the Catholic Truth Society, which issues millions of pamphlets, nearly all of which misrepresent Protestantism and glorify Romanism. They are seen in the placing of Romanist pressmen in nearly every important newspaper in Great Britain. Literary editors, news editors, are often Romanists, who naturally use their influence in favour of their Church. They are seen in Parliament, they are seen in various other forms.

How far they have succeeded it is impossible to say. In point of actual numbers they have made but little headway. Fifty years ago there were 1,500,000 Romanists in Great Britain, of which 200,000 were English. From all I can gather those numbers are but little altered. But this tells little; we have to get a little deeper. Their work is, comparatively speaking, only just begun, and as we shall see presently.

Mark you I am not objecting to their work. They have a perfect right, believing as they do, to seek to win England back to Rome. Nevertheless there are certain facts which I would bring before you which I think demands our serious consideration. And please remember that my time will allow me only to touch on what seems to me the most striking features. I must leave you to amplify for yourselves.

First let me refer a moment to the Press. I need not enlarge as to the power of the Press, or to urge that what millions are daily accustomed to read, must affect their mental outlook. Let us remember that Romanists form an insignificant portion of our population, and yet consider the prominence given to Roman Catholic news, especially in everything that is favourable to it. Items insignificant in themselves are dressed up in the most alluring form. Scarcely a day passes without this taking place, while Protestant news takes a subsidiary place. Let Father Vaughan declare that Protestantism is dying, and behold it is copied in almost every newspaper. Let him go from Newcastle to Plymouth, and he is fully reported. Let Dr. Horton go to those same towns and proclaim what England owes to Protestantism, and he is not reported at all or discussed by half a dozen unattractive lines.

Archbishop Bourne states that no less than ninety-two papers were represented at the late Eucharistic Conference, and in the daily papers which I read the story of that Conference was given in terms of fulsome adulation, suggesting that the articles were inspired from headquarters. It might seem indeed to the ordinary reader that the Catholic claims were conceded, and that Christ our Lord had, for 300 years, been banished from England, and that the Roman Cardinals had brought him back to take possession of our country.

I do not for a moment hint that there is any collusion between the editors of our newspapers and the Roman Church. I am only urging that that Church has seen to it that those favourable to their interests are placed on every great newspaper.

Let Father Vaughan tell a story to an East End audience, full of ridiculous nonsense, as was evidenced in

the London newspapers on Wednesday last, and he is reported *in extenso*; but let some Protestant divine, whose shoes intellectually, and from the standpoint of scholarship, he is not worthy to stoop down and unloose, give a Protestant lecture, and he is unnoticed. No wonder that Father Vaughan said to a *Daily Mail* reporter on June 28, 1906 : "Let me tell you how deeply I am indebted to the *Daily Mail* and the Press generally for the generous, handsome way I have been reported."

Here, then, is a fact patent to the eyes of all who will take the trouble to look. The Romanists have gone far to capture the Press of Protestant England. After having been the bitterest enemies to the dissemination of light, they are now using what Protestantism has made possible for the advancement of their own Church.

Mind, I do not blame the Romanists for this, rather I admire them. All the same, one cannot help asking what Protestants are doing to tell the country the real inwardness of such a conference as that held at Westminster.

There is another thing to which I would draw your attention. I said just now that in 1851 there were 70 monastic institutions in Great Britain; in 1908 there were 1,131. Please remember that there must be many thousands of people in them. Of these 1,131, 813 are for women. When a woman enters as a nun she vows away her liberty, she vows absolute obedience. She has to confess her inmost thoughts. If she desires liberty she has to confess it, and suffer penance. She is taught to obey her Mother Superior as she would obey God Himself. She is hedged around by rules, and the whole influence of her training is to crush and to subjugate the will.

In connection with these places are industrial homes, reformatories, laundries, and the like, where thousands of people, in the main young girls, are employed, but the ordinary Factory Acts do not apply to them.

Now the story of monastic institutions is among the blackest in history. They have been the centre of intrigue, impurity, and treason. They have been in past years expelled from land after land. Roman Catholic countries have refused to have them. This has lately been urged upon us with great force. The French Government demanded proper regulation and supervision of Religious Houses in that country. Those Houses refused to comply with the law, so they came to England. We, as a Protestant country, give a home to those whom Roman Catholic countries declare to be a danger. I do not object to this, dangerous though it may be. I am too strong a Protestant to refuse a place of refuge to those who think differently from me. But—and it is a great but—they should be under proper rule and supervision. Other nations refused them. Spain insisted on laws similar to those of France; Portugal refused them; Austria, Germany, Italy gave them no welcome. England alone received them. Well, what are the conditions which obtain? How many inmates there are in these places we do not know, we cannot know. As Sir Godfrey Lushington, formerly Under Secretary for Home Affairs, said in the *National Review*, May, 1903, "In practice religious houses are shrouded in secrecy. No one knows anything about them. The Home Office does not. Nor does the Local Government Board. Nor does Dublin Castle. Nor does Somerset House. The census gives no statistics showing the total number of religious houses and their locality, or the number of nuns, or the number of penitents, or the number of inmates." Now these are weighty words. As a matter of fact, convents are sealed houses. In them are thousands of our fellow-creatures. Most of them enter in youth when their natures are most susceptible to influence. They are strictly guarded. Obedience is one of the great laws of life. A ghastly curse rests on all those who dare to run away. They are taught to destroy all human affection. Do they wish to come into the world again? We do not know, cannot know, except on some rare occasion one happens to escape. They are under the dominion of a confessor, whom to disobey is regarded as sin. A few days ago a nun escaped from a convent in Essex. When she was overtaken by pursuers she cried out in agony. But she escaped. Of course the Roman Catholics have sought to gloss over the facts. They say she might have got away any time. But can any one believe it who reads the story? I make no charge of cruelty, immorality, or crime. But I assert that anything can be done, children can be born, and women can die, there can be cruelty, crime, outrage, and yet no one has the right to know anything about it. A convent is a sealed house, and its secrets in most cases remain secrets.

And yet, is it not a fact that, besides these, practically every public institution of every sort—asylum, prison, reformatory—is open to public inspection? Why is it that Rome should so rule our land that convents, monasteries, and the industrial institutions associated with that Church, should be exempt? The public has a Right to Know that all is well within these prison houses, especially in view of their history, ancient and modern.

Well, what is the state of affairs? Attempt after attempt has been made to obtain inquiry, only to fail. Only a few months ago a memorial containing nearly a million signatures were brought to the House of Commons demanding inquiry, but the question is shelved.

Let me give you a little modern history :—

In June, 1906, Mr. T. L. Corbett moved for leave to introduce a Bill "*to appoint Commissioners to inquire as to the growth in numbers of Conventual and Monastic Institutions in Great Britain and Ireland, and whether any further regulations of such institutions are required.*"

A modest demand, surely.

This was defeated by 231 against 72.

In June, 1907, he brought the same proposal. It was carried by a majority of 4, 125 against 121.

In 1908 he again moved his motion, and it was lost.

And why has this been vetoed and shelved time after time? Because of the influence of the Roman Catholics, and because political expediency is regarded as of greater importance than the welfare of human lives.

Surely the time has come when we should demand laws to be placed on our statute-book whereby this unholy compact with Rome should be brought to an end.

Another alarming fact for consideration is that our Established Church can no longer be called Protestant. To a large extent it repudiates the name. In proof of this I will give only two quotations. Says the late Cardinal Vaughan, when speaking on the conversion of England : "I heard some one whisper, 'You are dreaming. Your talk of the conversion of England is childish babble. You are not two, out of the twenty-seven millions of population. You misread their strong Protestantism.'" "To this I reply," he says, "Compare the onetime attitude of England towards the Church with her attitude to-day. The population has changed. The very establishment which was set up in rivalry to the Church has changed its tone and temper. In the Church of England many of the churches are often distinguishable only with extreme difficulty from those belonging to the Church of Rome. The doctrines of the Catholic Church, which had been rejected and condemned as blasphemous, superstitious, and fond inventions, have been re-examined, and taken back one by one, until the Thirty-nine Articles have been banished as the rule of faith. And what is still more remarkable is that the movement has been stronger than the rankest Protestantism, stronger than the Bishops, stronger than the lawyers and the legislature. A spasmodic protest, a useless prosecution, a delphic judgment, and the movement continues and spreads, lodging itself in Anglican houses and convents, churches, and even cathedrals, until it is rapidly covering the country."

This is strong language, and it is only part of the truth. A vast number of the clergy of the Church of England are betraying the Protestantism of the country, while our elephantine Liberal majority, with its 180 so-called stalwart Free Churchmen, stand supinely by doing nothing. No wonder Father Vaughan declares that Protestantism as a fighting force is dead.

The other quotation to which I referred is from a lecture given by Father Hugh Benson, son of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, one time clergyman of the Church of England, and a member of the Community of the Resurrection at Mirfield, one of several similar institutions belonging to the Church of England. Some months ago Father Hugh Benson, now a Catholic priest, gave a lecture in Liverpool, in which he told the story of his conversion to Rome, and what part the teaching of this Church of England Monastery had in it. He says : "We had what we believed to be Mass; we observed silence during the greater part of the day; we wore a certain habit with a girdle, and some wore a biretta; we used the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, supplementing it with *a great part* of the Catholic Breviary, and I, for years before I became a Catholic, recited my Rosary every day. We taught the doctrine of Confession, and I can tell you that at the conclusion of the missions I conducted, I used to hear far more confessions than I have heard as a Catholic priest.

"On practically every point except the supremacy of the Pope we believed the teaching of the Catholic Church, taught most of its doctrines, as thousands of Anglican clergy are doing to-day; and it is this teaching that is building the bridge over which Anglicans will come over to the true fold."

I have only this to say about this quotation. If the battle between Protestantism and Popery is to be fought over again, let it be done fairly and in the open field. Let us know where we are. It is bad enough to fight a system, aided by the Press and politics of the country; but it is worse when those sworn to maintain the Reformed teaching of our land, and taking the pay and prestige of the nation to disseminate the teaching of the New Testament, are, instead, betraying those principles which they are sworn to defend.

There is but one other alarming development that I have time to mention, and that is the endeavour to tamper with the King's Coronation Oath. This may at first sight seem insignificant; in reality it is a striking sign of the times. A century ago the suggestion would have been repudiated with scorn; to-day it is advocated by those to whom we looked for better things. I know that plausible statements are made; I know we are told that the Oath is an insult to our fellow Christians. In answer to this I wish to say two or three things.

First, if our Coronation Oath is an insult to the Romanists, what of the oath which Princess Ena had to make when she became the wife of a Spanish king? If this stood alone, I should not have mentioned it, but when taken in conjunction with what follows, is of importance.

Second, I would ask you to consider the history of that Oath. It did not exist without serious reasons. It was framed to save the nation from forces which would have destroyed its liberties and dragged it back into past slavery.

And, third, I would draw your attention to a serious consideration. When you are dealing with Rome you

are not dealing with a body like other religious bodies. Rome does not desire religious equality. She Demands Supremacy. Mr. Gladstone made this clear in his "Vatican Decrees." He says : "All other Christian bodies are content with freedom in their own domain. Orientals, Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Nonconformists, *one and all* in the present day, contentedly and thankfully accept the benefits of civil order; they never contend that the State is not its own master, . . . but not so the leaders of the Roman Church."

Mr. Gladstone clearly shows that Papal Infallibility means that every Catholic owes allegiance first to the Pope and to the State afterwards. Roman Catholicism is not only a religious organisation, it is essentially a great political body; and it demands absolute obedience, not only in religious matters, but in matters of State, to him who sits in the so-called Chair of Peter. And the Pope demands, as the very essence of the system of Popery, obedience not only in religion but in civil matters.

In the light of that thought, then, it becomes a very dangerous thing to tamper with the Coronation Oath. It opens the door to abuses which we all desire to avoid.

But whether I am right or wrong in this, the whole question shows the aggressiveness of Romanism.

You have a huge organisation, eager, alert, uncompromising, determined to convert England. She is working in a thousand ways, she never confesses defeat, and she believes she will conquer. Moreover, in order to conquer she is using all the artillery of the greatest organisation in the world.

You have an Established Church, nominally Protestant, but really riddled with Romanism. It, in large measure, scorns the name of Protestant, and is filled with Societies the avowed purpose of which is to lead England to Rome.

You have the huge engine of the Press utilised to do Rome's work.

You have convents and monasteries dotted all over the country, the heads of which are using them as a means of disseminating their faith. You have innumerable schools, well equipped, where modern languages are taught by native teachers, and so ridiculously cheap that Protestants are induced to send their children.

You have a matchless audacity, an insidious power which demands everything and concedes nothing. You have an apparently insignificant minority, dictating terms to what seems an overwhelming majority. If you doubt this, think of the Education Act of 1902, when Protestantism suffered the greatest humiliation and disgrace since the days of Bloody Mary.

You have, in short, an earnest, enthusiastic determined Romanism on the one hand, and a comparatively indifferent Protestantism on the other.

Do we desire for Romanism to come back? If we wish England to become like the South of Ireland; if we desire to sink into the retrograde and moribund condition of Spain; if we desire to drift into atheism like France or Italy; or if we desire our Press, our Parliament, our consciences, our best life, to be placed under the tyranny and terrorism of priestism; if we desire to drift into the power of a merciless, tyrannous, and soul-poisoning hierarchy, which has cursed every country on which she has laid her hand in power, let us be indifferent about the faith and the freedom which our fathers won for us.

Let me, in closing, indicate what steps I think we as a Free Church Council should take.

- Should not a great Protestant demonstration form a part of our programme at our meetings each year? If our enthusiasm needs to be fanned into a flame, is not this an effective means of doing it?
- Should we not send out an urgent request to all the ministers of all our Churches to see to it that all the children associated with our Churches should be instructed in the history and principles of our faith? Every Romanist child is carefully grounded in his faith, can we say the same of our Protestant children?
- Should not our Press be more and more utilised for the dissemination of distinctly Protestant literature?
- Should not pressure be brought to bear upon our so-called Nonconformist members of Parliament, urging them to safeguard our faith, by checking the legislation which means the placing of more and more power in the hands of Rome, a power which will be used for the cursing of our country?
- Should we not send out a band of our best scholars, speakers, and lecturers, whose business it shall be to educate the people of the country in the story of the Great Reformation and in the principles to which we owe all that is holiest and best in our national life? We are often taunted that only the ignorant and the blatant fanatics are aggressive Protestants, should we not make such a taunt impossible?

For let us remember, and with this I close, we have nothing of which we need be ashamed. There is nothing more glorious in the history of the world since the times of the Acts of the Apostles, than the story of Protestantism. The men who fought our battles were heroes, they stood before kings, and fearless of death defied the power of Popes and Councils, they lifted up the lamp of truth in the darkest ages, and they broke the shackles which bound the nations. All that is most blessed in our life to-day we owe to the Great Reformation truths, for in that great movement lay the seeds from which have come forth a harvest that has fed the best life of the world.

Unwin Brothers, Limited, the Gresham Press, Woking and London.

Front Cover

Eras of Nonconformity.

Edited by Rev. C. Silvester Horne, M.A.

A Series of Volumes, embracing the complete history of the Free Churches of Britain. Size extra foolscap 8vo (7 x 4½), with frontispiece, handsomely bound in cloth, gilt, uniform throughout, price 1/- net each.

An Invaluable Series of Free Church Histories for placing in the hands of all classes.

London: National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, Thomas Law, Memorial Hall, E.C.

The New Testament Problem Solved:

Or, Professor W. B. Smith On The pre-Christian Jesus "Der Vor-Christliche Jesus." An Address Delivered Before the Unitarian Society of Wellington N.Z., on Sunday Evening, October 20. 1907. By John Gammell. B.A. (LOND. UNIV.) "AGONISE FOR THE TRUTH EVEN UNTO DEATH, AND THE LORD SHALL FIGHT FOR THEE." —*Ecclesiasticus*.

Wellington: Printed at the "Free Lance" Office. 1907

The new Testament Problem Solved

Or, Professor W. B. Smith On The Pre-Christian Jesus.

("Der Vor-Christliche Jesus")

BRETHREN AND SISTERS IN THE MONOTHEISTIC FAITH:

IN view of what I purpose saying to-night, which will be different in some respects from the ordinary run of Unitarian teaching in the past, and so novel to some of my hearers, it seems to me desirable I should repeat a caution I have uttered more than once here on previous occasions, to the effect that for the opinions expressed in this address to-night the present speaker is alone responsible; neither the Unitarian denomination as a whole, nor this congregation in particular, must be held answerable for them; certainly the regular Minister of this congregation is not in any way committed to them; nay, even I myself to-night do not speak in my official character as President of the Unitarian Society of Wellington, but simply in my private capacity as a student and thinker. It is only just to others I should enter this caveat; but now, having done so, I shall speak out boldly all that I think on the great subject before us, relying with full confidence on your kind indulgence of me, and knowing well that each and all of you are animated by the great Unitarian principle to open your minds expansively to all new light, and listen gladly to both sides of every great question, reserving to yourselves, of course, your individual right to reject or accept the new ideas according as seems good to you.

I shall begin, however, with a platitude, and a well-worn one too, viz., that we ourselves are living in a most remarkable age. Yes, you will say, there is not much heresy about that statement anyway. But I go even further than that, and maintain that our age is remarkable to a degree even greater than we ourselves are apt to perceive. Thus, fifty years ago we used to think we showed our smartness by boasting that we travelled by steam and talked by lightning, but anyone who should think that a smart thing to say now, would show himself hopelessly behind the times. Why we travel by lightning now in this very city of Wellington; and, as to talking, the absent, and even the very dead, can do that to us still through the wonderful machinery of the phonograph. So also our parents thought they had done something wonderful when they invented the art of photography and actually obliged the material god of the solar system to register their features in a picture by means of his own rays instantaneously applied. But who thinks of that as anything marvellous now? We not only do that, but we make the very figures in our picture alive, or apparently so, and mystify the uninitiated spectator by the marvels of the cinematograph. It is true we cannot as yet pay visits to our neighbours in the planet Mars, but we can do something little less wonderful; by means of our spectroscope we can tell you with absolute certainty, the chemical composition not only of the planet Mars but of stars and suns in the remotest regions of space. Or, returning to the earth, and to other departments of mental activity, we can recover lost languages, tongues, some of which had been dead languages before Abraham had abandoned the plains of Mesopotamia, and the very key to which had been absolutely lost ere the Romans conquered the East, or the Christian Church had any existence. Nay, human society itself has changed in our time; not only has democracy become supreme amongst us, but our women possess the political franchise and vote at elections for members of Parliament;

whilst in our scholastic institutions, not only has the University of Cambridge, which fifty years ago would not grant its humblest degree to anyone except a pledged Anglican—not only has the University of Cambridge recently appointed a layman as its Professor of Divinity, but our schoolmasters generally have actually banished Euclid's Elements of Geometry from their schools as a text book behind the times and so injurious to the mental development of our young people. Some would say we have done a good deal more than that, we have actually changed our religion, we have abolished hell itself, and, as Lord Chancellor Bethel said when he did it, with costs as against Christianity; nay, we have even reduced the Bible to the level of an ordinary book, and, to come to my subject for this evening, our profoundest scholars now publish theological works on topics that would absolutely have had no meaning to our ancestors, being expressed in titles that would have seemed to them simply self-contradictions. To one of these, styled "The Pre-Christian Jesus," and written by Professor W. B. Smith, of the Tulane University, New Orleans, in the United States of America, I wish now to direct your attention for a few moments.

The book is a paradox in more than its title. It is a work on theology, written by a college professor, but a professor, not of theology, but of mathematics. Again, the author is an American, and so, in speech, an Englishman. He wrote his book in English, but for some reason or other, hasn't published it in that language, but in German only. I cannot say heartily may the Powers forgive him for that aberration. Further, the writer actually distinguishes between the personalities of Jesus and Christ, and speaks of the one as antecedent to the other, "the pre-Christian Jesus." And, lastly, he has got the famous Swiss scholar, Professor Schmiedel, to write the preface to his book, a preface in which Dr Schmiedel actually informs the reader that he himself doesn't believe at all in the conclusion at which the author has arrived.

But it is time we addressed ourselves to the substance of the book, which, however, can hardly be understood without a few preliminary remarks. When the revolutionary criticism which has so completely changed our idea of the Old Testament, and especially of the Pentateuch, was first applied to those portions of the Bible, the religious public was warned against the principle by conservative theologians, and that on the incontestible ground that, if once admitted as valid in the case of the Old Testament, it would inevitably be applied, sooner or later, to the New Testament, and that with results destructive to church creeds beyond anything at that time contemplated even by the rationalist critics themselves. The prediction has been more than fulfilled; similar radical criticism has now been applied to the New Testament, and that with consequences not confined to the orthodox alone. On the contrary, some of our most rationalistic scholars now find themselves regarded as conservatives, and appealed to to change their old fashioned ideas, and to do so, however unwillingly, in the most absolute manner and with reference to the fundamentals of historical Christianity itself.

But our own individual experience will perhaps form a better introduction to what I am anxious to say. Most of us, I presume, as soon as we found ourselves unable to accept any longer the orthodox teaching, say, on the subject of the proper Deity of Jesus Christ, fell back automatically on the theory of his proper humanity. We at once adopted the view that Jesus of Nazareth was just a typical human being, who had lived in Palestine in the reign of the Roman emperor Tiberius, had become a public character in comparatively early life and adopted the role of a great religious reformer, a sort of Jewish Martin Luther. Through the force of his personality he had actually founded a new religion, and that although, after a very short public career, he had met with a violent death at the hands of the Government of the day. Such was our creed, such probably is still the creed of most of us here to-night, and such in fact was my own belief until very recently. We eliminated from our New Testament in thought all the supernatural element in its life of Christ, and then accepted all the rest as probably, and even certainly, historic truth. We did so, not because of any evidence we possessed in favour of such a belief, but because it seemed to us at the time the only alternative. We reasoned, if we reasoned at all on the matter, in this way. The Christian church certainly exists to-day, it must therefore have had a founder, and there is no reason to suppose that founder was any other than its own sacred books disclose to us. We acknowledged the gospel accounts were largely fabulous, but rather illogically assumed, in spite of that, that the small remainder of them was worthy of all confidence. However inadvertently we built our house upon the sand.

And now the floods have come and the winds are blowing and that with more than Wellington violence. Certain pestilent critics, who will not let people alone, call our attention to the fact that a third alternative is possible, and even highly probable. They ask us what right we have to assume that the Jesus of the New Testament is a historical character at all. They point out that if the books of the New Testament are to be regarded as authoritative on the subject in any way, then the Jesus of whom they speak is not a human being but a demigod, a divine being, though certainly not the supreme divine being. That is the teaching of the New Testament, they say, and, if the authority of the New Testament is not good enough for that, and does not convince us of that, if there are no demigods in our pantheon today, then the logical alternative is, that there has been no historical Jesus at all. The New Testament does not take cognizance of any Jesus less than a demigod. If you cannot admit a historical demigod into your mind, then you have nothing left of your Jesus but a fiction,

a myth, an ideal figure; the noblest ideal, perhaps, ever submitted to humanity, but all the same, a creation of the human imagination alone. Thus, those of you who read the Hibbert Journal will remember an article very much to this effect in its latest number (July, 1907,) entitled, "Who is the Christian Deity?" and written by James Collier, of Sydney, formerly of Wellington, N.Z., an article in which the writer maintains that all the early Christian literature reveals to us a new god come into the world, that really the Deity worshipped by the earliest Christians was not God the Father at all, but God the Son, and that Jesus is and always has been, even from the beginning, the God of the Christian Church. You will say indeed that, if Rationalists now adopt this view, they will have to recant some things they have formerly affirmed, that this looks very much like playing into the hands of the orthodox, uttering the Catholic shibboleths and reciting the Catholic creeds. No orthodox man, however, who grasps the full significance of what Mr. Collier says, will think so for a moment; or, he will acknowledge his church has won, at the best, merely a Pyrrhic victory which spells ruin to the victor. For, after all, this view only completes the idea towards which Rationalist scholars have been working for some generations past, though, perhaps, more or less unconsciously to themselves. Thus Rationalist scholars have all long since recognised that the Jesus of the Fourth Gospel at least is a mythical being, the mysterious Word of God, i.e., just a fanciful conceit of the writer—nothing more. No one can say that John's Jesus is merely a human being, he who declares "Before Abraham was I am." And, as we know, the same conclusion has been come to of late in the case of the Pauline epistles, and that without any reference to the question of their unauthenticity. The Jesus of these epistles is altogether a fabulous being, a celestial man, the typical man of the Platonic philosophy, and therefore as fanciful and baseless as that philosophy itself. Plainly he is one of the demigods of mythology, as appears from the fact that, according to the Pauline writer, he pre-existed in Heaven, and even assisted the Almighty in the creation of the world; or, as the anonymous author of the epistle to the Hebrews puts it, "By whom God made the worlds." Indeed, in view of these circumstances, we should almost have imagined him to be the Demiurge of Gnosticism did we not know from other passages that he is just the Adam Kadmon, or Original Man, of the Jewish Platonists of Alexandria. Anyway the Jesus of the Pauline letters can never be regarded as a historical human being.

Again, there is no book of the New Testament so calculated to foster the idea of the mythical Jesus as that which we call "The Revelation of St. John." This is admittedly a strange book, and we need not wonder that it had to fight hard and long for its admission into the Canon. If it were not in the Canon I should certainly be inclined to say it is an early edition of Zadkiel's Almanac. Undoubtedly it was written under the influence of the pseudo-science of astrology, and shows us plainly in what dark and superstitious mysteries orthodox Christianity originated. Its facts are all fables, and its hero apparently strictly allied to those powers of the air, like the Archangels Gabriel and Michael, which are realities to the ignorant and credulous, but to them alone. Confessedly its contents are a vision, and it is of course an artificial vision, fabricated by the author of the book, and not until its fancies are proved to be realities can we regard its Jesus as a historical character on its authority alone. On the contrary, he answers exactly to what the new school of critics affirm Jesus to have really been, an obscure mythological being, worshipped by an early Gnostic sect. Anyway he is no human being in the eyes of the apocalyptic writer, but rather such a supernatural personality as we find the Son of Man to be in the gloomy visions of the apocryphal book of Enoch. I cannot help thinking that this book of Revelation is the one we must study in the future if we wish to find out the true genesis of the Christian Jesus. That too seems to be the opinion held by scholars like Professor Cheyne, of Oxford University, as we see from that critic's new book, *Bible Problems and the new Material for their Solution*. "Truly it is a most significant conclusion for an Anglican Professor of Divinity and Canon of Rochester Cathedral to come to.

There remains of our New Testament only the Synoptic Gospels, and it is to these that the believers in a historic human Jesus have usually been content to pin their faith. Yet surely nothing but our life-long identification with these little pamphlets, and our consequent inability to view them from a distance, and so impartially, can have so obscured the true nature of their contents from our minds. From beginning to end of them their Jesus is a supernatural being, and, if so, surely a mythical being. Like Hercules, and the pagan demigods generally, he was born miraculously and of divine parentage; whilst, at the other end of his career, he bursts the bands of death itself like Osiris of Egypt or Ishtar of Assyria. Did Paul of Tarsus ever do that? or even Mohammed of Mecca, real human beings? Are the grotesque adventures of Jesus and the Devil on the Mount of Temptation and elsewhere compatible with the thought that the hero of them is a historical character? Or, when the ghosts of Moses and Elijah appear on the scene on the Mountain of Transfiguration, should not the third figure, the middle figure, be a ghost too? Anyway his body is evidently only a magical one, which he can annihilate and renew again at any moment, as the early Christian heretics, the Docetae, actually claimed it was. Or, lastly; dare any human being usurp the functions of the Almighty God himself, and actually condone the offences of his fellow mortal at the divine bar? "Who can forgive sins but God only?" truly say the scribes in the synoptic writer. Hardly could the hero whom that writer had in his mind have been a simple human being. Surely he was rather a personality from another world, the deputy of the Supreme Existence. He was the

prophet Daniel's Son of Man, as popularly interpreted, once enthroned upon the clouds of Heaven, and destined to be so again. He was almost what the orthodox represent him to have been, with the element of reality knocked out of their picture.

Ah, but you say, surely there is one scene in that synoptic narrative only too circumstantial and with verisimilitude not to be mistaken. We surrender all the rest, but surely the story of the crucifixion is too natural, too lifelike, to be an unreality; the protagonist of that tragedy cannot have been merely a fiction-writer's invention. Well, I grant this at once, if there is anything at all in the synoptic gospel that is historic, that does describe an actual occurrence, it is that pathetic narrative of the crucifixion; and I grant further that at a superficial glance, which is all that it generally gets from the reader, its historicity seems to be self-evident. Pontius Pilate is certainly a well-known historic character, why then may not his victim have been the same?

And yet, notwithstanding all that, if instead of merely reading the story superficially, you dissect and analyze it, not only does its verisimilitude vanish, the story becomes almost an impossibility, nothing else but Jewish haggada, i.e. a fabricated story with a moral purpose, a fiction to embody a great ideal; in this case, the ideal of the suffering Messiah.

Remember then, if you please, that the Jewish judicial system was in practice a very noble one, one of which the Jews were very proud. In particular it was a humane system for those days; human life was a sacred thing in the eyes of the Jews. It is true the system included capital punishment, but only in the most extreme cases, and under the very strongest safeguards against any miscarriage of justice. An accused person could only be condemned capitally after trial by a committee of the great Sanhedrim, a committee of 23 in number, sitting by daylight in its own official hall in the Temple Buildings; nor was sentence ever passed until twenty-four hours had elapsed from the completion of the trial. But far more than that. Should an accused person be found guilty and condemned to death a long interval was prescribed between sentence and execution. For forty days the convict was kept in prison, while, on each one of those forty days, he was publicly paraded through the streets of Jerusalem, attended by the public crier, who repeatedly announced his name, crime, and sentence, adding that if any citizen present knew of any circumstance favourable to the prisoner, by his allegiance to Jahveh he should stand forward and declare it. And it was not until all these precautions had been taken that the capital sentence was executed. (See Mead's "Did Jesus Live 100 B.C.?" p. 178.)

Even if I were to stop here what has become of the verisimilitude of our gospel-story now? What is the account in the Synoptics? The victim was arrested, examined, tried, convicted, sentenced, executed, and buried, all in far less than twenty-four hours! He was apprehended in the night, immediately dragged before, not the Committee of twenty-three, of which the synoptic writer evidently knows nothing, but apparently the whole Sanhedrim, and that sitting, not in the public court of justice in the Temple, but in the high-priest's own private residence on Mount Olivet. Here, strange to say, a large number of witnesses were ready collected in the dead of night, and the examination proceeds at once. Compare that with what happens in our own Courts here to-day, with all our facilities of communication. Why here, in the most trumpery case before the magistrate? the police almost invariably plead that, as the prisoner has been only just arrested, it is necessary to ask for a remand, perhaps for a week, in order to get up the case and summon the witnesses. According to our evangelical narratives, however, they got on faster than that in Jerusalem, in the year 30 A.D. The examination and cross-examination of many witnesses were got through in what remained of the night, and, without any delay for deliberation, the High Priest at once announced the finding of the Court, guilty of blasphemy and deserving of death. You think perhaps the wearied officials then retired to obtain the night's sleep out of which they had been cheated, but not at all, everybody apparently is still as fresh as a lark, and at once, early in the morning as it is, carry the prisoner before the Roman Procurator, where in the most naive manner a different charge is at once substituted for the original one, involving of course an entirely different set of witnesses. The prisoner is no longer accused of transgressing the Jewish law of blasphemy but of rebellion against the Roman Emperor. As this is a new charge surely we shall have a remand now to get the new set of witnesses together. But not at all, they are all here waiting, and, early as it is, the august Roman procurator is waiting in court too. Plainly this is not a scene from real life, but a theatrical drama; it is, in fact, a sacred drama founded on the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, the chapter I read in your hearing this evening. Indeed this conclusion is almost self-evident, for the story is a religious drama still and celebrated as such once every five years at Oberammergau in Germany.

But further, the Romans, we know, were as proud of their judicial system as were ever the Jews of theirs; yet, on the present occasion, a high Roman official with little delay sentenced to an immediate and cruel death a prisoner who is not only innocent of the charge brought against him, but is repeatedly declared to be innocent by the Roman Procurator himself. The whole thing is absurd on the face of it.

But that is not all. A still more extraordinary fact is this. The whole incident is said to have occurred at the feast of the Passover, while the feast of the Passover was in full celebration. Jesus, you remember, had just celebrated the Passover supper with his disciples before he was arrested; whilst he was put to death next day, i.e., on the first and great day of the feast Now the Passover-festival, as we know, was a most sacred solemnity

for the Jews, no private or public business of 'any kind must be allowed to interfere with its due celebration by everybody. Especially must every father of a family be at the Temple, or else at home, indoors, acting as priest to his own family in the celebration; and, more particularly, on the first day of the Feast, which included the evening before with its Passover-supper. There must be no secular business of any kind transacted by anybody at this sacred season, but all must be holy rejoicing and religious worship. But if that was true of the Jews generally, how especially true was it of the High Priest and members of the Sanhedrim, who must set the example to the nation as its religious chiefs. Yet this was the occasion, if you please, specially selected by the High Priest himself for the arrest, trial, and execution of a popular hero, an arrangement, I would almost venture to say, which was never heard of, before or since, in Jewish judicial history. The whole thing is a fiction, a historical impossibility, and has often been denounced as such by Jewish commentators. It is, in fact, an integral part of the story of the Resurrection which follows, and is as historical as that is, and no more. One is almost driven to the belief that our synoptic narrative generally was written, not by a Jew, but a Gentile, a Gentile too only very imperfectly acquainted with Jewish life and customs. Evidently indeed there is a great deal to be said for a very sagacious remark made by Mr Hubbard, of the Roycrofters, in his recent work entitled "The Man of Sorrows," a remark to the effect that Christianity is not what Rationalists have sometimes said it is, Judaism qualified by Paganism, but vice versa, it is Paganism though qualified by Judaism.

But it is now time we turned from these preliminary remarks to the volume which Professor Smith has given us, and again ask the question, Is the victim in this tragedy as imaginary as all the rest? Professor Smith implies that he is, and to his argument I will now turn.

His work then consists of five different essays bound up together, all bearing of course on the same subject, although the title, "The Pre-Christian Jesus," properly belongs to the first one only; the other four being respectively, "On the Significance of the Surname Nazarene," "The Resurrection," "The Parable of the Sower," and "The Silence of the Age" in respect to the so-called Epistle of Paul to the Romans, which, bettering Van Mahen, Professor Smith affirms had no existence before the year 160 A.D. I shall not touch to-night on the three last essays, and, of the other two, I will take the second first. It is, as I have just said, on the significance of the surname applied to Jesus in our New Testament, viz., the Nazarene, or, in the original Greek, *Jesous ho Nazoraios*.

This term, *Nazoraios* then is the usual epithet applied to Jesus in the Synoptic gospels, and, until the last few years, nobody hesitated for a moment to translate the phrase *Jesous ho Nazoraios* as Jesus the Nazarene, meaning thereby Jesus of Nazareth. Professor Smith, however, following, I must acknowledge, the writers of the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, makes the following astounding statement. But before I mention that statement, I will tell you the effect the first reading of a similar one made upon me, when I first came across it in the *Encyclopedia Biblica* less than six years ago. Well, it made me angry. "No" I said, "that is carrying scepticism too far; I refuse to admit that;" and it was not till I came upon the overwhelming evidence in its favour that I acknowledged its truth, and turned my indignation against those ecclesiastical authorities who had so grossly deceived me through a long life-time. The statement then is this:—There is no evidence whatever for the existence of any town or village of Nazareth in Palestine as early as the days of Herod and Pontius Pilate. The Jesus of our gospels cannot have been Jesus of Nazareth because, as far as we know, there was no Nazareth at the commencement of the Christian era. And here is the evidence for that extraordinary statement. No town or village of Nazareth is ever once mentioned in the whole of the Old Testament literature, in the whole of the works of the Jewish historian Josephus, in the whole of the Talmud, voluminous as that work is, and, finally, in the whole of the Old Testament Apocrypha, i.e., in the whole literature of the ancient world in which it was possible for that town to be mentioned if it had existed. And Professor Smith goes even one step further. He points out that the Talmud actually does mention no less than sixty-three towns as existing in the small province of Galilee, but that Nazareth is not one of the sixty-three (page 43). In fact, the earliest mention we have of any Nazareth outside the covers of the New Testament is in the pages of the Christian writer, Julius Africanus, as quoted by the historian, Eusebius. Africanus lived in Palestine at the beginning of the third century A.D. But even this quotation is very little to the purpose, for the Nazareth which Africanus mentions is, he says, not in Galilee, but in Judea; which surely makes confusion worse confounded.

You now begin to see how completely the whole evangelical story is up in the clouds, and should have, in consequence, no place in history. But Professor Smith has a positive side as well as a negative side to this argument of his. Having pointed out that the epithet *Nazoraios* cannot have been originally the geographical expression it is supposed to have been, he proceeds to show his readers what it really was in his judgment. He calls attention to the fact that in the Talmud the Christian hero is always called Jesus the Nozri, and that both Nozri and *Nazoraios* may very well have been derived from a well-known Hebrew root *Nazar*, which means to protect, to deliver, to save. Hence Jesus the Nozri, or Jesus *Nazoraios* may very well have meant Jesus the Protector, Jesus the Saviour. In antiquity a divine being always had an epithet of this kind applied to him. Thus in Greek we read of Zeus Xenios, i.e., Jupiter the friend and protector of man; and in the same way in the Old

Testament we meet repeatedly with the expression Jahveh Sabaoth, i.e., Jehovah of hosts. In Professor Smith's judgment therefore we have in the phrase Jesus Nazoraios, or Jesus the Saviour, another proof that the hero of the New Testament was a divine being, a mythological being, from the very first. Thus the surname in question has nothing to do with any birthplace of Jesus, but only with his function as a supernatural being, a Saviour. Especially does he save his servants from the power of evil spirits, as we see in the fact that the apostles were in the habit of exorcising the demons from the possessed by invoking the name of Jesus ho Nazoraios.

Bold as is this argument of Professor Smith it wanes in audacity before another of which he is the author. Not only does he hold that Jesus was originally a demigod, and that prior to the age in which appeared, he informs us definitely who exactly these earlier worshippers of Jesus were, and has made our reviews and periodicals ring with their name. Needless to say they were a sect of the Gnostics; not however the Gnostics of the second century A.D., of whom we heard so much in the Van Manen discussions, but the far earlier Jewish Gnostics who are known to have existed amongst the Jews of the Dispersion before the days of the Christian era. The Pauline letters, you remember, when we studied them two or three years ago, showed us plainly enough that Christianity was in some way or other a derivative of Gnosticism, that in its gloomy portals the new religion was born; well Professor Smith improves on that, and shows us the precise room in the building in which the accouchement took place. Whether he is right or wrong at this point, only the future can finally determine. But let us hear what this most profound and erudite Professor has got to tell us.

The Gnostic philosophy, as many of you know, was a strange compound of Oriental and Grecian thought. One of its chief principles was that of the inherent evil of matter. The material world was wholly and entirely bad, so that man himself, by reason of his material body, was a foul and corrupt creature, the sport of passion, and crushed under a load of sin. It was, you remember, from this Gnostic principle that the Pauline writer obtained that cheerful dogma of his, the Fall of Man and the inherent depravity of everybody, a dogma as false and mischievous as Gnosticism itself. Not less fantastic in this system of philosophy was its doctrine of the Divine, which taught the existence of two Deities, the good God, and the just God, i.e. the kind God, and the merely righteous God. This latter was called the Demiurge, and was identified by some with Jahveh, the God of the Jews. Hence it was the Demiurge who created the world and superintended the history of the Jews through the centuries of their national existence, because the good God was far too exalted and pure a being to come into contact with material things and material creatures. In the process of the ages, however, the good God threw off various emanations of himself, called Aeons, which of course were themselves all divine. They were also personalities, and so themselves Gods, but of course only subordinate Gods. One of them was the divine Reason, the Logos, or Word of God, and this we know the Fourth Gospeller tells us became incarnate in Jesus. Another of these Aeons was Sophia, or the Wisdom of God, and it is the worshippers of this Aeon with whom we have to do now, and who were called Ophites, or Naassenes. The two words mean the same thing, Ophis being the Greek word for a serpent, and Nahash its Hebrew or Syriac equivalent. You must not, however, think of these Naassenes as serpent worshippers, but rather as people devoted to the pursuit of wisdom, worshippers of the Aeon Sophia, the serpent being always in antiquity the symbol of wisdom. The Naassenes, therefore, were just a sect of the Gnostic school, probably the earliest of all the Gnostic sects, of which there were a great many. Their Aramaic name, Naassenes, marks out their locality unmistakably; they resided in Syria, and, if they were not actually Jews, they were very close neighbours to the Jews, and probably had much intercourse with them.

Now it is these little known Naassenes to whom Professor Smith introduces us. They produced a literature, and some of that literature has come down to our own time, though, apparently, only as quotations in the early Christian Fathers. Now it is in the pages of one of these early Christian Fathers, by name Hippolytus, Bishop of the Port of Rome, and who seems to have flourished at the beginning of the third century, A.D.—it is in the pages of this Hippolytus that Professor Smith has found a very ancient Naassene Hymn, a hymn too in which the name of Jesus occurs, and that as a God in Heaven addressing his Father there. The Naassene poet has been describing the spiritual storms by which the soul of man is visited in the wilderness of life, and he then proceeds thus:—"Thereupon spake Jesus: Behold, O Father, there is battle with the Evil Ones upon earth. Of thy breath man wanders forth; he seeks to escape from the bitter Chaos, and knows not how he shall come through it. Therefore, do thou send me. O Father; with the seals in my hand will I descend. Through all worlds will I journey, all mysteries will I reveal. Also the forms of the deities will I unveil. And everything which was concealed of thy holy way, that will I liberate with the name of knowledge," i.e., of course in Greek, Gnosis, Gnosticism, (p. 31.)

On this Hymn Professor Smith very properly remarks thus:—"In this old, and nobody can say how old hymn, Jesus appears unmistakably as a divine being, as the Son, who rests on the heart of the Father, and who begs to be sent away to suffering, error-led humanity, in order to liberate it through the holy way called Gnosis. The seals which he carries are possibly the sacraments, possibly the gifts of the spirit; it doesn't matter which; each was, in the consciousness of antiquity, not complete without the other. The saving effect of Gnosis is also

visible in the New Testament; thus we have in Luke (I. 77) "to give the Gnosis of salvation," i.e., the knowledge of salvation, "unto his people." . . . Hence it is plain that the Naassenes who reach back into the remotest antiquity worshipped Jesus as a God." (p. 32.)

So far Professor Smith, and to this I will only add that we plainly have in this hymn, not only the earliest Gnosticism, but, apparently, some colour of Pagan Gnosticism, for the writer, you observe, speaks of the forms of the deities, deities in the plural number, whilst yet Jesus is one of the gods mentioned, and his mission to earth for the salvation of man is as plainly set forth as if the hymn were a passage from one of our New Testament books. It is this half-Pagan Gnostic Jesus, of times indefinitely remote, which Professor Smith means when he speaks of "the pre-Christian Jesus."

Well, that is one of our author's discoveries, but we have yet another (p.38.) This time it is not the Gnostic Naassenes but the Jewish Essenes who provide him with an argument, or so he thinks. An ancient Greek M.S. preserved in Paris, probably in the great National Library there, the largest in the world, I believe, has recently been printed and published. Professor Smith calls it a Magic Papyrus; he means it is a collection of ancient magical formulae, formulae warranted to be efficacious in the expulsion of demons or evil spirits from the human body, a proceeding of which, you remember, we hear so much in the New Testament. In these degenerate days in which we live this expulsion of demons is a lost art; we cannot, unfortunately, expel even the demon of drunkenness from men. In antiquity, however, especially among the Jews, there were many professors of the art of exorcism; in fact every Jewish scribe was believed to possess this skill more or less. "By whom do your children cast them out," are, as we know, the words put into the mouth of Jesus in connection with this subject. And the most efficacious formula for the purpose of this exorcism was the invocation of some god, mentioned by name. The devils always felt themselves bound to obey then, and depart at once, bag and baggage, from their unhappy host. In the Acts of the Apostles, you remember, it is the name of Jesus himself that is used by his disciples in all their attempts at exorcism. Thus at Philippi (xvi., 8), when Paul was there, we find him addressing a demon thus:—"I charge thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her." And we are then told the demon came out that very hour. But now suppose this identical formula were found to have been used for a similar purpose in days far antecedent to those of Paul and his brethren! What are we to infer from that? Yet that is what Professor Smith maintains he has made highly probable. Anyway here is one of the formulae employed in the Magic Papyrus of which I spoke a moment ago. "I adjure you," it says, "by Jesus the God of the Hebrews," (p. 38.) This formula an early copyist of the Papyrus M.S. attributes to a people he calls "The Pure"; and "The Pure," we know, was a name of the Essenes. I shall not delay at this late stage of my address to descant upon the Essenes, especially as you can easily learn all about them in the pages of Josephus. They were certainly a pre-Christian sect, so that here again, if we are to believe Professor Smith, we have our Jesus as well known in the capacity of a God, and worshipped as such amongst a sect of the Jews who were organised as a church as far back as the times of the Maccabean Kings, i.e., in the 2nd century B.C. And some confirmation of this startling conclusion is found in the fact that this formula is part of a Hebrew utterance in the Magic Papyrus.

Such then are the leading ideas of Professor Smith's book. Much of the work is far too learned and too minutely elaborated, not to say too far fetched, for reproduction in a popular lecture, and I will therefore conclude my exposition of his argument by giving you the last two paragraphs of his first essay; and that although his final words contain rather a hard hit at us Unitarians of to-day.

"We dare therefore," he says, "we dare with great confidence maintain that the phrase 'Jesous ho Nazoraius,' 'Jesus the Nazarene,' means nothing else than Jesus the Protector, the Guardian, Jesus the Deliverer or Saviour, so that the expression is entirely parallel with combinations such as Zeus Xenios, Hermes Psychopompos, Jahveh Sabaoth, and innumerable others both in the classical and Semitic languages. Since Jesus in addition to this also is named "Lord" (Gr. kurios) which in the septuagint is the usual if not everywhere the equivalent reproduction of the divine name, Jahveh, it is clear that Jesus from the beginning was nothing else than a deity, and certainly a deity under a definite point of view, viz., considered as the Liberator, the Guardian, the Saviour. So also Christ signified the like deity under a slightly different point of view, viz., as the Messiah, the King, the Judge. The Mightier One who should come after the preaching of the Baptist was no other than God himself, as Malachi prophesied. It was the union of these two points of view, the more friendly Jesus, and the mightier Christ, which gave as a result Jesus the Christ, the Lord God of the oldest Christianity; his announcement was the refrain of the first preaching."

"It is not possible," Professor Smith continues, "in the foregoing discussion to set forth more accurately the thoughts and conjectures which crop up at this place. One thought is, however, too important, and at the same time also too easily imagined to be wholly suppressed. We understand now clearly the secret, plain before us to-day—the secret of the victory of Athanasius, and of the consequently necessary defeat of Arianism, as well in antiquity as also in its modern form. No demonstration, let it rest upon ever so high philosophical authorization, no exposition, be it ever so studied, logically grounded, and produced from the most zealous

devotedness, no learning, be it ever so extolled—the attempt to derive Christianity from a man must always miscarry. For the Jesus Christ of the original Christianity was not of human but of divine nature, the King of all Kings, the Lord of all Lords, the Redeemer, the Deliverer, the Protecting God." (p. 41.)

Now that, I think, is pretty well for a man who does not believe that such a person as Jesus Christ ever really existed. The utterance undoubtedly has the most orthodox sound, but, as it is meant by the author, is more fatal to orthodoxy and, therefore, more obnoxious to orthodox people, than even old fashioned Unitarianism itself. According to Professor Smith, Jesus was never other than a myth, and our gospels, even the synoptics, are the merest fictions, describing only an ideal life. As we have not exhausted Professor Smith's book, we have hardly the right to criticise his argument as a whole, but I think you will agree with me when I say that, as far as we have gone, his basis of argument is too slender to carry such a colossal superstructure as the conclusion he deduces from it. Granting he is right in his view of the surname Nazoraios, as I certainly think he is, we still require a little more than two quotations from documents of very uncertain date to demonstrate Jesus, on that account alone, a mythological being of a pre-Christian age. The conclusion may be right, but you must look elsewhere for adequate proof of it.

Of course I am not going to discuss that "elsewhere" to-night, but, were there time to do so, it would not be difficult to produce many recent writers in support of Professor Smith's conclusion. Thus in England we have Mr. J. M. Robertson, now M.P. for Tyneside, who advocates the new view in two most masterly volumes, one entitled *Christianity and Mythology*," and the other *"Pagan Christs."* What the state of thought on the matter is on the Continent of Europe will best appear from a sentence or two I may be allowed to quote from a little work just published by Professor Schmiedel, entitled *"Jesus in Modern Criticism"* (p. 12). Dr Schmiedel, as I have already said, is not yet in sympathy with the mythical view, but this is what he says of its progress:—"Doubts as to the reliability of our authorities have recently increased to such an extent that for about six years past, the view that Jesus never really lived has gained an ever-growing number of supporters. It is no use to ignore it, or to frame resolutions against it in meetings of non-theologians. It is little use merely to say in a vague and general way that the figure of Jesus, as portrayed in the gospels, could not possibly have been invented. In the case of the Fourth Gospel, a school of theology of a seriously scientific character does not itself make this contention; and, since it finds very much even in the first three gospels that is a product of later myth-making, it may easily seem that the advance would not be so very great if the whole record of Jesus' life were referred to the domain of myth."

One word more and then I will conclude with a few remarks on the personal bearings of the subject. There is no doubt that what has produced this revolutionary criticism of the New Testament to-day is, not so much the more minute examination of the text of that book, as the advances made in the new science of authropology, the publication of such books as Mr. Fraser's *"Golden Bough."* The subject is absorbingly interesting, but I will only say this:—Mr. Fraser's book shows us that in the great controversy on the Eucharist waged between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Churches, the weight of evidence for the historical view maintained by the Roman Catholic Church is increasing. The Roman Catholic at the celebration of the Eucharist to-day eats his God, and that because, presumably now, the primitive Christian did the same. Primitive man used at certain sacred festivals to eat his totem-god, and that is what his ecclesiastical descendant does to-day at the Eucharist, he is a theophagist, he eats his totem-god. And, if so, the Roman Catholic Church to-day has not deviated from, but only perpetuated, primitive principles. The totem in this case, representing the god Jesus, was a lamb, the lamb of the book of Revelation. Once it was a real lamb, then a loaf of bread in the form of a lamb, than a wafer of bread with the figure of a lamb stamped upon it; at which it remains to-day. Therefore I say it is in the antiquities of the Roman Catholic Church, in its mysteries, in its superstitions, in its darkness, not in the bright and sunny little fictions you call synoptic gospels, that you must look for the real origin of Christianity. The synoptic gospels are, like the Fourth Gospel, simply a late attempt to provide with a human life, a pre-existing mythological figure such as is found in the Pauline epistles and elsewhere in the New Testament.

I have spoken too long to-night, but you will see I have, after all, only blocked out the subject in the rudest and most desultory manner. Especially I have said nothing on the many objections that will rise up in the minds of hearers spontaneously at their first contact with the principle of this discourse. More particularly I have omitted all reference to the argument to be drawn in favour of a historical Jesus from the reference to him to be found in the works of Pagan writers, such for instance as *"The Annals"* of the historian Tacitus. No more, however, can be done now, and so I will only say that, in my judgment, these pagan testimonies, what there is of them, form by no means an insuperable barrier to the acceptance of the mythical explanation of Christian origins. One of them in fact, the letter of the younger Pliny to the Roman Emperor Trajan, is emphatically in favour of it, since Pliny there declares that the Christians used to meet in their assemblies before it was light and there sing a hymn to Christ as to a God.

You will perhaps expect me to say a final word as to whether or not I myself regard this mythical hypothesis as fully established. I have put it forward boldly to-night and urged the arguments in favour of it

with all the little skill of which I am master. I acknowledge that to me the theory seems not only possible but highly probable; it appears to me to solve more difficulties than the one to which we Rationalists have hitherto been inclined. But that it has yet been thoroughly demonstrated so that it will be henceforth impossible for reasonable and unprejudiced people to hold any other view I am not at all prepared to admit. For one thing, no conclusion is certain that has not been submitted to the ordeal of time; it is time and time alone that proves all things, and for that test to be applied we must wait. It is quite true that the mythical theory in its general form is by no means a new one, but it has only recently been placed in the fierce light of public notice and criticism, in that storm of controversy which truth alone can weather; and therefore we should all, I think, act very unwisely, to do other than accept or reject it conditionally at the present stage of the controversy. We shall do all that duty requires of us if we keep an open mind towards it, if we fully recognise that there is another possible solution of the problem of Christianity than that which has hitherto commended itself to the Unitarian Church, and, above all, if we personally investigate the question for ourselves, and welcome all light upon it from whatever quarter it may come. We must achieve that most difficult of all tasks required of the philosopher, hold our judgment in suspense.

And yet the Unitarian philosopher should have little difficulty in maintaining himself on that high plane of duty in reference to this subject. To himself the issue at stake should be merely a question of history and little more, like that of the reality or otherwise of the seven early Kings of Rome. His soul is free, or professes to be free, from the profanation of idolatry; he has, so he says, never looked for salvation to any but God alone. In the highest sense he has called no man master on earth, not even Jesus Christ. To the Unitarian there is only one necessary factor in religion and that is Deity himself. The new hypothesis will not deprive the Unitarian of his God. On the contrary, it will, I venture to think, leave him alone with his Heavenly Father in a more perfect sanctity than heretofore. The Form that in other churches interposes between the worshipping child and his divine Father is to the Unitarian, however noble a form it may be, a hindrance rather than a help to fellowship between the two. To the Unitarian, should the new view prevail, even the shadow of that Form will be gone now.

"Ah but," you say, "will not our human ideal be lost to us? Will there not be a vacant niche there where our Elder Brother used to stand?" I reply, I hardly think so, at least it will be no more vacant than it was before. You will have the ideal still, though not the ideal realised. But are you quite sure you ever had the ideal realised even on the old hypothesis? You always acknowledged the unreliableness of the record; so that, although you felt sure of the life, you could never be sure of its perfection. Now the case will be merely reversed; you will have the perfection still, but not the life; you will still have the noble ideal, even though it has not yet been embodied in a human life. But indeed I venture to say, an avowed fiction is better, and exercises a more attractive influence than an impossible reality, if I may so express myself. What attractiveness there is in fiction, and in a fictitious character, let any one say who has ever made the acquaintance, for instance, of the heroine, Helen Ward, in Mrs. Deland's novel of "John Ward, Preacher." And, in the same manner, the great ideal built up of traits gathered from a galaxy of Old Testament worthies by the loving hand of some austere Essene will lose but little of its attractive power when all disguises have been stripped from it. An ideal that has won the affectionate homage of two millenniums in the past has indeed stood the test of time; it already belongs to humanity and will not lose its virtue till humanity itself has passed away. For myself I venture to think it will even gain in power when we are able to conceive of it without any confusion of thought. At present we call it a human personality and then proceed to ascribe to it every perfection of which the human mind can form an idea, a process which makes us "uncomfortably conscious that we have destroyed its humanity in eliminating from it all weaknesses. On the new hypothesis it may without any impropriety be perfect because it is ideal and ideal only.

Yes, you say, but why disturb people's minis? Why not be content with the very fair approximation to truth you have already attained to? Why not let sleeping dogs lie? Why run the risk of losing any of your church members and the subscriptions they bring with them? Surely you are a little Quixotic.

I reply, what you ask is an impossibility, at least on the part of the Unitarian Church. The discussion is in the air already, the reviews and magazines are taking cognisance of it. To attempt to ignore the subject is simply to shrink into your shell, to stultify yourself, to forfeit your legitimate influence in the world. It is either to show yourself not up to date, or a soldier shirking the battle. All such worldly considerations are utterly unworthy of the Unitarian Church which has been built up on the principle that fidelity to truth is man's supreme duty. To hide your convictions because perhaps they may not be popular is to forego the blessedness that is peculiarly the Unitarian's, that of the pioneer in the sacred cause of human enlightenment. Truth must be, like virtue, its own reward. The ideal Unitarian is he who sacrifices a lifetime in the pursuit of the Angel of Truth, and who at the end of it, if he do but secure one small white feather from that Angel's wing, deems the reward cheap at the price.—Amen.

Addendum.

Although it was impossible through lack of time to refer to extra-Biblical testimonies in the preceding lecture, a word or two on the subject may be added here. Rationalists who admit a historical Jesus, base their belief in him now for the most part, not on the authority of the Canonical Gospels, but on the testimony afforded to that view by the two secular historians, Josephus and Tacitus. But the witness even of these writers will no longer bear investigation.

I Josephus. In the popular edition of this author, that of Whiston (1667 to 1752 A.D.), occurs a most direct and explicit testimony to the view we are combating. It is Ant. XVIII. 3.3., and runs as follows:—"Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works,—a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ, and when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him, for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him; and the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day."

The evidence obtainable from this paragraph would of course be overwhelming could the passage be only supposed to be the genuine writing of the Jewish historian, who, however, was not born till seven years after the date (A.D. 30) usually assigned to the Crucifixion. Notwithstanding, the passage is condemned as a later interpolation by every critic who has ever studied the question. Some of their reasons for so doing are as follows:—

1. If this passage were genuine Josephus must have been a Christian. The writer avows his own belief that Jesus was the Messiah, and even hints that he was more than human. He also admits the reality of the miracles ascribed to Jesus, and affirms his resurrection from the dead as a fact and the fulfilment of ancient Jewish prophecy. What more could a Christian assert? Yet to suppose Josephus was really a Christian is too absurd for argument, especially as he himself declares that he regarded the Roman Emperor, Vespasian, as fulfilling the Messianic prophecies. See "Wars" VI, 5.4.

2. The passage in question is not quoted by any of the Christian Fathers before Eusebius, Bishop of Caesarea in the fourth century. Why were so many great Christian writers silent upon it for more than two centuries? And especially why was one of the most voluminous of them, Origen of Alexandria (A.D. 186 to 255), silent upon it? It was not because he did not know of the works of Josephus, for he quotes them repeatedly. Moreover, this passage would have suited his purpose better than any other in Josephus, when writing against Celsus, yet he never quotes it. There is only one way of accounting for his silence;—the passage did not exist in his copy of Josephus. It was forged between his day and that of Eusebius, a view confirmed by the circumstance that Origen himself twice asserts that Josephus did not acknowledge Jesus for Christ, thus flatly contradicting the statement to the contrary in the disputed passage.

The only other reference to Jesus in Josephus is a very short and incidental one in Ant. XX. 9.1. The words are:—[Ananus] "assembled the Sanhedrim of Judges and brought before them the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, whose name was James."

But this must have been some other James, because James, styled the brother of the Lord, met his death on an entirely different occasion, and under quite other circumstances, as we learn from the "Commentaries" of the Christian historian, Hegesippus (see Eusebeus, p. 64.) It is therefore quite open to us to maintain that the words, brother of Jesus who was called Christ," are an interpolation. Indeed it would be quite sufficient if we restricted the interpolation to the latter phrase, "who was called Christ," as Jesus was quite a common name at this time (see Index to Josephus), one instance of this, Jesus, the son of Damneus, being mentioned at the close of this very section in Josephus.

We are confirmed in our rejection of this passage by the authority of Le Clerc, Lardner, and other scholars.

II. The passage in Tacitus is as follows:—"Nero . . . inflicted exquisite punishment upon those people who were held in abhorrence for their crimes and were commonly known by the name of Christians. They had their denomination from Christus, who, in the reign of Tiberius, was put to death as a criminal by the procurator Pontius Pilate. This pernicious superstition, though checked for a while, broke out again, and spread, not only over Judea, the source of this evil, but reached the City (i.e. Rome) also." Annals XV. 44.

The writer is here alluding to the persecution of the Christians which is said to have followed the destruction of Rome by fire in the year 64 A.D.; and the passage, if genuine, was written about fifty years later. But is the passage genuine? In the view of the famous historian, Gibbon, it undoubtedly was, but later critics look upon it with very different eyes, and that for the following reasons:—

1. The style of the whole chapter in which this passage occurs awakens suspicion, it being far coarser in

expression than that to which Tacitus has everywhere else accustomed us.

2. The passage is found in one M.S. only, though that is true of the whole book in which it occurs, and indeed of the six last books of the Annals, which all exist in one M.S. only.

3. This M.S., strange to say, did not see the light till the fifteenth century of our era.

4. There is no mention of this disputed passage in any early Christian Father, or any writer of any age previous to the fifteenth century. Neither Tertullian (who mentions Tacitus by name and quotes him,) Origen, Eusebius, or any other of the famous Church writers of antiquity knows anything of it. This is the most strange in the case of Clement of Alexandria (d. 220 A.D.) who set himself to collect all the testimonies he could find relating to Christianity in pagan authors, but who yet managed to miss this one, the most valuable of all, the testimony of the greatest historian, bar one, of his own or any other age!

5. The persecution described in this chapter is probably itself fictitious, being inferentially denied alike by Tertullian and Melito, Bishop of Sardis towards the end of the second century, the latter of whom declares that up to his time there had been no persecution of the Christians.

Hence the circumstances of the case are altogether too suspicious, and the passage must now be looked upon as just another Christian forgery, manufactured, however, not in ancient but comparatively modern times. (See Taylor's "Diegesis," pp. 372 to 376.)'

And, finally; to the absolute and hitherto puzzling silence on the subject of Christ and Christianity maintained by the contemporary of the supposed Jesus, Philo of Alexandria, must now therefore be added the equally absolute silence of Josephus and Tacitus, and so of all the non-Christian writers of the same age. A silence so unbroken not only confirms the argument of our preceding lecture but almost makes that argument unnecessary.

Explanation.

A SHORT time ago the Rev. I. Jolly, Palmerston North, attacked Dr. Tudor Jones, of Wellington, in connection with a short notice of an address by Dr. Tudor Jones on the "Atonement," which appeared in "The Dominion." Nine letters (four from Mr. Jolly and five from anonymous correspondents) were admitted to "The Dominion" on the Jolly side of the controversy; four were admitted from the Jones side (three from Dr. Jones and one from an anonymous correspondent). Dr. Jones considers that he has the right of reply to the last budget of letters from the Jolly side. Replies to Mr. Jolly and "Inquirer" were sent in, but the Editor at this stage (in what the writers of the "replies" consider a manner contrary to the traditions of accredited journalism) announced his intention of closing this correspondence.

October 1st, 1908.

Dr. Tudor Jones and the Doctrine of the Atonement.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DOMINION."

SIR,— "He believes as they do." Who is he? And who are they? He is the Rev. Isaac Jolly, Presbyterian Minister, Palmerston North, New Zealand; and they are Principals Garvie and Forsyth. Now, I have pointed out from the beginning that they believe in the Atonement as a great spiritual reality which cannot be expressed at all in the logical forms of the past; that they believe that even the very words of the Bible are not sufficient to express this highest act of the death of the Founder of Christianity. The words of the Bible are a help, but unless we have interpreted them with our own minds and have brought them into the deepest focus of our own souls no book religion, no piecing together of verses of the Bible, will enable us to realize the meanings of the truths and deeds of the Founder. These men believe, too, that the Creeds and Confessions of the past cannot express the deeper meaning of the Atonement of Christ or of any other lesser religious hero of history. These men have pointed out with emphasis throughout their books that it is not mere theories and mere creed intellectualisms that we need, but more of the very same thing as Jesus himself possessed; and they have shown, too, that by no external transaction on the part even of God in eternity can this be given to us. For these men know what Mr. Jolly has yet to learn: that no alien thing can enter into the mind and spirit of man except in the degree man's own power is at work. Hence they place on one side "the man-made theories" of distant days, because they are aware that these may be held in the head without touching the heart and life at all. They state, as I have already quoted from them, that these head theories of the past are not religion but the transient and past clothing of religion. This clothing must be changed in theology and religion, as it is changed without the discussion of any

Presbytery or Assembly in all the other branches of knowledge. These men have shown that the meaning of the Atonement which can be valid and be the highest Norm or Standard for us to-day is to be sought in the very ideals which Jesus realized and which every good human being possesses in potentiality. They have shown that doctrines which have crystallised into immutable dogmas such as a trinity of persons arranging the destiny of man in eternity, the fall of man, original sin, personal devil, everlasting hell, payment of a debt which God as an oriental king demanded for the sins of men, the miraculous and mythical elements which have gathered around the name of the Founder of Christianity, the modes of thought and the terminology expressed in all creeds and confessions,—these and a hundred other things they in conjunction with practically all other modern religious teachers have cast into a sea of oblivion. Yet Mr. Jolly says that he believes as they do. They have explained why they have cast aside these things, and could not believe as they do until they had done it. "He believes as they do" without having done it, or, as far as his letters show, without realizing the need of doing this at all. Instead of that he jumps at a stray word which they use in a sense totally different from him, and then says that he believes as they do.

Let me show your readers in reality what they do believe and how they believe it. The Atonement is viewed by them as man's ultimate reality. So I view it myself. The highest peak of goodness and holiness and love and service has been scaled by Jesus Christ. It has become evermore an ideal for man; to do the same with his own nature will mean for every human being the gaining of God, Freedom, and Immortality. All this is independent of every intellectual notion about the Godhead or of the deity of Christ. In fact the term deity has largely disappeared from current theological literature, and the word divinity has taken its place. We all believe in the divinity of Christ, and believe in the potential divinity of every good man and woman. Where has any ideal and goodness that is in any of us come from except from the divine source of all Being? No one emphasized this more in the Britain of the 19th Century than the immortal heretic Dr. James Martineau. But the two men whom Mr. Jolly quotes do not base their religion on any written creed or confession. They have none, and know too well that "God is not a God of the dead but of the living," i.e., that the divine reveals himself to the mind and spirit of men through Ideals and through the great Personalities of History. These men know that the highest revelation of God must be sought in these two sources at least. The first source is the present with all its complexities framed into a religious totality and experience; the second source is the unique personality of Jesus who realized the ultimate reality possible for humanity. The Atonement is thus something totally different from notions about God and Christ and Man under legal terminology; it is the way how to live and how to die; it means what I said in the sermon which offended Mr. Jolly: "Jesus the unique figure of Christendom has pointed out to us the greatest truth of all—that the path of self-denial is the path of self-realisation." So many things, as already pointed out, had to be placed on one side before the centre of gravity of religion could be placed here. It has been the greatest spiritual gain of modern religion to have brought this out. It is none other than the way how to live, how to dive into the depth of Being, and how to taste and live eternal life in the midst of time.

But let us turn to Mr. Jolly. Has he no capacity to understand this fundamental difference between the dogmas of the past and the living realities of the past and the present? These living realities, and the Atonement amongst them, can only mean anything to us in the degree we utilize them in our own lives. Judging from his letters, and that is all I know of Mr. Jolly, I have no hesitation in stating that he has not grappled with the real problem at stake. The Rev. J. Gibson-Smith states that Mr. Jolly has no capacity to understand "The Christ of the Cross," and that he puts forward his "man-made theories." I challenge him again to tackle the real problem of the Atonement. Mr. Jolly, I understand, is a much older man than I am, and with all modesty do I say that he has a great deal yet to learn on the great differences which modern religious and philosophical literature has made abundantly clear between the transient and the permanent elements in Christianity. The people, too, have a right to know of this difference. Any reader who wishes to see a fragment of this truth presented may do so by reading a little book which I have published this week on the Religious Philosophy of the leading religious idealist of Europe, one under whom I had the great privilege of studying these subjects—Prof. Rudolf Eucken of the famous University of Jena in Germany (Rudolf Eucken's Philosophy of Religion: Wellington, Messrs. S. & W. Mackay and Messrs. Whitcombe and Tombs.)

There is another matter to which I have to call attention in closing. Mr. Jolly ignores the work of foreign countries. The men whom he quotes could never have written their books without this literature. In the Crown Theological Library of Messrs. Williams and Norgate 24 volumes have already appeared presenting the modern views of religion. Only six of these volumes are the work of English writers. These foreign volumes express and explain the distinction which I have indicated above between the transient and the permanent elements in religion. Dr. Garvie says of them: "I am very grateful for the publication of these volumes." Dr. Marcus Dods says: "Your Crown Theological Library has done wonderful service to theological learning in this country." The Rev. Isaac Jolly is satisfied to leave this on one side or on his shelves. His reference to Dr. Mackintosh's review in "The Hibbert Journal" shows an entire lack of discrimination of the meaning of that review. With this

I shall deal in my next letter. I may now inform Mr. Jolly that "The Hibbert Journal" is financed by a Unitarian trust and that two Unitarian Ministers are its editors, and also, that I happen to be the representative of that Journal in New Zealand

I am, etc.,

W. TUDOR JONES,

September 17th,

Dr. Tudor Jones' Use of Great Names

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DOMINION."

SIR,—It seems to me palpable to thinking that "Inquirer" is more concerned as to how he can discredit Dr. Jones than as to the particular issue raised in the Jones-Jolly controversy. Why should it be any concern of Dr. Jones or of "Anything-arian" as to whether Dr. Driver, Canon Cheyne, and Dr. Raslulall can be regarded as honest men in continuing to call themselves English Churchmen, while entertaining views on Biblical literature and so-called Christian dogma more advanced and heretical than those entertained by the rank and file of Unitarians? This is a matter which concerns them and their Church. "Inquirer" must know, if he has read one or two of their many contributions to theological, philosophical, an ecclesiastical literature, that they are among the greatest "heretics" of the age, and that they, and many more scholars within the pale of the English Church, are regarded by English churchmen, more or less generally, as more heretical than Unitarians. Would "Inquirer," for instance, suggest that any of the three accepts the story of the "fall of man," or that of the virgin-birth" as fact? Could they accept the popularly accredited view of the Atonement? If "Inquirer" imagines they could he can know nothing of their work and influence as theologians or critics. Of course it is quite possible to explain the facts of sin and the consequent necessity of an atonement, without having to draw upon Biblical mythology or the metaphysics of the Dark and Middle Ages in this connection. As for Professor W. E. Addis, I am quite prepared to believe that he believes, or could believe, anything. He has played many parts in his day. He has boxed the ecclesiastical compass and circumnavigated the theological globe! He began his career in the Church of England, then passed over to the Church of Rome became a priest—left the Church of Rome, married a wealthy lady, and though employed as Professor of Old Testament Literature in Manchester [Unitarian] College, Oxford, was never "required" to call himself a Unitarian. He preferred to call himself an Arian. He thereafter returned to the Church of England. This is a brilliant record! The most memorable incident in his life was the fact that Canon Cheyne asked him to write the article on the "Gospel of St. John" for the "Encyclopaedia Biblica," and rejected it when written! He had to go to Professor Schmiedel, of Zurich, to get the work done competently. Here are a few tit-bits from the writings of Dr. Rashdall :—

"Supposing the question had been put to the bishops: 'Is it consistent with the doctrine of the Church of England to assert that the account of the Fall is a myth?' I very much doubt whether the majority of them would have ventured to assert that it was"!

This is surely a high compliment to the Bishops of his Church! . Again—

"The heretic [Gore] against whom orthodox pamphlets thundered in 1889, is now (next to Lord Halifax) the nearest approach to a theological Pope that the Anglican system can tolerate."

Rashdall commends R. J. Campbell's views of the Atonement. He cites the following passage from R. J. Campbell's book: "What is it that is slowly winning the world from its selfishness to-day and lifting it gradually into the higher, purer atmosphere. There is but one thing that is doing it, and that is the spirit of self-sacrifice. Wherever you see that you see the true Atonement at work." Rashdall adds: "I wish I could transcribe more of this admirable passage." Again: "At bottom I believe he (R. J. Campbell) is right in his way of representing the Divinity of Christ. He regards Christ as a full and finally sufficient revelation of God. Nor have I any quarrel with what he says about the possibilities of others with His (Christ's) help becoming like Him. All men are, in some degree, sons or revelations of God. Christ was so in a unique degree."

I commend the following to "Inquirer's" notice and hope he may find it possible to answer his query about "honesty" for himself and his Church: "Dr. Rashdall also spoke of the petition to Convocation. He said that the Royal Commission's proposal that questions of doctrine or ritual should be referred to the Bishops might well be viewed with alarm. If a majority of the Bishops were of a particular school, they might, for instance, decide that any clergyman not believing in the Real Presence in the Eucharist should be ejected from his benefice. He thought it was the general feeling that certain psalms and hymns which were opposed to the Ethical spirit of Christianity should be excluded at the discretion of the officiating clergyman. Referring to certain Bible stories

as being unelevating and unhistorical, he said he did not suppose that there were six Bishops on the Bench, who, in the privacy of their study, seriously believed that the walls of Jericho really did fall down. Other stories which should also disappear from public use were those of the murder of Agag, the horrible story of Jael, the narrative of Balaam's ass, the floating axe-head, and the anointing of blood thirsty Jehu. The services of the Church were cast in too archaic a mould for modern religious opinion." [The Liberal Churchman, Oct. 1907.] In an article on "Religion and History" by Rashdall in the same number of "The Liberal Churchman," I find: "It is clear to me at least that the most ultimate and fundamental truths of Religion must be independent of any particular revelation" (page 12). Again: "I would venture, therefore, to lay down that any truth of religion that is of primary importance must be regarded as independent of history, in the sense that it is independent of miracles." (page 14.)

The less you rely upon historical testimony and miraculous attestation the more you must emphasize the moral and religious consciousness" (page 15).

Again: "I do not think that Christianity must for ever stand or fall with the exact formulae of the Nicene Creed. Those formulas were a way of expressing in the language of the day the unique value which the Christian society attributed to Christ. They have not lost their usefulness for us, though we naturally interpret them to some extent differently from the men of the fourth century as of the sixteenth! "What about your Nicene Creed now, brother "Inquirer."?"

As to Canon Cheyne, it would be an easy matter to show that he is a greater heretic than Dr. Rashdall. Any of his many contributions to his own "Encyclopaedia Biblica" puts that beyond question.

Let me say, in conclusion, that of the "eminent scholars" enumerated by Mr. Jolly in his first letter only two were University teachers, and one of them a mere theological unknown quantity. All his great authorities (with the exception of two) belong to the non-University theological halls. I doubt if even the two most distinguished of them (Drs. Driver and George Adam Smith) have any claim to a place in the first rank of present-day Biblical critics and scholars. I am surprised that Dr. Jones failed to notice this. Dr. Jones is too modest to claim that the thinkers and critics whose names he enumerated are in fundamental agreement with him in theology, he rather claims that he is in fundamental agreement with them, and I challenge "Inquirer" to prove that so far as Dr. Rashdall and Canon Cheyne are concerned this is not the case.

I am, yours, &c.,

ANYTHINGARIAN.

September 17th.

Free Lance Print

Science and the Soul.

Startling Psychic Phenomena! Miracles in Melbourne! Photographs of Thoughts! Has Immortality been Proved?

BY W. BRITTON HARVEY

Preface.

This Booklet has not been written to advance any particular Cause—except the sacred Cause of Truth.

It represents an unpretentious attempt on the part of the author to place before the reader some idea of the present relation of Science to those amazing Psychic phenomena which are to-day claiming attention amongst the intellectual classes in all parts of the world.

The public has, from time to time, learnt with astonishment that this and that eminent Scientist has become convinced of the Spiritual origin of these wonderful manifestations, but very few have had the opportunity of acquiring a knowledge of the *nature* of the phenomena which have wrought such a transformation in these brilliant and, in many cases, previously Materialistic minds.

It is hoped that this little work may, in some degree, supply this information, and the author trusts it may not be deemed unworthy of careful perusal inasmuch as the late Mr. Gladstone, in writing on the subject with which it deals, declared that it was "*by far the most important that could occupy the human mind*"

The only favour asked of the reader is that he shall approach the subject, by no means in a spirit of credulity, but with an *open mind* and an impartial regard for the evidence submitted.

Grateful acknowledgment is made of the generosity of the Editor of the *Harbinger of Light*, Melbourne, for the loan of the blocks of the pictures which illustrate the Booklet, that journal being the leading exponent of the New Psychology in Australia and a high-class production warmly eulogised by Professor Larkin, Director of

the Lowe Observatory, California, for its finished literary and scientific contents.

No financial benefit is desired from the publication of this treatise, and consequently it is offered to the public at what will doubtless be recognised as a merely nominal price.

The Author.

WARRNAMBOOL,
OCTOBER, 1908.

Photographs of Thoughts and Emotions.

by Dr. Baraduc, the eminent Nerve Specialists of Paris (Refer to page 10)

Science and the Soul.

Introduction.

THIS is pre-eminently a Scientific age. Almost every week I witness some new discovery or the introduction of a new invention. It is not an easy matter, in fact, to keep pace with the almost magic strides which Science is taking to-day. Wonder follows upon wonder, and there is not much risk in advancing the belief that we have at last entered upon a Golden Age which, in the brilliancy of its Scientific achievements, will far and away eclipse any similar development since the world first started on its, possibly, unending career of evolutionary progress.

In all its varied ramifications Science is shedding lustre on the times in which it is our privilege to live, greatly ameliorating the material conditions of existence and facilitating intercourse between the nations of the earth; and at the same time lifting men to a higher plane of mental thought, and by illumining their minds and augmenting their knowledge of Natural laws, is giving a potent stimulus to that spirit of *inquiry* without the exercise of which there can be no advance in the more important spheres of human action. Doubt spells inquiry, and inquiry spells progress. Hence all the most *progressive* minds of all the ages have been doubters and, consequently, inquirers, and it is along that path alone that has come all that accumulation of knowledge in the domains of Science, Philosophy, and Religion which is the fortunate inheritance of the present generations of men.

The leaders of these movements have, of course, been derided, scoffed at and persecuted, and in very many instances have been tortured and subsequently put to death rather than act the part of traitor to their conscience, be false to what they believed to be true, stiflers of the voice of duty, and disloyal to their God. The spirit—divine in its origin—which influenced those men, lives on, and is to-day manifesting itself in the unpopular declarations of some of the most eminent minds of the twentieth century. They are fighting for what they believe to be Truth, and though at times discouraged when "facing fearful odds," the hope of ultimate victory is a constant spur to continued persistence. They know that—

Truth crushed to earth will rise again,
The eternal years of God are hers.

You cannot kill Truth. It would not be Truth if you could. Truth is everlasting. It springs from God Himself and is equally enduring. It is only *error* that fails to survive. As old Gamaliel, the tutor of the illustrious Paul, expressed it in New Testament phraseology two thousand years ago, when Peter and the others were arraigned before the Ecclesiastical Court of that day for the heresy they were alleged to have preached—"And now I say unto you, refrain from these men and let them alone; for if this counsel, or this work be of men, it will come to nought; but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found even to fight against God Himself."

He was a fine old philosopher was Gamaliel, and we, in our day, would do well to emulate his example of broad-minded toleration when encountering those with whose Scientific, Philosophic or Religious views we happen to be at variance. Unhappily, there is too much of the opposite spirit displayed in these so-called tolerant times, and amongst no section of the community do you find it more prominently in evidence than amongst many of those who profess to be followers of the Prince of Peace, whose precepts they cordially endorse, but whose example of love and forbearance they so often fail to reproduce. In spite of the opposition

of the past, however, Science has continued to push its way to the front and will unquestionably continue to advance, notwithstanding the bitterest bigotry of the narrowest minds and all the jeers and ridicule it may yet have to encounter.

I am led to make these remarks because of the nature of some of the facts I propose to submit in the course of this treatise, and of the unreasoning and illogical antipathy sometimes exhibited towards those who feel they are neither degrading themselves, nor belittling their Creator, by obeying the command of the Master—"Seek and ye shall find"—no matter along what channel their investigations may lead them. But before alluding further to this particular phase of the subject—the Transcendental phase—let us briefly review some of the other marvellous Scientific developments which have in recent years arrested the attention of intelligent and thoughtful men, and which appear almost miraculous in their mysterious detail.

The Wonders of Electricity.

Many years have passed since men ceased to wonder at the telegraphy and they are now becoming quite familiarised with the marvels of wireless telegraphy. Yet how many of them try to understand something of the process whereby messages can be sent by a transmitter and correctly recorded by the receiver, although the two stations are thousands of miles apart, and have no visible connecting medium between them ! Of what interest is it to them to be informed that the atmosphere which surrounds the earth is interlaced with channels of ether—that mystic something which is lighter than the lightest gas—and that these lines of ether are the unseen courses along which the electric current is conducted for the purposes of wireless telegraphy? They are too much engrossed in material things to give thought and study to ascertaining something of the mystery of these sublimer forces—these Laws of God, which form a more vital part of the mighty universal scheme of Creation than all the other forces with which we are more or less familiar.

Scientists are now beginning to realise that it is the *invisible* that is the *real*, and that the *seen* is only the effect of *invisible* causes. We see this exemplified in wireless telegraphy, and what, in my opinion, is more wonderful still, is that other marvel of Scientific attainment—wireless telephony.

This remarkable discovery of the twentieth century is to-day but in its infancy. The experiments, however, which have been so successfully conducted in Europe and America indicate that the possibilities which lie before it are well nigh boundless. This planet of ours, in fact, seems destined to be reduced to the dimensions of a drawing-room respecting the freedom with which we shall be able to converse with each other in the years that are to be. Space would then be annihilated, and the sense of separation would almost cease to exist.

To show that this conception is not necessarily the imaginative conjecture of an idle fancy, one of the more prominent workers engaged in perfecting and extending this wonderful process recently discussed the future of wireless telephony in terms like these—"The day will come when copper wires, gutta-percha covers, and iron bands will only be found in museums; when a person who wishes to speak to a friend, but does not know where he is, will call with an electrical voice which will be heard only by him who has a similarly-tuned electrical ear. He will cry : 'Where are you V And the answer will sound in his ear : 'I am in the depths of a mine, on the summit of the Andes, or on the broad expanse of ocean.' Or perhaps no voice will reply, and he will know that his friend is dead."

This certainly reads very much like romance. So did wireless telegraphy when it was first mooted and so have clone many other, at one time, incredible Scientific achievements. Romance, in the realm of Science, has a very peculiar knack of transforming itself into a prosaic and indisputable reality, and this experience may be repeated in the actual realisation of what to-day may seem impossible in regard to this predicted development in wireless telephony. It is, in short, just about time the word "impossible" was erased from the vocabulary of the English language. Most intelligent men and women have now reached a stage of mental expansion enabling them to recognise that nothing is impossible, and seeing that Science is so rapidly and completely conquering space we ought to frame our minds for the reception of any fresh development in any realm, no matter how sensational and how unexpected such developments may be.

Mankind has been amazed by Science time after time in the past—more particularly in recent years—and these surprises will doubtless continue to be sprung on the world as "knowledge grows from more to more." To be able to reproduce the human voice over long distances without the aid of wires would have seemed miraculous to a less-enlightened generation, and if our grandmothers had been told that this development was in store they would certainly have declared that it could only be rendered possible by the performance of a miracle. Ignorance, in fact, always sees the miraculous in an inexplicable circumstance. But it is only miraculous because of our lack of knowledge of those profound Laws of Nature through which the effects are produced.

As men grow in knowledge of God and His wondrous works, miracles diminish, and consequently it is literally true that the age of miracles has passed—not because there are not things happening to-day equally

marvellous as most of the events described as miracles, but because the mind of man has developed; because his knowledge has increased in obedience to the divine law of *progressive revelation*, and because he is beginning to understand something of those higher natural forces which have been in active operation since the beginning of Time, for "with God is no variableness, neither the shadow of a turning."

God's laws are from everlasting to everlasting, and in all their multifarious operations never vary a hair's breadth from their set and beneficent purposes. They are immutable, inexorable, eternal, and the Reason of Man—which has, unhappily, been too long dethroned, but which is at last breaking through the fettering bonds of superstition and tradition—is now beginning to realise that no other arrangement of natural forces could possibly be reconciled with the existence of an Omnipotent, Omniscient and Omni-present Creative Mind.

Passing on, then, to further wonders of these latter days, we come to the transmission of pictures—photographs and scenes—by the use of the telegraphic wire, and in this connection lifelike portraits have been reproduced by this inscrutable process. The two stations were far apart, but the result was almost faultless, and now we learn that even the wire has been dispensed with and that pictures are to-day actually being transmitted by the wireless method. Wherever the necessary stations are erected, it is claimed, as one of the advantages of this discovery, that portraits of criminals can be faithfully flashed across space, and even the faintest outlines of their finger prints. That is truly wonderful enough, but it seems to be almost equalled as a marvel by the fact that a telegraph operator in London can dispatch a message to Paris, where the electric current agitates a wire connected with one of the Parisian newspaper offices, sets the linotype machine in motion, which machine automatically sets up the telegraphed matter in type and presents it ready for the press, with virtually no one doing any work but the man manipulating the apparatus in London!

Compared with this achievement we can read with complacency that ships are now being installed with an invention for submarine signalling whereby a vessel, many miles from land, in a dense fog, can be informed of her position by signals given with a bell from the lighthouse near the mainland. The warning sound travels under water, strikes the receiver on the vessel, and the captain knows exactly where he is, although previously he might have been in a hopeless haze concerning his bearings. This discovery will obviate many wrecks and may in course of time be the means of saving thousands of precious lives. We are also ceasing to view with our former sense of wonderment the spectacle of a ship sailing through the air, and even the announcement that a speed of 50 or 60 miles an hour has been attained, scarcely induces us to raise our eyebrows.

Another invention naturally leads us to inquire—"Is the telegraph instrument, with its code of dots and dashes, doomed?" One may well ask the question after learning about the telewriter, by which it is possible to write a message which is reproduced *simultaneously* miles away in *fac simile* writing. This wonderful machine has already been brought to such a state of simplicity and perfection that it is in use in several London offices, and before long will probably be used as largely as the telephone is to-day. As soon as the sender's pencil is taken up, the pen of the receiver, miles and miles away, comes out of the ink, and moving as if by magic, traces exactly what is written or drawn at the other end. A message can be signed, and the signature is just as convincing as if it were the *original*. Amongst other things it is proposed to use the telewriter for advertising purposes, and very shortly we may expect to see writing without hands being done in shop windows in order to attract the passers-by.

But if all these things are to be considered almost inconceivable in their bewildering ingenuity, what about the Lynnoscope—an invention by means of which it is claimed that anyone will be able to see around the world? We have not heard much about this discovery yet. Mr. John Wellesley Lynn is the inventor, and he declares he has proved by experiment that the instrument will allow people in London to see their fellow beings in America instantaneously; that it will reflect any written message to the most distant place, and that it will enable any person to see right through any human being or solid substance as if they were not there.

"*The Lynnoscope consists of three distinct instruments,*" says the inventor—"(*i*) the operator, (*2*) the transmitter, (*3*) the receiver. All that is necessary in sending reflections any distance overland is to fix a transmitter on the highest available point—a hill-top or a tower—and the image is correctly reflected on the receiver. It will be possible to present an actual reflection of the Derby as it is being run, to an audience at a matinee at any London theatre. I do not mean a living cinematograph picture, he goes on, "but an actual reflection of the event as it is in progress. I have secured perfect reflections at a distance of 186 miles, and I have photographed scenes 80 miles away. I experimented at Buckingham Palace, and the Lynnoscope made a lady who was present apparently invisible. Sir Thos. Lipton and others have interested themselves in the invention, and have written expressing themselves perfectly satisfied with the experiments. I have been at work on this invention for nine years, and was working all the time on a pre-conceived scheme. A curious accident, however, helped me to the solution. I was working in my study with my apparatus, and, on looking through it, saw what appeared to be a hole in place of the floor. I found to my surprise that I could see right through carpet and floor to a transmitter in the cellar. I have been awarded a diploma at the Inventions Exhibition for optical discoveries, and am willing to show what I can do before any committee of Scientific experts."

According to this, there will be no necessity for us presently to go to the old country to see our friends. By looking through this instrument in Australia we shall be able to see them going to church on Sunday, and on the Monday morning we shall have the unspeakable joy of watching them "hanging out the clothes!" Again I ask—"Have we room for the word 'impossible' when contemplating even the most sensational predictions which Science has yet to fulfil?" Does not the whole trend of Scientific attainment clearly demonstrate that anything and everything is possible? Let us, then, dismiss that word from our minds and be prepared for any wonder that has yet to be revealed!

Solid Matter Abolished—Nothing Exists but Corpuscles of Electricity.

Accompanying the foregoing developments must be mentioned the discovery of the X Rays and the recent declaration of Scientists that there is no such thing as *solid* matter. That which we call solid matter has been found to consist of an aggregation of atoms—infinately small, so small, in fact, that 100,000 of them would only cover a square inch—and these atoms appear to be subdivided into something infinitely smaller still. These latter inconceivably minute particles have been named electrons by certain physicists, and corpuscles of electricity by others. So that in the final analysis we find nothing but electricity as the basis of all matter.

The whole universe is one vast ocean of electric energy—heaving, pulsating, always in a state of flux and incessant activity. It was Sir William Crookes, the brilliant British Scientist, who first advanced this theory some thirty years ago, and he has lived to see it accepted by the more celebrated of his gifted colleagues. Amongst these is Professor Edgar Lucien Larkin, the well-known Astronomer and Director of the famed Lowe Observatory, in California, who has recently contributed a striking series of erudite articles on the subject to the columns of the *Harbinger of Light*. From these articles I cull the following extracts relating to what he describes as "the recent mighty discoveries in those almost inscrutable realms of the new higher Science of electricity—

"The Science began when that great pioneer, William Crookes, made his first and now classical and historical experiments with his glass, high vacuum tubes. Human eyes for the first time saw matter put on an entirely new condition. It became radiant. He called it Radiant Matter, or matter in a Fourth State. This was in 1879. At once every physical, chemical and electrical laboratory in the world became scenes of the most intense activity. After classes were dismissed, University professors locked the doors and worked all night delving and digging round about the base of Nature.

"The most skilful glassblowers were employed to make new, strange, and perfect tubes. And mechanical skill was taxed to the limit in making air-pumps to exhaust the air in these new tubes, so that finally less than the one-millionth part remained. This was for the purpose of allowing the electrical particles to fly from end to end as free as possible from collision with the molecules of air. These almost empty tubes of hard glass had platinum terminals or electrodes fused through the end walls, and these were connected by wires to sources of electricity at enormous pressures. When the electricity was turned on, wonders entirely unknown were displayed.

"I was astonished when I made my first demonstration before students with a Crookes' tube. The bombarding particles were turned on platinum, and this obdurate metal became white hot in an instant. Strange but supernal lights glowed in the vacuum. These were of surpassing beauty, and were at once sent into the spectroscope for analysis. Illimitable wonders were again revealed, and every Scientific man in the world buckled on armour in which to explore this new and infinitely wide field, in which everything was new.

"With rare prescience and with a sagacity always characteristic of Crookes, he said that the streams through the tubes consisted of negatively electrified bodies—each inconceivably small. This statement is the basic rock now lying under the most wonderful of all Sciences, if indeed one can be called more wonderful than another. For all those engaged in these studies can now see, and are fully aware, that the universe is—what shall I say?—hundreds of millions of times more majestic, complex and intricate than ever conceived by the most vivid imagination. It is one grand homogeneous unit, and we humans are integral parts thereof, especially our minds. Crookes said that the particles flying at terrific speed were charged negatively. In 1895 Perrin proved this to be true.

"Crookes' particles are now called corpuscles. A few physicists call them electrons. But the point is that nothing else, whatever, is in existence. Thus everything—all atoms of matter and of mind—are made of corpuscles, and these are made of pure electricity, and nothing else. This is the inevitable tendency and trend of the latest Science, mental and material. For the entire activity of the universe consists of concentration and radiation—a flux and flow of corpuscles toward and away from a centre.

"Telepathy consists of a flow of corpuscles away from a mental centre and impact on another. And telekinesis is caused by the motion of corpuscles. So is everything. There is no such thing as a phenomenon. The universe and all within are in the clutch of law. Thoughts are things—currents of real corpuscles. Cells in

brains are transmitters and receivers of corpuscles, and these only. The body and its organs, together with the brain and nerves, unite into one complex electro-bio-mental machine. Its sole output is corpuscles, and it receives corpuscles only. Life and mind are electrical.

"Since the discovery of hydrogen, its atom has been the smallest and lightest body known. It is so small that the most powerful minds—those of the world's ablest mathematicians, have never been able to think, or even begin to think, how minute it is. Yet it weighs as much as 1700 corpuscles ! These are the carriers, makers, workers, and builders. They made the entire visible and invisible universes, one within the other."

Professor Edgar Lucien Larkin,

Director of Lowe Observatory, California.

"You know how strenuously I have written for 40 years all over the world in 70 different papers and magazines on Natural Science and rigid Materialism—over 4000 articles which I now see clearly were on the wrong side. Now I am studying and writing all the time on Psychology and Mental Subjects."

Elaborating still further on the theme Professor Larkin says :—

"Matter is chemically inert unless nascent. Thus the most recent and world-astounding declaration of Science is that nothing exists but electricity in the form of inconceivably small discrete particles or bodies called corpuscles. . . Corpuscles in a nascent state vibrate, oscillate, undulate and revolve with velocities far and ever beyond hope of comprehension. These motions, and these only, constitute the entire life of the Universe. Then our minds, our very thoughts, conscious and sub-conscious, are flows of corpuscles. Radium sends out flows of corpuscles, and so do cells in the brain. Positively thoughts are as real as are these corpuscles . . . and doubtless our own marvellous minds are made of corpuscles.

"Thus the Universe is a unit, although there are actually billions of suns, and, without doubt, trillions of minute invisible planets like the earth and other planets of our little solar system, all of which, even up to trillions, amount to next to nothing in the mighty cosmical edifice. . .

"Now, since all suns are composed of like phases of matter, and as all matter known to spectroscopists can be resolved into corpuscles, it can be said that nothing is in existence beside. But when the corpuscles are obtained the ablest physicists and chemists cannot possibly detect any difference between them and electricity. So we say that the entire Universe and all things it contains are made of electricity. But corpuscles are so far beyond all powers of imagination that no hope can be had of thinking about their ultimate nature."

After perusing these mind-whirling statements, the reader will probably want to stop and "take breath"! They, are, however, endorsed, amongst others, by that brilliant astronomer, M. Camille Flammarion, who last year published a work in which he declares that matter, of which we make so much, does not really exist, and that the Universe is a mighty organism which is ruled by dynamics of a psychic order. That which we term matter, then, is simply an agglomeration of tiny particles of electricity attracted to each other by some inscrutable Law of Affinity. It is not a *solid* at all. It is a mosaic of electric corpuscles and perhaps this fact furnishes an explanation of its being so easily penetrable by the marvellous X Rays.

Telepathy Scientifically Demonstrated.

A wonderful age, this, in which to live ! But there are greater marvels than any of these revelations in store. "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive" the glories and wonders that are yet to be revealed. The Scientific demonstration and acceptance of the fact of telepathy is a step in the direction to which I refer—the revelations of what Professor Zöllner, the eminent German Scientist, calls Transcendental Physics, *which seem destined to conclusively prove the continuity of existence and the immortality of the soul.*

Mr. W. T. Stead, the brilliant journalist and social reformer, and the confidant of Emperors and Kings, has told us over and over again that he is in daily communication with friends at a distance to whom he sends telepathic messages, and receives answers by the same mysterious channel, upon which he acts as though he had actually been in conversation with the party with whom he has thus been invisibly connected. "I find this a great convenience," he says, "for it saves a lot of personal interviewing, and consequently a lot of time."

Here, then, we have two minds communicating with each other, and Sir William Crookes tells us that if he were to-day beginning his investigations in the Transcendental realm he would base his researches upon this supreme and proved mental fact of telepathy, because, if two minds, whilst still in the flesh, can communicate with each other, he sees no reason why two minds—one in the flesh and the other out of the flesh—should not be able to do the same.

The transference of thought, then, from one mind to another, is to-day accepted by *official* Science, and this has naturally led to an investigation of the nature of thought, with the result that thoughts are now described—not as mere "nothings," but as palpable, though invisible, "*things* " which shoot forth from the mind

like the electrons which dart from a piece of radium, and go careering through space until they strike some receptive mind with which they have an affinity, and the individual is correspondingly influenced thereby. If the thought is evil it will influence him for evil. If it is good it will influence him for good, There is no more impressive statement in the whole of this work than that which I have just presented. Only think of it ! *Thoughts are things, and your thoughts and my thoughts, by the influence they exert, may possibly determine the ultimate destiny of immortal souls !*

Thoughts and Emotions Photographed.

Professor Larkin describes thoughts as "electric corpuscles" darting hither and thither with inconceivable rapidity in search of a congenial lodgment, and to show that this conception of the nature and power of thought is no empty flight of the imagination, it will only be necessary to draw attention to the photographic experiments conducted by Dr. Baraduc, the eminent nerve specialist, of Paris. If thoughts are *things*, he considered it should be possible to photograph them. He accordingly prepared a special apparatus, with an exceptionally sensitive plate attached, and under the most conclusive conditions obtained a series of strikingly distinct, and, in some cases, most beautiful pictures of these thought forces and emotions, as will be seen from the frontispiece to this little work.

These pictorial wonders were reproduced in the *Illustrated London News* some time ago, and their publication caused a great sensation in the Scientific circles of Europe. *One of these photographs represents a column of prayer.* By arrangement with half-a-dozen devout persons, a prayer meeting was held in an apartment at the top of the Eiffel Tower. The special camera was arranged in position, and at a given moment Dr. Baraduc took the picture. The result was a very clear and impressive representation of the thoughts and aspirations of these intensely earnest souls rising like a column of incense as though ascending direct to the very throne of God. He has also taken good thoughts and bad thoughts of certain individuals, placid thoughts and stormy thoughts, and the pictures they produce are most remarkable—some beautiful in their sweet and tranquilising aspect, whilst others resemble a veritable mental typhoon, according to the humour of the subject at the time the photo was taken.

Dr. Baraduc further believes that psychic powers can be applied to the treatment of diseases, and in this connection the pictures representing the forms of benedictions and of a flow of curative force at Lourdes during the performance of a "miracle" are certainly very suggestive. The wonderful cures wrought at Lourdes. year after year have hitherto been regarded by the majority of people, either as frauds or purely imaginary occurrences, but it is now known that they are well-based Scientifically and are too real to be any longer disputed. They are, apparently, due to that Spiritual "gift of healing," of which Paul writes, and the potential curative agency is a mysterious psychic emanation which is sufficiently palpable to impress a sensitive plate.

"I am not a Spiritualist, nor a doctrinaire," says Dr. Baraduc, "but speak from experience, and I declare I have found forces surrounding man which have been registered on photographic plates. Man is surrounded by an atmosphere of personal ether. Every human being has an impalpable double, which reproduces his form and which allows us to explain ghost stories and the phenomena of double sight Call it soul, if you like, or astral body. I have photographed this ether double 80 hours after death. When my wife died I photographed a nebulous globe which escaped from her like a soul. You see, there are forces in this world and forces in the other world. When, in the name of truth, Spiritual scientists unite with Material scientists, we will arrive at a knowledge of the synthesis of the forces which regulate our life and our immortality, for man does not belong to this planet only, but to the starry spaces in which his thoughts revolve."

Nor are we indebted to Dr. Baraduc alone for this revelation. Colonel Albert de Rochas has conducted similar experiments with great success, and in *The Annals of Psychical Science* in February last he contributes an illustrated article showing not only remarkably vivid representations of thought forces, but also of the partial and *complete severance* of the astral body from its physical counterpart, the complete astral form being identical in outline with the human body. "We have a natural body and we have a spiritual body," says St. Paul. Was it this astral body to which Paul alluded as the spiritual body ? Was he aware of the existence of this duplicate which we are only just discovering ? And, it should be remembered, the camera cannot lie !

Fighting the Materialist.

If, then, mind can communicate with mind, if thoughts are *things*, and if they can be photographed, it will at once be seen that we are entering upon a field of study of transcendent interest, and we have only to go one step further and we immediately inquire—Can the Scientist offer us any absolute and conclusive answer to the question, "*If a man die, shall he live again ?*" That is the all-important question, to which mankind requires a positive and decisive reply. Neither the poet nor the philosopher can give a convincing answer, and theologians

admit they are equally impotent to furnish us with proof. We may "believe" in an after life, but mere "belief" is not *knowing*, and if the dense Materialism which has taken possession of a large proportion of the race—with its most powerful exponent in Haeckel—and which, perhaps, more than any other influence is at present impeding the progress of the Christian Church, is to be effectually and finally dispersed, the answer *must* come from the experimental investigations of the Scientists, and from these alone. We must have, not only mental, but *objective* evidence of the survival of the human personality.

The solution of this problem seems to be vital to the continued well-being of the Christian Church, and therefore the best friends the Church possesses to-day are those who, for the time being, may *be* derided and ridiculed, but who are nevertheless working assiduously to supply that unanswerable demonstrative proof which will *hurl the Materialist from his pedestal and give a new and irresistible impulse to the spread of spiritual truths*. This, then, is the stupendous problem that has for many years past been engaging the minds of the leading Scientists of the age, and some of them, at least, tell us that the mystery has been solved—that they have discovered absolutely irrefutable proof that the continuity of consciousness is a demonstrated fact, and that when we leave these physical bodies the *real* man—of which this outward form is but the semblance—enters upon a higher stage of existence in obedience to that great undeviating law of evolution which reigns throughout the universe.

Now, if this very definite claim is really based upon Truth it is just as well that we should know it—especially as it is made on the authority of such eminent Scientists as Dr. A. Russel Wallace, Sir William Crookes, Sir Oliver Lodge, Professor Zöllner Professor Lombroso, and M. Camille Flammarion, among many other less familiarly known celebrities, to say nothing of the hosts of philosophers and poets, and of men ranking on the highest summit in Literature, Art and the Church—all of whom sing the one song of assured immortality.

As men and women possessing intelligence and reason, and desiring above all things that the mystery should be solved, we cannot dismiss the conclusions of these intellectual giants with a careless wave of the hand and declare that it is all a delusion. This is surely not the attitude of the man who is loyal in his adherence to Christianity and who sincerely desires to see the Materialist overthrown. It is rather the attitude of the man who is, unconsciously no doubt, the greatest enemy of the Church and that which the Church represents, and at the same time the friend of those whose soul-killing Materialism operates as an extinguisher of the spiritual life of the people.

Transcendental Experiments.

I may point out that these Scientific investigations have been carried on with great thoroughness, with the most scrupulous scrutiny and under strictly Scientific test conditions. Many of these tests seem almost ludicrous in their exacting requirements, but the very fact that they were so rigid as to absolutely preclude all possibility of fraud or delusion makes them the more valuable and gives the results greatly added weight. The investigations, moreover, have extended over a very long interval of time. It is not a matter of a year or two, or even of a decade. From 30 to 40 years have elapsed since the study of psychic phenomena was taken in hand by the leading Scientific minds of that time, and in more recent years the subject has received the closest attention of Scientists in England and America, and in Germany, France and Italy.

Certain peculiarly constituted persons called Psychics, or Sensitives, or Mediums, or "Automatists," as Sir Oliver Lodge describes them, have been found from time to time possessing in a very remarkable degree that mysterious agent known as psychic force, which is given off from their organisms as an invisible emanation, and which is said to be the potent agency through which the manifestations witnessed have been obtained.

There was a time when these manifestations were regarded either as delusions or frauds. That, however, was before the Scientists took their investigations systematically in hand, and now, after years of experiment, and after taking all the precautions which human ingenuity could devise to safeguard themselves against trickery, these brilliant lights in the Scientific firmament *unanimously* declare these almost stupefying phenomena to be *absolutely real, absolutely genuine*. That, at any rate, is an enormous advance, for we now know that we are dealing with a great reality, and not with an imposture or an imaginary freak.

I wish, however to explain that although the whole of these Scientific investigators have pronounced the phenomena to be *real* they are not at the present time unanimous as to the *cause*. The more prominent of them—such as Wallace, Crookes, Lodge, Zöllner, and Lombroso—declare the results to be due to the operations of invisible intelligences—of the spirits of men and women who formerly lived upon the earth. Others—like Professor Morselli, the distinguished Italian psychologist—tell us that they have no room in their mental fabric for the "Spiritual," and that they do not know what to make of the wonders they have seen. Although he cannot at present accept the Spiritual hypothesis, however, Professor Morselli by no means exhibits a blind and unreasoning antagonism to this theory. In an article he contributed recently to the *Corriere*

della Lara, of Milan, he says :—

"Spiritualism, bound up, as it is, with the beliefs of the ancients, and associated with all the great religions and philosophies of the world, deserves to engage the attention and respect of the most liberal, as well as of the most prejudiced man of Science. It can no longer be passed over with derision and almost indifference, because it is an hypothesis which commands the assent of intellects of the highest order."

Graphic Border

Some Amazing phenomena.

Sensational Experiences of Eminent Scientists.

We will now proceed to inquire into the *nature* of the phenomena which have created such a sensation in Scientific circles, and which have transformed so many Materialist Scientists into believers in the immortality of the soul. I have taken the particulars from the published works of the Scientists quoted and from *The Annals of Psychical Science*, the latter being described on the cover as "a monthly journal devoted to *critical and experimental* research in metaphysical phenomena," and bearing the following names of a Committee of Supervision : Sir William Crookes, Camille Flammarion, Professor Caesar Lombroso, Dr. Joseph Maxwell, Professor Morselli, Mareel Mangin, Dr. Julien Ochorowitz, Professor Francoise Porro, Colonel de Rochas, Dr. A. Von Schrenck-Notzing, and W. T. Stead. The editor of the French edition is Professor Caesar de Vesme, and of the English edition, Mrs. Laura I. Finch; and the Directors are Dr. Dariex and Professor Charles Richet. That which I relate therefore, is *official, written by the authorities quoted themselves*, and I will reproduce their actual phraseology as faithfully as this summarised version will allow.

Sir William Crookes, F.R.S.

A Brilliant Scientist in Wonderland.

I will first of all take the investigations of Sir Wm. Crookes, the most eminent Scientist in England to-day—Fellow of the Royal Society and Gold Medallist; Discoverer of the Sodium Amalgam Process; Inventor of the Radiometer and Otheoscope; Past-President of the British Chemical Society, and Gold Medallist of the French Academy of Sciences. Thirty years have elapsed since he commenced his experiments in psychic phenomena, and at that time he was admittedly pronouncedly antagonistic to any hypothesis accounting for these mysteries which did not come within the scope of the physical sciences.

When, therefore, it was announced that this shrewd and talented investigator had undertaken to inquire into these so-called spiritual manifestations, the greatest satisfaction was expressed in Scientific circles and in the Press, the latter eulogising him as the one man who could be trusted to pursue the research with all the care, caution, and accuracy that marked his other Scientific work, and he was expected to once and for all annihilate the claim that the phenomena which had been witnessed by others proved that the human personality survived the ordeal of death.

He devoted four years in this selected capacity to this important work, and in his private house, laboratory and elsewhere took every conceivable precaution to protect himself against being duped. He had a great reputation at stake and was naturally jealous of it. During the whole of this time a fight was going on in his Scientific mind between his implacable scepticism, on the one hand, and the conviction of the reality of the phenomena on the other, and he required to sum up all the moral courage of his nature before he eventually decided, in the face of the storm of ridicule which he knew the declaration would raise, to remain true to Science and true to himself by publicly proclaiming that he had found new and unsuspected forces at work which could only be attributable to the agency of invisible intelligences.

He relates in full detail the varied phenomena he witnessed, and amongst these he enumerates the playing of musical instruments without human intervention and "under conditions rendering contact or connection with the keys impossible." One of these instruments was an accordeon, which was a new one purchased by himself, and the medium had neither seen nor handled it before the commencement of the test experiments. The accordeon, whilst suspended in the air, *expanded and contracted* just as if being played by invisible hands, the hands of the medium being at the same time quite still. A simple air was played on one occasion and was "considered a crucial test."

Dealing with what he calls percussive and other allied sounds, he says he has sometimes heard loud thuds—loud enough to be heard several rooms off. He has heard them also in a living tree, on a sheet of glass,

on a stretched iron wire, on the roof of a cab, on the floor of a theatre, on his shoulder and *under* his own hands. "I have tested them in every way I could devise," he says, "until there has been no escape from the conviction that they were true objective occurrences, not produced by trickery or mechanical means."

Alluding to the movements of heavy substances he declares a chair was seen by all present to move slowly up to the table from a far corner when all were watching it; "an armchair moved to where we were sitting and then moved slowly back again *at my request*—a distance of about 3ft."

"On three successive evenings," he continues, "a small table moved slowly across the room under conditions which I had

Sir William Crookes, F.R.S.,

Britain's Brilliant Scientist.

"The impression was conveyed to my mind that it was a living woman by my side instead of a visitor from the other world."?

specially pre-arranged, and I have had several repetitions of the experiment considered by the Committee of the Dialectical Society to be conclusive, viz.: the movement of a heavy table in full light, the chairs turned with their backs to the table, about a foot off, and each person kneeling in his chair, but not touching the table. On one occasion this took place when I was moving about so as to see how everyone was placed. On five separate occasions a heavy dining table rose from a few inches to 18 inches off the floor under special circumstances when trickery was impossible. On another occasion I witnessed a chair, with a lady sitting on it, rise several inches from the ground, and on another occasion two children rose from the floor with their chairs in full daylight under most satisfactory conditions, for I was kneeling and keeping close watch on the feet of the chair."

"I would again remind my readers," he explains, "that what I relate has not been accomplished at the house of a medium, but in *my own house, where preparations have been quite impossible.*"

"A medium walking into my dining room," he goes on, "cannot, while seated in one part of the room with a number of persons keenly watching him, by trickery, make an accordeon play *in my own hand* when I hold it keys downwards, or cause the same accordeon to *float about the room* playing all the time; he cannot introduce machinery which will wave window curtains or *pull up Venetian blinds 8ft. off*; tie a knot in a handkerchief and place it in a far corner of the room; sound notes on a distant piano; cause a card plate to float about the room; raise a water bottle and tumbler from the table; *make a coral necklace rise on end*; *cause a fan to move about and fan company*; or set in motion a pendulum when enclosed in a glass case firmly cemented to the wall."

Describing certain luminous appearances he has seen, he says: "I have seen luminous points of light darting about and settling on the heads of different persons; I have had questions answered by the flashing of a bright light a desired number of times *in front of my face*; I have seen sparks of light; rising from the table to the ceiling and again falling upon the table, striking it with an audible sound; I have had an alphabetic communication given by luminous flashes occurring before me in the air *whilst my hand was moving about amongst them*; and under the strictest test conditions I have more than once had a solid, self-luminous crystalline body placed in my hand *by a hand which did not belong to any person in the room*. In the light, I have seen a luminous cloud over a heliotrope flower, *break a sprig off and carry the sprig to a lady*; and on some occasions I have seen a similar luminous cloud *visibly condense to the form of a hand and carry small objects about.*"

He proceeds to say: "A beautifully-formed small hand rose up from an opening in a dining table and *gave me a flower*; it appeared and then disappeared three times at intervals, affording me ample opportunity of satisfying myself that it was *as real in appearance as my own*. This occurred in the light in my own room whilst I was holding the medium's hands and feet. At another time a finger and thumb were seen to pick the petals from a flower in the medium's buttonhole and lay them in front of several persons who were sitting near him. On another occasion, a small hand and arm, like a baby's, appeared playing about a lady who was sitting next to me; it then passed to me and patted my arm and pulled my coat several times. A hand has been repeatedly seen by myself and others playing the keys of an accordeon, both of the medium's hands being visible at the time and sometimes being held by those near him. To the touch the hand sometimes appears icy cold and dead; at other times warm and lifelike, *grasping my own with the firm pressure of an old friend.*"

"A phantom form came from the corner of the room, *took an accordeon in its hand* and then glided about the room playing the instrument. The form was *visible to all present* for many minutes, the medium also being seen at the same time. Coming rather close to a lady who was sitting apart from the rest of the company, she gave a slight cry, upon which it vanished."

Describing his experiences with direct writing—that is writing which has not been produced by any person present—Sir William says; "A luminous hand came down from the upper part of the room, and after hovering

near me for a few seconds, *took the pencil from my hands*, rapidly wrote on a sheet of paper, threw the pencil down, and then rose up over our heads, gradually fading into darkness."

"My second instance of this character," he continues, "may be considered the record of a failure. A good failure often teaches more than the most successful experiment. It took place in the light, in my own room, with only a few private friends and the medium present. Several circumstances, to which I need not further allude, had shown that the power that evening was strong. I therefore expressed a wish to witness the actual production of a written message such as I had heard described a short time before by a friend. Immediately an alphabetic communication was made as follows—"We will try." A pencil and some sheets of paper had been lying on the centre of the table; presently *the pencil rose up on its point*, and after advancing by hesitating jerks to the paper, fell down. It then rose and again fell. A third time it tried, but with no better result. After three unsuccessful attempts, a small wooden lath, which was lying near upon the table, slid towards the pencil, and rose a few inches from the table; the pencil rose again, and *propping itself against the lath, the two together made an effort to mark the paper*. It fell, and then a joint effort was again made. After a third trial the lath gave it up, and moved back to its place; the pencil lay as it fell across the paper, and an alphabetic message told us—"We have tried to do as you asked, but our power is exhausted"

"On another occasion the same lath moved across the table to me in the light, and delivered a message to me by *tapping my hand*, I repeating the alphabet and the lath tapping me at the right letters. The other end of the lath was resting on the table some distance from the medium's hands. The taps were so sharp and clear, and the lath was evidently so *well under control of the invisible power which was governing its movements*, that I said—"Can the intelligence governing the motion of this lath change the character of the movements and give me a telegraphic message through the Morse alphabet by taps on my hands?" Immediately I said this the character of the taps changed and the message was continued in the way I had requested. The letters were given too rapidly for me to do more than catch a word here and there, and consequently I lost the message, but I heard sufficient to convince me that *there was a good Morse operator at the other end of the line, wherever that might be*"

An experiment designed to demonstrate that *matter can pass through matter* by the application of those higher chemical principles known to these alleged invisible intelligences is recorded as follows:—"The circumstance occurred in the light one Sunday night, only the medium and members of my family being present. My wife and I had been spending the day in the country, and had brought home a few flowers she had gathered. On reaching home we gave them to the servant to put into water, As we were sitting in the dining room the servant brought in the flowers, which she had arranged in a vase. I placed it in the centre of the dining table, which was without a cloth. This was the first time the medium had seen these flowers. Presently a luminous hand was seen hovering over the bouquet of flowers, and then, in full view of all present, a piece of China grass, 15 inches long, which formed the centra ornament of the bouquet, slowly rose from the other flowers and then descended to the table in front of the vase. It did not *stop* on reaching the table, but *went though it*, and we all watched it until it had entirely passed through. Immediately on the disappearance of the grass my wife, who was sitting near the medium, saw a hand come up from under the table between them, *holding the piece of grass. It tapped her on the shoulder two or three times* with a sound audible to all, then laid the grass on the floor and disappeared. During the time this was taking place, the medium's hands were seen by all to be quietly resting on the table in front of him. The place where the grass disappeared was 18 inches from his hands."

A Visitor from the other World.

I could go on enumerating instances of the remarkable phenomena which this illustrious Scientist has witnessed, but must conclude by briefly relating the most sensational of all his experiences, which occurred during the presence in his own home of a Miss Florence Cook, whom Sir Wm. Crookes describes as a young, sensitive, innocent girl. For three years, he tells us, he was almost daily visited by the beautiful spirit form of a young woman who, as a matter of convenience, was named Katie King, and who, to all intents and purposes, appeared to be a veritable human being.

"On one occasion," says Sir William, "for nearly two hours Katie walked about the room, *conversing familiarly with those present*. Several times she *took my arm* when walking, and the impression was conveyed to my mind that it was a living woman by my side, *instead of a visitor from the other world*." He then describes how he clasped her in his arms and found her as material a being as the medium herself. He also tells us that he took several *flashlight photographs* of his mysterious friend, and that on one of these occasions "*Katie muffled her medium's head up in a shawl to prevent the light falling upon her face*."

"It was a common thing," he adds, "for 7 or 8 of us in the laboratory to see the medium and Katie at the same time under the *full blaze of the electric light*."

In the photographs Katie is half a head taller than the medium, and looks a big woman in comparison with her. "But," he goes on, "photography is as inadequate to depict the perfect beauty of Katie's face as words are powerless to describe her charming manner. Photography may, indeed, give a map of her face, but how can it reproduce the brilliant purity of her complexion, or the ever-varying expression of her mobile features, now overshadowed with sadness when relating some of the bitter experiences of her past life, now smiling with all the innocence of happy girlhood *when she had collected my children around her* and was amusing them by recounting anecdotes of her adventures in India."

Alfred Russel Wallace,

F.R.S., D.C.L., L.L.D.

Foremost Living European Naturalist.

"Spiritualistic phenomena in their entirety do not require further confirmation."

Katie had always explained that she was an Indian in her earth life. She was attired in flowing raiment and always wore a turban. "The medium's hair," continues the narrator, "is so dark a brown as almost to appear black; a lock of Katie's, which is now before me, *and which she allowed me to cut from her luxuriant tresses*, having first traced it up to the scalp and satisfied myself that it actually grew there, is *a rich golden auburn*. One evening I tried Katie's pulse. It beat steadily at 75, whilst the medium's pulse, a little time after, was going at the usual rate of 90. On applying my ear to Katie's chest I heard a heart beating rhythmically inside and pulsating even more steadily than did the medium's heart," and Katie's lungs were found to be sounder than the medium's.

At the end of this three years' continuous companionship, Katie having appeared nearly every day and vanished mysteriously at night, she intimated one day that she intended to take her departure for good. There was quite a pathetic leave-taking, the details of which will be found in the work, "Researches into the Phenomena of Modern Spiritualism," and in commenting on this most wonderful of all the incidents recorded in the annals of psychical research, Sir William Crookes says:—

"To imagine that the medium, an innocent school girl of 15, should be able to conceive and then successfully carry out for three years so gigantic an imposture as this, and in that time should submit to any test that might be imposed upon her, should bear the strictest scrutiny, should be willing to be searched at any time, either before or after the seance, and should meet with even better success in my own house than at that of her parents, knowing that she visited me with the express object of submitting to strict Scientific tests—to imagine, I say, the Katie King of the last three years to be the result of imposture, does more violence to one's reason and common sense than to believe her to be what she herself affirms."

It may interest the reader to add that Sir William Crookes declares that the production of the phenomena he has witnessed was generally preceded by a peculiar cold air, sometimes amounting to a decided wind. "I have had sheets of paper blown about by it," he says, "and a thermometer lowered several degrees."

Just ten years ago this distinguished Scientist had the honor of being President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, and in the course of his courageous Presidential address he emphatically re-affirmed all that he had said and written on the subject for many years previously, whilst as recently as two years since he again publicly declared his conviction that "he had witnessed and proved to be genuine certain phenomena which cannot be explained by any Scientific knowledge possessed by us at present." On that occasion, the celebration of his golden wedding, he added—"I have studied these phenomena for over twenty-five years, and Sir Oliver Lodge is as keen a student of them as myself. *It is certain that a great many persons are seriously studying the subject to-day*"

Dr. A. Russel Wallace, F.R.S., L.L.D., D.C.L.

Photographs of Invisible Beings.

No name is better known amongst Britishers than that of Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, F.R.S., L.L.D., D.C.L., the foremost living European naturalist, who simultaneously with, and independent of, Darwin, worked out the theory of Evolution which is to-day accepted by all Scientific minds. It was as far back as 1851—at which time he was a Materialist—that he commenced his investigations into these remarkable phenomena, but it was not for some years afterwards that he became convinced of their *Spiritual* origin, and then only after having instituted the most conclusive tests and conducted the most exhaustive inquiries. His experiences were in many respects similar to those of Sir William Crookes, and therefore there is no necessity to go into details. I may mention, however, that he has several references in his book, "A Defence of Modern Spiritualism," to the arrival of flowers in his presence by what he declares to be the agency of invisible carriers, and one or two

instances may be related as an addition to the variety of the phenomena already set forth.

Describing one of his experiences under strictly test conditions, he says that "upon a bare table, in a small closed room, a quantity of flowers appeared consisting of Anemones, Tulips, Chrysanthemums, Chinese Primroses, and several Ferns. They were as absolutely fresh as if gathered from a conservatory, and were covered with a fine, cold dew. Not a petal was crumpled or broken, not the most delicate point or pinnule of the ferns was out of place." Dr. Wallace dried and preserved the whole of them.

Similar phenomena have occurred hundreds of times, he says; sometimes the flowers have been in vast quantities heaped upon the table. Often flowers and fruit asked for are brought. "*A friend of mine asked for a sunflower,*" he adds, "and one 6ft. high fell upon the table, having a large mass of earth about its roots." "Surely these are phenomena about which there can be no mistake," he exclaims. "What theories have ever been proposed by our Scientific teachers which even attempt to account for them? Delusion it cannot be, for *the flowers are real* and can be preserved and imposture under the conditions imposed is even less credible."

He further tells us that he has carried out many tests in spirit photography, and avers that this has now been successfully done under such convincing conditions that "the evidence is of such a nature as to satisfy anyone who will take the trouble to examine it." He thereupon proceeds to lay this evidence before the reader, and avers that "*clearly recognisable likenesses of deceased persons and friends have often been obtained.*" He cites these instances in detail and says he has himself gone secretly to a photographer and "obtained a most unmistakable likeness of a deceased relative." These results have been obtained both with professional and amateur photographers, and Dr. Wallace declares that "*they establish as a Scientific fact the objective existence of invisible human forms and definite invisible actinic images.*"

He reviews with a masterly pen the vast mass of Scientific evidence in support of the theory that the invisible and visible worlds interblend, and in conclusion states—"My position, therefore, is that *Spiritualistic phenomena in their entirety do not require further confirmation.* They are proved quite as well as any facts are proved in other Sciences; and it is not denial or quibbling that can disprove any of them, but only fresh facts and accurate deductions from those facts. This being the state of the case as regards evidence and proof, we are fully justified in taking the facts (*and with them the Spiritual theory as the only tenable one*) as being *fully established.*"

Sir Oliver Lodge, F.R.S., Dr. Sc., L.L.B.

An Address That Amazed The World.

Now I come to Sir Oliver Lodge, F.R.S., Dr. Sc., L.L.B., the brilliant and level-headed physicist whom we all admire and who is at the present time Professor of Physics of Birmingham University, of which scholastic institution he is the able Principal. We admire him for his distinguished attainments and also for the deeply religious sentiment that permeates his nature. He is also one of the intellectual ornaments of the Psychical Research Society of England and for very many years has devoted close attention to this absorbing and all-important problem. His religious fervour appears to have spurred him on in his investigations to discover the whereabouts and conditions of the "Unknown": because he realizes that it is only through the demonstrations of Science that the fact of an after-life can be established and because he sees that the proof of that fact will sound the death-knell of that spirit of Materialism which has so lamentably arrested the Spiritual movements of the world. The details of the nature of the phenomena Sir Oliver has witnessed have not yet been published, and therefore I will simply reproduce in his own language an extract from an address delivered by him before the Society for Psychical Research as recently as the end of January last. He says :—

"The phenomena of automatic writing strikes some of us as if it was in the direct line of evolutionary advance—it seems like the beginning of a new human faculty. First of all, the evidence led us to realise the truth of telepathy; and that was the first chapter of the new volume that we have set ourselves to explore.

"I am going to assume, in fact, that our bodies can, under certain exceptional circumstances, be controlled, directly or temporarily possessed, by another or foreign intelligence, operating either on the whole or on some limited part of it. The question lying behind such a hypothesis, and justifying it or negating it, is the root question of identity—the identity of the control.

"This question of identity is, of course, a fundamental one. The controlling spirit proves his identity mainly by reproducing, in speech or writing, facts which belong to his memory, and not to the automatisms memory. And notice that proof of identity will usually depend on the memory of trifles. The objection raised that communications too often relate to trivial subjects shows a lack of intelligence, or, at least, of due thought on the part of the critic. Our object is to get, not something dignified, but something evidential; and what evidence of persistent memory can be better than the recollection of trifling incidents which, for some personal reason,

happen to have made a permanent impression ?

"We find the late Edmund Gurney and the late Richard Hodgson and the late F. W. H. Myers, with some other less known names, constantly purporting to communicate with us with the express purpose of patiently proving their identity, and giving us cross-correspondence between different mediums. We also find them answering specific questions in a manner characteristic of their known personalities, and giving evidence of knowledge appropriate to them.

"Not easily or early do we make this admission. In spite of long conversations with what purport to be the surviving intelligences of these friends and investigators, we were by no means convinced of their identity by mere general conversation, even when of a friendly and intimate character such as, in normal cases, would be considered amply and overwhelmingly sufficient for the identification of friends speaking, let us say, through a telephone or a typewriter. We required definite and crucial proof, a proof difficult even to imagine, as well as difficult to supply.

"The ostensible communicators realise the need of such proof just as fully as we do, and have done their best to satisfy the rational demand. Some of us think they have succeeded; others are still doubtful.

Sir Oliver Lodge,

F.R.S., Dr. Sc., L.L.B.

Celebrated British Physicist and Principal of Birmingham University.

"We are beginning to hear, now and again, the strokes of the pickaxes of our comrades on the other side."

"I am one of those who, though they would like to see further and more continued proofs, are of opinion that a good case has been made out, and that, as the best working hypothesis at the present time, it is legitimate to grant that lucid moments of intercourse with deceased persons may, in the best cases, supervene amid a mass of supplementary material.

"What we have to announce is the reception by old but developing methods of carefully constructed evidence of identity more exact and more nearly complete than perhaps ever before. There has been distinct co-operation between those on the material side and those on the immaterial side.

"Cross-correspondence—that is the reception of part of a message through one medium and part through another, neither portion separately being understood by either—is good evidence of one intelligence dominating both automatists. And, if the message is characteristic of some particular deceased person, and is received as such by people to whom he was not intimately known, then it is fair proof of the continued intellectual activity of that person. If, further, we get from him a piece of literary criticism which is eminently in his vein, and has not occurred to ordinary people, then I say the proof, already striking, is tending to become crucial. These are the kinds of proof which the Society has had communicated to it. The boundary between the two states—the present and the future—is still substantial, but it is wearing thin in places. Like excavators engaged in boring a tunnel from opposite ends, amid the roar of water and other noises we are beginning to hear, now and again, the strokes of the pickaxes of our comrades on the other side."

This sensational deliverance stirred and amazed the more sceptical in Scientific circles and among the public generally and a full report of the experiments upon which Sir Oliver Lodge bases his conclusions is looked for with interest.

Significant Press Comments.

The Christian World, the leading Non-conformist organ of England, in a leading article displaying keen interest in the discussion evoked by the foregoing address, says: "Whatever may be the findings on this particular side of its inquiries, it is certain that the investigations of the Psychical Research Society have already more than justified its existence. . . Thanks to its inquiries and the stimulus they have given to psychological research, we are getting a new map of the human soul. The wonders they have reduced to a Science—such as Telepathy and Hypnotism—should leave us, *at least with an open mind*, for that more daring investigation which seeks to wring from Nature her so jealously-guarded secret of what lies on the farther side of death."

The Liverpool Mercury, one of the largest and most influential daily papers published in England, recently stated in a leading article that Sir Wm. Crookes deserved a Victoria Cross for his courage in publishing the results of his psychical experiences, and proceeded to state—

"Only a few days ago Sir Oliver Lodge announced his definite belief that he had established communication with his departed friend Myers. When Sir Oliver publishes the evidence on which his belief reposes we may be compelled respectfully and reluctantly to contend that the evidence is insufficient to establish the conclusion. Meanwhile, we should like to point out that his announcement is not a fit subject for ignorant ridicule, and that he is not a man whose opinions as to observed facts and Scientific inferences can be lightly waved aside.

"The persons who are really foolish and incredulously credulous are those who fail to perceive the enormous importance of the investigation to which Sir Oliver Lodge has applied his powerful mind. He may fail to obtain any positive results, but there is certainly no other question to which a great man might devote his intellect and energy with a larger hope of serving mankind.

"If a man could lay him down on his deathbed with the same rational expectation of waking up as he has of rising in the morning when he goes to bed at night, the whole aspect of human life would be changed. We have, of course, now all the consolations of faith—reasonable and well-grounded faith; but—why deceive ourselves?—there is a great gulf between faith and knowledge.

"If men not only believed but knew that there was for them a life beyond the grave, the mystery of pain and sin would melt away, the decline of old age would be an interesting episode, the buoyant hopes of youth would gladden the whole human race, the sting of death would vanish, and sorrow and sighing would flee away.

"The greatest mystery of all is the indisposition of men to investigate the obstacles that bar the way to this blessed certitude, and their readiness to ridicule those who do have the courage to investigate them."

Mr. Cromwell Varley, F.R.S

Striking Evidence of a Great Electrician.

In the course of my investigation of this subject I was greatly impressed by some of the evidence on psychic phenomena contained in the Report of the London Dialectical Society published in 1871, and the witness whose testimony produced the greatest effect on my mind was no less a celebrity than Mr. Cromwell F. Varley, F.R.S., the distinguished electrician who has won enduring fame by his association with the brilliant feat of laying the Atlantic cable. At the outset of his evidence before the specially-appointed Committee of the Society named he said—"I was a sceptic when these matters first came under my notice in 1850." He then proceeded to narrate many marvellous phenomena he had witnessed in the course of his investigations and spoke of their production as being the results of the operations of the *spirits of men who formerly lived upon the earth.*

"My authority for asserting that the spirits of kindred beings to ourselves *do* visit us," he said, "is (1) I have on several occasions distinctly seen them. (2) On several occasions things known only to myself and to the deceased person purporting to communicate with me, have been correctly stated, while the medium was unaware of any of the circumstances. (3) On several occasions things known only to our two selves, *and which I had entirely forgotten*, have been recalled to my mind by the communicating spirit, therefore this could not be a case of mere thought-reading. (4) On some occasions when the communications have been made to me I have put my questions *mentally*, while the medium—a private lady in an independent position—has written out the answers, she being quite unconscious of the meaning of the communications. (5) The time and nature of coming events, unanticipated and unknown both to myself and the medium have, on more than one occasion, been accurately made known to me several days in advance. As my invisible informants told me the truth regarding the coming events, and also stated that they were spirits, and as no mortals in the room had any knowledge of some of the facts they communicated, I see no reason to disbelieve them,"

In concluding his voluminous testimony he added—"I have now told you about as much as I am able : what I have stated is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth; *I have been most careful to believe nothing until unbelief became impossible*; I firmly believe from the facts I have alluded to that we are not our bodies, that *when we die we exist just as much as before*, and that under certain conditions we are able to hold communication with those on earth."

Dialectical Committee's Report.

As far back as the year 1869 a Committee of the Dialectical Society, which was established "for the purpose of considering all subjects with a view to the discovery and elucidation of Truth," was appointed to investigate these extraordinary phenomena. In that year Sir John Lubbock—now Lord Avebury—the distinguished Naturalist and Anthropologist, was President of the Society.

The Committee consisted of 36 members, who were sub-divided into six Sub-committees, each of which conducted experiments with different mediums under conditions which the investigators admitted precluded the possibility of fraud or delusion, and in the course of its very voluminous Report it stated that "*four-fifths* of the members were at the outset *opposed* to Spiritualism," but "they considered it incumbent upon them to state their conviction that the subject is worthy of more serious attention and careful investigation than it has hitherto received," and added that "*the manifestations were witnessed without the aid or presence of any professional medium.*"

Ven. Arehdeacon Colley.

Marvellous Materialisations Described.

I do not intend during the course of this survey to deal at any length with any other than the testimony of Scientists—with one exception. That exception is the Ven. Arehdeacon Colley, Rector of Stockton, Warwickshire, England. I make this exception because of the responsible and sacred position he occupies; because of the high esteem in which he is held for his personal integrity and candour; because of the bewildering nature of his experiences, and because those experiences corroborate the declarations of Scientific investigators whose verdict we cannot treat with disrespect.

I can only give a very brief outline of the lecture delivered by the Ven. Arehdeacon during the week of the Church Congress at Weymouth, England, in October, 1905, in the presence of a large audience, including two Bishops and fifteen clergymen of the Church of England. What is known as the materialisation of spirit bodies—the clothing of themselves with that mysterious and subtle substance which they draw from certain mediums—is one of the phases of the more advanced mediumistic phenomena, and is now witnessed in circumstances where the necessary delicate and harmonious conditions prevail. It is with this form of phenomena that the Arehdeacon exclusively deals. He goes as far back as 1877 and relates:—

"Five of us were one night with our esteemed medium at my rooms, Russell Square, London. The first abnormal form that came to us on this occasion was that of a little child of six or seven years of age. This small figure, in view of us all—three gas jets being full on at the time—grew into life before us. I, with my left hand at his back, upheld the entranced medium, having thus the best opportunity that could be desired for closely observing what took place.

Ven. Arehdeacon Colley,

Rector of Stockton, Warwickshire, England.

"Spiritualism comes as a real God-send to save men from the Sadducean Materialism that looks for no hereafter beyond the grave."

"In expectation of a materialisation, there was seen steaming, as from a kettle spout, through the texture and substance of the medium's black coat, a little below the medium's left breast, a vapourous filament, which would be almost invisible until within an inch or two of our medium's body. It grew in density to a cloudy something, from which (and apparently using the same for the quick evolving of much white raiment) there would step forth, a little maiden, boldly and naturally, as with other of our psychic visitors.

"The child form, now abnormally present with us, clad in white, and having beautiful golden hair, had all the actions of human girlhood; *clapped her little hands*; pursed its mouth for the kisses we each gave it; *spoke in childish manner*, with a slight lisp—the medium, like an elder brother, instructing and sending the little one hither and thither to bring this thing or that from different parts of the room, which she went for and brought us in a way quite natural. Then drawing with winsome confidence to the author of its temporary being, the medium, the dainty creature was gradually absorbed, and disappeared, to melt again into our friend's body.

"How could the most St. Thomas sceptic, in the best sense of weighing and pondering these things, hold out against what was vouchsafed me one memorable Tuesday evening, when, as the living gate for the extrusion of spirit forms from the realm of mind into this world of matter, the medium received back into himself *a perfect form of exquisite womanhood* that had companied with us for a while? For I led it to him, as he stood up to receive back at my hands this marvellous aeon or emanation—human-spiritual. And as I brought my sweet companion close up to him, the gossamer filament again came into view; its attenuated and vanishing point being, as before, towards the heart.

"Greatly wondering, yet keen to observe, did I notice how, by means of this vapoury core, the psychic figure was sucked back into the figure of the medium. For, like a waterspout—funnel-shaped, or sand column, such as I have seen in Egypt—horizontal instead of vertical, the vital power of our friend appeared to draw in the spirit form: but, at my desire, so gradually, that I was enabled quite leisurely thus closely to watch the process. For, leaning against and holding the medium with my left arm at his back, and my left ear and cheek at his breast, his heart beating in an alarming way, I saw him receive back the lovely birth of the invisible into his robust and corporeal person. And as I gazed on the sweet face of the disintegrating spirit, *within three or four inches of its features*, I again marked the fair lineaments, eyes, hair, and delicate complexion, and kissed the dainty hand as in process of absorption it dissolved and was drawn through the texture and substance of his black coat positively into our friend's bosom.

"How, then, could I with the evidence of my senses, and many opportunities in this way for their exercise,

be other than a Spiritualist? Well, indeed, might the noble-hearted Bishop Colenso, when I first spoke of these things to him in Natal, exclaim, 'I would, Arehdeacon, readily give my right arm to see what you tell me.'

Arehdeacon Colley next tells of a materialised spirit form that often came in the same way—a former earth friend and *brother minister* of the medium. "It was desired, if it were not dangerous, that the controls should awaken the medium in order that he might see his old friend. This was done and the scene that followed may better be imagined than described. Dazed for a moment, and then most astonished, the aroused medium looked at the spirit-form and jumping up from the sofa he excitedly pushed forward to his at one time fellow-student, shouting, 'Why, it is Sam ! I declare it is Sam !' And there was *hand-shaking and brotherly greetings between the two*. The remarkable thing was that both could not speak at the same time. One had to remain silent when the other was speaking, but they *walked about the room together* in quite a joyous mood. At last the spirit form was absorbed by the medium; then it took control and *spoke to the sitters* ."

The Arehdeacon concludes: "I am not astonished at the incredulity of the ignorant touching these astounding marvels, for even now, after all my large experience, the things I have witnessed and recorded are so *over-whelming*, that should a cessation of these inexplicable phenomena take place, and should the progress of these miraculous things be arrested, and further evidence of the reality of what *I know to be true* not be forthcoming, the future might perhaps find me in a doubtful mood relative to matter most assured; yea, incredulous, perchance regarding what I have pledged my word as a clergyman for the truth of, and *imperilled my clerical position* and prospect carefully and accurately to report."

Professor Zöllner,

"I Shook Hands with a Friend from the other World."

We will now cross from England to Germany and see what the late Professor Zöllner has to say—a man who stood as high in Scientific attainment in Germany as does Sir Wm. Crookes in England to-day. His exalted status is indicated by the fact that he was Professor of Physical Astronomy at the University of Leipsic; Member of the Royal Saxon Society of Sciences; Foreign Member of the Royal Astronomical Society of London, and of the Imperial Academy of Natural Philosophers at Moscow, &c., &c.

For very many years he was engaged in the investigation of similar phenomena to those inquired into by Sir Wm. Crookes, but with different mediums, and he published a work, entitled "Transcendental Physics," giving a very comprehensive record of his experiences and conclusions. These conclusions may be gleaned from the very gracefully-penned note to Sir Wm. Crookes, to whom he dedicates his book and which opens with these words:—

"With the feeling of sincere gratitude, and recognition of your immortal deserts in the foundation of a new Science, I dedicate to you, highly honoured colleague, this third volume of Scientific Treatises. By a strange conjunction our Scientific endeavours have met upon the same field of light and of a new class of physical phenomena which proclaim to astonished mankind, with assurance no longer doubtful, the existence of another material and intelligent world. . . To you ingratitude and scorn have been abundantly dealt out by the blind representatives of modern Science, and by the multitude befooled by their erroneous teachings. May you be consoled by the consciousness that the undying splendour with which the names of a Newton and a Faraday have illustrated the history of the English people can be obscured by nothing; not even by the political decline of your great nation : even so will your name survive in the history of culture, adding a new ornament to those with which the English nation has endowed the human race. Your courage, your admirable acuteness in experiment, and your incomparable perseverance, will raise for you a memorial in the hearts of grateful posterity as indestructible as the marble of the statues of Westminster. Accept, then, this work as a token of thanks and sympathy poured out to you from an honest German heart."

Professor Zöllner had associated with him, in conducting his experiments, Professor Weber, known as the founder of the doctrine of the Vibration of Forces; Professor Scheibner of the Leipsic University, a highly-distinguished Mathematician, and Professor Fechner, eminent as a Natural Philosopher. These were the men who witnessed the phenomena I am about to relate, and who, like Wallace, Crookes, Lombroso, and others, were transformed from Materialist sceptics into confirmed believers in the existence of an unseen world and of the survival of the human personality after death.

And what was the nature of the phenomena which brought home conviction to these shrewd, exacting, level-headed men of Science—men who introduced every precaution against trickery and delusion that human ingenuity could possibly conceive? I will briefly summarise some of the more remarkable occurrences, as detailed in Zöllner's standard work, and it may be as well to point out that most of them took place in Zöllner's private house or in a University laboratory.

A single endless cord was procured by Zöllner—that is, a cord with its ends tied together and sealed—and in the space of a few minutes four knots were tied in the cord and these knots were of such a character that they could not be untied without cutting the cord. The experiment occurred in bright daylight and the seal and cord were all the time in sight. This phenomenon occurred several times at different sittings and the medium's hands were always in view and did not touch the string.

While some slate writing was going on, a bed, which stood in the room behind a screen, suddenly moved about two feet from the wall, pushing the screen outwards. The medium was more than four feet distant from the bed, had his back turned towards it and his legs crossed. At a subsequent sitting a violent crack was suddenly heard, as of the discharge of a large battery of Leyden jars, and the aforementioned screen fell apart in two pieces. The medium was sitting at least five feet from the screen, and "we were all astonished at this unexpected and violent manifestation of mechanical force, and asked the medium what it all meant, but he only shrugged his shoulders, saying that such a phenomenon occasionally occurred in his presence." A folding slate, purchased by Zöllner himself, was placed on the table, and as soon as the medium placed his hand on it, writing began on the *inner surface*, and when it was opened the following sentence was found in English—"It was not our intention to do harm; forgive what has happened."

On another occasion, in the morning, a large hand-bell which had been placed under the table where the medium could not possibly reach it, began to ring and was then "*violently projected before all our eyes about ten feet distant.*" A small paper thermometer case was laid upon the slate and disappeared, and after three minutes re-appeared. Professor Scheibner took an accordeon in his hand when it began to play a tune without the medium touching it, and the bell under the table again rang violently. Suddenly a *small reddish-brown hand* appeared at the edge of the table, visible to all, and *moved itself vivaciously* for two seconds. This phenomenon was repeated several times. Whilst an open slate lay upon the floor under the table "writing, perceptibly with a slate pencil placed near at hand, began upon the slate and when it was raised there were on it the words—"Truth will overcome all error."

Regularly at almost all the sittings these Scientific investigators felt the touch of hands under the table, and in order to obtain proof of the presence of these hands a bowl was filled with wheat flour and placed under the table. "Suddenly," says Zöllner, "*I felt my right knee powerfully grasped and pressed by a large hand under the table for about a second*, and at the same moment the bowl of meal was pushed forward from its place under the table about four feet on the floor. Upon my trousers I had the *impression in meal of a strong hand* and on the meal surface of the bowl were indented the thumb and four fingers with all the niceties and structures and folds of the skin impressed. An immediate examination of the medium's hands showed not the slightest traces of flour, and a comparison of his own hand with the impression on the meal proved the latter to be considerably larger. The impression is still in my possession."

At a subsequent sitting a piece of coal the size of a fist fell suddenly from the ceiling, and half an hour later a piece of wood fell in a similar manner. One morning whilst Zöllner stood talking to Professor Scheibner "we saw my pocket knife," he says, "fly through the air and strike the forehead of my friend Scheibner with some force, the scar remaining visible on the following day. Since, at the time of the accident, I was conversing with the medium, and the latter had his back turned at a distance of about ten feet, the medium, at any rate, could not have thrown the knife at my friend's head."

This was exciting, no doubt, but the experiments which Zöllner treated as being of much greater importance were those in which *permanent impressions of contact* were left behind, as was the case with the impression of the hand in the bowl of flour. He, accordingly, placed a sheet of paper, covered all over with lampblack, under the table, when suddenly the board was pushed forward with force, and on inspecting it there was on it the impression of a *naked left foot*. The medium had his shoes and stockings on at the time and the impression of the foot on the paper was considerably larger than the medium's foot. The experiment was repeated at the next sitting, and the impression of the same left foot was left upon the blackened paper. "I have had this impression reproduced photographically on a reduced scale."

At a later sitting an even more remarkable result was experienced. Zöllner bought a folding slate and lined the inner surfaces with paper upon which he spread lamp black. He closed the slate and *kept it on his own knees* so that he could continually observe it. Five minutes later, in a brightly lighted room, he felt *on two occasions* the slate pressed down upon his lap without anybody touching it. Three raps on the table announced that all was complete, and when he opened the slate there was on the one side the impression of a *right foot* and on the other side that of a *left foot*.

On another occasion all the furniture in the drawing room was turned upside down, and the upright piano was lain prone upon the carpet flat on its face. "It required two strong men to lift up the piano and restore it to its proper position," says Zöllner.

Then he tells us of chairs being threaded on the arms of persons while they were firmly holding the hands of others. "I have seen the chairs on the arms of seven persons," he continues, "whose word I could perfectly

trust, but I wished to make assurance doubly sure, so, at a recent seance, I tied two wrists together with a cotton thread. In three seconds the chair was hanging upon the arm of one and I found the thread unbroken. I then held the hand of the medium as firmly as possible in mine, and in an instant the chair, one of our cane seats with bent backs, was hanging on my arm. *This beyond all doubt*" he adds, "*was matter passing through matter,*" but whether the wood passed through flesh and bone, or flesh and bone passed through wood, I have not yet been able to determine."

At noon on another day *at his request* a chair walked forward on two of its legs, placing itself at the table, travelling a distance of *six feet*, and pressed against his knee carressingly. "It was a weird spectacle," says Zöllner, "but it was also a very interesting fact, seen for ten or fifteen minutes by four persons *without the possibility of trick or hallucination.*" "Then the light was turned off for a minute or so, during which time we heard rapid movements of a pencil and on re-lighting the gas we found on the marked sheet of paper the portrait of a deceased friend and a letter of more than a page *in the well-known hand writing of a beloved child whose spirit often visits us.* I have now from her hands *five elaborate drawings and four letters*, no one of which occupied two minutes under absolutely test conditions. No living artist could make the drawings in from ten to twenty times the time occupied in their production."

A materialised hand appeared at another sitting and *pinched him so violently* that he could not help crying out, and on a subsequent occasion Professor Weber's coat was unbuttoned *by a visible and tangible hand*, and his gold watch was taken from his pocket and placed gently in his right hand.

A small round table, at a later date, completely vanished from sight, and after the most rigid search it was nowhere to be found. Five or six minutes later, at a height of about 5ft., the lost table, *with its legs turned upwards* floated down in the air upon the card table, striking Zöllner so violently on the side of the head that he felt the pain for four hours.

Another very striking experiment proving the passage of a physical substance through matter was conducted as follows:—Two large wooden rings were tied together with cat-gut, and the knot sealed. Zöllner held the cat-gut at the other end and allowed the rings to dangle from the end of the table. The medium did not touch either the cat-gut or the rings. Zöllner requested the Sketch of woden table invisible operators to intertwine the two rings without injuring either the cat-gut or the rings. Shortly afterwards they heard a rattling sound. "To our great astonishment," he says, "we found the two wooden rings which, about six minutes previously were strung on the cat-gut, which was in complete preservation, encircling the leg of a small table," like a gipsy table, which was at the opposite end of the table at which the investigators were sitting. The table was afterwards photographed with the rings on its legs, as will be seen from the accompanying illustration.

One day Zöllner bought two shells from a dealer, and at a sitting placed the smaller shell under the larger, so that the smaller one was completely hidden, and without the medium touching the shells or being near them the smaller one was removed from its prison and placed in another part of the room—"another instance," says Zöllner, "of matter passing through matter." On being examined the small shell was so *hot* that Zöllner nearly let it drop.

"Nothing is more convincing of *the operations of invisible intelligences,*" declares Zöllner, "than the transport of material bodies from a space *enclosed on every side*" and consequently he sought particularly for this form of evidence. One afternoon he placed a piece of money in a cardboard box and then firmly plastered it up with strips of paper, and although the medium did not touch the box, the coin was removed and deposited elsewhere in the room. On another occasion a large piece of slate pencil was placed inside a sealed-up box by some unseen agency. These experiments were frequently repeated and proved, Zöllner says, "*the apparent passage of matter through matte? in a highly elegant and compendious manner.*" He then passes to the account of further facts observed by him which he avers "*prove the intimate connection of another material world with our own* and which may be considered, in general, as a confirmation of the numerous observations of Sir William Crookes and other physicists."

"One morning while standing in the room with the medium," he says, "we were sprinkled from above by a sort of drizzle. We were both wet on the head, clothes and hands, and the traces of a shower of perhaps one-fourth of a second duration were afterwards clearly perceptible upon the floor of the room." Shortly afterwards the ceiling and walls of the room became moistened, and "judging by the direction and form of the traces of water, they appear to have proceeded from several jets at the same time from a point in the middle of the room, perhaps 4ft. high above our heads."

On another occasion *smoke* arose in three different places with the smell of acid of sulphur and saltpetre. Two candles were placed under the table to see if the invisible beings would light them. "After we had waited for some minutes, smoke rose up again from under the table, almost from all sides, and at the same time one of the candlesticks, *with the candle burning*, hovered up above the edge of the table opposite to me," says Zöllner, "and after a few seconds it sank down again."

Now comes something very exhilarating! "Whilst sitting at a table one day a small handbell hovered down

from the stand on which it stood, lay itself down on the carpet of the floor, and *moved itself forward by jerks* until it got under the table where it began ringing in the most lively manner, and a hand suddenly appeared, *snatched the bell* and placed it in the middle *on top of the table*" The hand appeared again at Zöllner's request, shook hands with him, and thus he says, "I *shook hands with a friend from the other world*" "It had quite a living warmth," he adds, "and returned my pressure heartily." After letting go the hand he got a slate, and held one end and the materialised hand held the other, and "I challenged it to a duel of strength," continues the Professor, "and in the *frequent give and take* I had quite the feeling of an elastic tug as though a man held hold of the slate at the other end. By a *strong wrench* I got possession of it." "I again remark," he emphasises, "that during all these proceedings the medium sat quietly before us, both his hands being covered and *detained by my left hand and by the hands of the others.*"

The foregoing is a brief summary of the experiments conducted by this eminent German Scientist and his intellectual colleagues, and if the reader would like to know more about these marvellous phenomena, I must refer him to Professor Zöllner's work, "Transcendental Physics," from which I have reproduced what I have written.

Professor Morselli.

A Bewildering Series of Phenomena.

Now let us see what the Scientists have been doing in Italy. In no country in the world is such interest being manifested at the present time in these bewildering phenomena as in Italy, where all the leading Scientific giants, including the great Lombroso himself, have been for some years, and are still, holding seances at the Universities of Naples, Turin, Genoa, and Milan.

The medium is an ignorant, ill-bred peasant woman, named Eusapia Paladino, and the investigating Scientists have been allowed to conduct the proceedings on their own conditions and to impose such a rich variety of unique tests as to almost trespass on the verge of the ridiculous. I cannot recount the elaborate precautions they took, notwithstanding the fact that the experiments were made in their own laboratories and that this wonderfully mediumistic woman was the only stranger amongst them. I will therefore ask the reader to take it for granted that they have not left the slightest loophole for fraud or delusion. As exacting Scientists, accustomed to scrutinising things with the greatest care, and trained to weigh and consider the minutest circumstance, it is hardly likely that they would do so.

The source of my information is the *official* Reports written by one or other of these Scientific investigators themselves, signed with their own names and published from time to time in *The Annals of Psychological Science* last year. Their details would cover pages of a newspaper, and therefore what I am about to reproduce is a very brief resume.

I will first deal with the Report of Professor Morselli, Director of the Department of Psychiatry in the University of Genoa, who, up to the time of writing, says that in about 30 sittings he has seen Paladino perform *several hundred phenomena*. I lead off with him because, although he admits that the phenomena are *real and genuine*, and says that in these days only *ignorant people talk about fraud and delusion*, he nevertheless declares that he has no room at present in his mental fabric for any hypothesis pertaining to the "Spiritual," and cannot see anything beyond the realm of the physical Sciences. He, in fact, acknowledges that he simply does not know what is the cause. It is a mystery to him and yet this is what he says :—

"In full light we saw the table raised to the height of our heads while we were *standing up* in the middle of the room. I have also seen the table turn upside down by full gas light. Seats are seen to move at such a distance from the medium as to *render absurd the hypothesis of deception*. Several times I was *pulled violently* on my chair back towards the cabinet to receive special manifestations of a *personal* character.

"Sometimes we felt our chairs pulled from beneath us. Musical instruments (the mandoline, zither, pianoforte, trumpets, etc.) are spontaneously set in action at a distance from the medium—this occurred at almost every sitting. I have witnessed the mysterious opening and closing of the electric circuit of the lights by means of unperceived manipulation of the pear-shaped switches *contained in the pockets of one of the sitters*. It sometimes happens that the medium is lifted bodily, together with her chair, and to her great alarm, deposited on the table. I have only once seen this *miracle contrary to the law of gravitation*.

"A veritable current of air sometimes rushes through the room and it is sometimes intensely cold. Raps are heard—some have the intensity of blows delivered by a *powerful but invisible fist*. In various cases the clapping of hands is heard." "A favourite phenomenon with students of psychical matters," continues Morselli, "is impressions in plastic substances—impressions of fingers, palms, hands, feet, and also of faces. *We obtained many such impressions.*"

Then he goes on—"Apports of various kinds are brought by invisible agency. *These figure as phenomena of the foremost rank, and are of the greatest significance for the Spiritual doctrine of the disintegration and re-constitution of matter*, for it consists in the unexpected appearance on the table or in the room of objects (such as flowers, branches, leaves, coins, stones, etc.) coming from a distance and *penetrating through doors and walls*"

I wish the reader to bear this declaration of Professor Morselli in mind—that the production of these particular phenomena figure in the *foremost rank* and are of the *greatest significance*—because I propose presently to relate some of my own personal experiences as a witness of what I believe to have been the *passage of matter through matter*.

This distinguished narrator proceeds to say that touching, feeling and grasping by invisible hands form a very common phenomenon, and "*they are really human hands*"—this is his exact phraseology—"which touch, press, grasp, pull, push, pat lightly, strike, pull the sitters' beards or hair, take off their spectacles, &c. Some of those to whom such contacts were new have been caused to shudder and really the first time they cause quite an impression. We felt the skin, the warmth, the movable fingers, etc.; materialised forms, tangible but invisible, advance towards the sitters *and embrace them*, draw them nearer or push them away, caress and kiss them with all the movements of living and real persons, *and some have had their pockets searched*"

"*It is all real and authentic*" exclaims this highly intellectual sceptic, "though incomprehensible." At the same time he candidly admits that the Spiritualistic hypothesis covers the whole of the phenomena—if one is prepared to accept it.

He goes on—"Spirit lights are frequently seen: sometimes they are veritable *tongues of fire* like those figured on the heads of the Apostles. They are very evident; sometimes multiple and running together into one."

"*Visible hands appear with elongated fingers and I have seen complete materialisations a few times, but this is not the place for me to relate the particulars of my extraordinary spiritistic adventure—the apparent materialisation of a discarnate being who was very dear to me*" This reference is, presumably, to Professor Morselli's mother, for in the *Annals of Psychical Science* for September *this year* Professor Lombroso, at the outset of an article he contributes, says—"During the first few days after the apparition of his own mother, Morselli admitted to me that he had seen her and had quite a conversation in gestures with her." Morselli, however, has since declared that he cannot feel for certain that it was really his mother, and there the matter ends for the present.

Professor Morselli concludes—"In reality the sitting is sometimes very complicated and different manifestations occur *simultaneously*."

Professor Botazzi.

Several Apparitions at the One Time.

Professor Botazzi, Director of the Physiological Institute at the University of Naples, in his Report gives similar testimony and embraces some additional interesting facts. He says that at the seances he attended the apparitions or materialisations were *numerous and multiple*. "I saw hands and closed fists over the medium's head; sometimes they were of ordinary size, at others at least *three* times larger than Paladino's hand and fist."

"Professor Cardarelli," continues Botazzi, "had, in the right pocket of his waistcoat an elaborate stethoscope taken to pieces and I felt it placed upon my fingers. Professor Cardarelli announced that someone had taken his stethoscope, and it then came against his lips and everyone heard it rap against his teeth. He took it in his hand, but *at the same time a mysterious hand wrenched it forcibly out of his hands*, and in this last exploit the tube of the instrument was somewhat bent."

"My pince-nez fell off my nose," continues Botazzi, "and I distinctly felt soon afterward a very delicate touch on my knee as if a hand were trying to find something, and the pince-nez was immediately placed on my nose *with a very precise action*. Needless to say I was keeping strict control of the medium all the time."

Touching this point of control, I may explain that sometimes as many as four of these dignified Scientists were engaged at the one time in controlling the medium—two of them firmly grasping her legs and the other two holding her securely by the arms. I really don't think they required to do this for their own satisfaction. I think it must have been done to convince others that they left no stone unturned to make fraud an absolute impossibility.

Professor Botazzi continues—"The keys of the type writer were pressed more than once, and twice we heard the movement of fingers running over the notes of the machine with a sound such as one hears when typing is rapidly done. The typewriter

Professor Caesar Lombroso,

Italy's Greatest Scientist.

"I had the happiness of seeing my deceased mother again, and of embracing her and conversing with her." was of course some distance from the medium. A metronome was put in motion and pressure was exerted on a letter weight. M. Scarpa three times felt his *hair seized and pulled* so violently *that he cried out with pain*; he declared that quite a quantity of hair had been pulled out. "On another occasion," he tells us, "a vase of flowers appeared on the medium's head when a mysterious hand seized the bunch and threw it against the extended face of Dr. Poso, *as if in scorn*, and carried the glass of water, which held the flowers, away, whilst another hand distributed roses one at a time and *I put mine in my button hole*"

He concludes by declaring the phenomena to be *absolutely genuine* and adds—"From henceforward sceptics can only deny the facts by accusing us of fraud and charlatanism. I should be very much surprised if anyone was bold enough to bring this accusation against us, but it would not disturb our minds in the least."

Professor Pio Foa.

The Ablest Conjurers Baffled.

Dr. Pio Foa, Professor of Pathological Anatomy in the University of Turin, Director of the Anatomical Museum and General Secretary of the Academy of Sciences in Turin, gave an address in the aristocratic Cardigan Theatre at Turin in March, 1907, on mediumistic phenomena, and in a comprehensive review of the seances held with Paladino declared that *able conjurers* had admitted that these phenomena *could not be explained by trickery*.

He declines at the present juncture to definitely accept the spiritistic hypothesis and cautiously adds—

"For the present let us preserve an attitude of quiet waiting in the face of superlative facts, which we have not had the opportunity to verify, such as the dematerialisation and the re-materialisation of bodies. Beyond what the eye can see, what the ears can hear, what the hands can touch, beyond the world of taste and smell and of all the other senses, *there exists a world invisible, inaudible, impalpable, of which we only know a few manifestations*. A gleam of light from that invisible world has been brought to us by the discovery of the X Rays, of which we only know the effects. . . Let us part with peace in mind and soul, with entire confidence in the progress of Science, to which appertains at the present time the largest share in the material and spiritual direction of humanity,"

Professor Lombroso.

A Highly Sensational Record.

I could add pages of further evidence of similar facts by others of these distinguished Italian savants, but will conclude with a brief allusion to Professor Lombroso, the illustrious psychiatrist and anthropologist, whose name is one to conjure with in the Scientific circles of the world. It took some of his colleagues years to induce him to enter upon this mind-expanding field of Scientific exploration, so great was his disbelief in the genuineness of these phenomena and so antagonistic were his views to the existence of a Spiritual realm.

Dr Lapponi, Chief Physician to his Holiness Leo XIII. and Pius X. referring to this antipathy in a work in which he acknowledges his own belief in these phenomena, says—"There are not wanting those, who, from being *contemptuous* of Spiritism have become convinced adherents to that Spiritism to which they brought the largest possible amount of doubt and diffidence, amongst whom should be *especially mentioned* Caesar Lombroso." And he adds, "Lombroso, with all his scepticism, after having assisted in Milan at some seances given by Eusapia Paladino, was constrained to say to some of his friends—'After *that* proof I shall go away because *I feel I might go mad; I must rest my mind*.'" This, apparently, refers to the meeting between Lombroso and his deceased mother, reference to which is made below.

It was Professor Bozzano, I understand, who finally persuaded Lombroso to take part in the investigations, and after witnessing an exhaustive series of phenomena, Lombroso created a great sensation in Italy by writing to the Press—"I am ashamed and grieved at having opposed with so much tenacity the possibility of the so-called Spiritualistic facts—*the facts exist and I boast of being a slave to facts*" He further declares—"There can be no doubt that *genuine Spiritualistic phenomena are produced by intelligences totally independent of the medium and the parties present at the seances*. On many occasions I have found this to be the case, a notable

instance being when *three spirits appeared in the room together*, each at a considerable distance from the others, and *each producing distinct phenomena.*"

"On one occasion Dr. Imoda observed that whilst a phantom took out of M. Becker's hand a pen and returned it to him, *another* phantom rested its brow on that of Dr. Imoda, and on another occasion, *whilst I was being caressed by a phantom*" continues Lombroso, "the Princess Ruspoli felt herself touched on the head by a hand and Dr. Imoda felt his hand pressed forcibly by *another* hand." "Several mediums," he adds, "can write with both hands, and also speak with someone at the same time." "Things moreover, occur," he says, "which are contrary to the medium's will and even against the will of the so-called spirit who operates."

In illustration of this fact he declares—"One day a woman of great beauty appeared who had died two years before. . . Her head was covered with a line veil; she breathed a warm breath against the back of M. Becker's hand, carried his hand up to her hair and *very gently bit his fingers*. The apparition was perceived by two others present and returned several times. An attempt was then made to photograph it; the medium and the controlling spirit consented, but the *phantom*, by a sign with the head and hands, indicated to us that she objected and *twice broke the photographic plate.*"

At another time an etheric hand appeared and *dashed* a block of paraffin to pieces, and ethereal hands "have been seen holding objects, twanging the mandoline, beating the drum, opening boxes, and putting the metronome in motion without a key."

And then, as if to seal his conversion to the Spiritualistic theory, we find Lombroso, writing on the 6th of March last year to Professor Falcomer, of Venice, declaring that "*he had seen and been brought into contact with his deceased mother* at a sitting with Eusapia Paladino."

During the seances held at Turin under the direction of Professor Lombroso a lump of clay was placed on the table *inside* the cabinet with the object of obtaining the impression of a face or a hand. After a while "great raps were heard on the table," the medium being at the time seated *outside* the cabinet, "and the table on which the clay was placed rapped out with its feet, "The impression is made."

"I was asked," writes Dr. Mucchi, "to take the mould. I was about to enter the cabinet, *but was repelled by two hands*, 'made of nothing.' I felt them; they were agile and prompt; they seized me and pushed me back—the struggle lasted for some time; the hands seemed to take pleasure in resisting me; they pushed me back if I tried to enter and pulled me forward if I retired. I ended by seizing the lump of clay which these 'Satanic' hands persisted in claiming for themselves; when I withdrew they *thrust me out with a violent shove which nearly upset everything*. There were observable on the clay two or three impressions such as might be made by a closed fist."

"A hand issued from the curtain near my head," continues Dr. Mucchi. It first showed with closed fist, then the hand opened and the fingers stretched out. This phenomenon was repeated several times; everyone could take note of it, because the hand stood out against the illuminated wall. The same hand subsequently laid hold of the wood of the cabinet and shook it violently. I tried in my turn and I found that to do this required considerable effort. Whilst I was doing so the invisible hand seized mine, pressed it and let go, *giving me a friendly pat on the shoulder.*"

A small table was subsequently *torn out of the hands* of one of the investigators by some invisible agency, "turned over and upside down, shaken about for a quarter of a minute, and ultimately was *violently seized, knocked about and smashed in pieces*. Two of the feet were thrown down amongst the investigators and the third hit Dr. Norlenghi in the face. Then the unknown entity seized one of the feet of the table and rapped with it repeatedly, now on one, then on another of the hands of the sitters, whilst the big table shook and *laughed* in its own fashion."

The leading French newspaper, "Le Matin," has recently published a series of interviews with well-known writers on mediumistic phenomena. Lombroso was one of the Scientific investigators interviewed and in the course of his remarks he said—

"I have been present at one hundred, at least, of these Spiritistic experiments. I have seen them at Milan, at Genoa, at Naples, at Turin, and at Venice. I am perfectly convinced of the authenticity of the phenomena presented by Paladino. . . I was present one clay when a pot of flowers, weighing from 30 to 40lbs., made a flight through the air. This pot, originally placed several yards away from us, rose of its own accord, then hovered about our heads, and finally came to rest on the table. On another occasion *I had the happiness of seeing my mother again, and of embracing her and conversing with her.*"

Mareoni a Convert.

I may add, in connection with these Italian developments, that Mareoni, of wireless telegraphy fame, became a convert last year through the mediumship of the Princess D' Antini del Drego, an exceptionally gifted medium who holds sittings in her own palace in Rome. Mareoni then interested the King of Italy in the subject

and a little later came the report that His Majesty had also been convinced of the Spiritual origin of these latter day wonders.

Immense Impression Created in Italy.

In commenting on the results of these investigations, the Editor of the *Annals of Psychical Science* states in the July number

Professor Hyslop, Ph. D.

Principal of Columbia University, U.S.A.

"I have talked with Dr. Hodgson (deceased) myself, and as for Frederick Myers (deceased) why, I talked with him only yesterday."

of last year that they have produced an "immense impression" in Italy. . . "and the movement progresses with increasing rapidity, fresh names of savants being constantly added to those of Professors Lombroso, Schiaparelli, Luciani, De Amicis, Bianchi, Queirolo, Gigli, Vizioli, Tamburini, Tassi, Ascensi, Porro, Limoncelli, Virgilio, Giardina, Ottolenghi, etc., all being Professors in the Universities of Italy." "It is difficult to realise the effects," the Editorial goes on, "which has been produced on all classes of Society in Italy by these *conversions of men of Science*; whilst the principal journals in Northern Italy have openly declared their intention of freely opening their columns to publications bearing reference to mediumism of which they recognise the immense Scientific and social importance."

M. Camille Flammarion.

An Invisible And Natural World Discovered.

The savants of France are vieing with those of Italy in their enthusiasm over the illumining revelations of Psychical Science, and amongst these must be mentioned M. Camille Flammarion, the brilliant astronomer, who, in his entrancing work, "The Unknown and Psychic Problems," published in 1900, cites 180 cases of the spirits of persons at the moment of death having presented themselves to relatives and friends by whom they were recognised. In the preface he says :—

"This work is an endeavour at the Scientific analysis of subjects generally considered foreign to Science, and even as uncertain, fabulous, and more or less imaginary. But I am about to show that these facts exist. I am going to bring the methods of the Science of observation to the establishment and analysis of phenomena generally relegated hitherto to the domain of marvellous or supernatural stories, and to prove that they are produced by unknown forces and belong to an invisible and natural world different from that which strikes our senses. . . Many will exclaim—'What is the good of such researches ? You will find nothing. These are secrets which God has reserved.' It is always thus with people who prefer ignorance to knowledge. With this manner of reasoning and acting we should never have known anything. It is that of those who are not in the habit of thinking for themselves, and who confide to their pretended directors the care of holding their consciences in fetters."

M. Guillaume de Fontenay.

Materialised Hands Photographed.

In the *Annals of Psychical Science* for April of this year, M. Guillaume de Fontenay contributes an article dealing with sittings he has held with Paladino, his specific object being to obtain photographic records of some of the phenomena produced. Four large photographs accompany the article. Two of these show a mass of white on the top of the medium's head, which is supposed to represent psychic matter in a materialised form. On the third the four fingers and thumb of a large hand, immediately over the medium's head, are distinctly reproduced, and on the fourth are to be seen, with equal clearness in the same position, all the fingers and thumbs of two large clenched fists, which appear to be grasping Paladino's hair. The medium's hands were tightly held by two of the investigators whilst the photographs were being taken, and in two of the pictures the medium's hands are to be seen securely gripped in those of the controls. It is admitted that fraud and hallucination are out of the question, and therefore, the question arises—"*To whom do these mysterious hands belong?*"

Professor Hyslop, Ph. D.

I will not enter into details concerning the vast strides which the study of this subject has made in America. It will be sufficient to state that from North to South the people are permeated with it and that the adherents in the United States of the explanatory hypothesis accepted by Wallace, Crookes, Lodge, Zöllner, Lombroso, and others, are to be counted by the million. Amongst the leaders Professor Hyslop, Doctor of Philosophy and the talented Principal of the Columbia University, holds a foremost place. Like Sir Oliver Lodge he has been conducting some of those remarkable *cross-correspondence tests* which have been taken as supplying *crucial* demonstration that this life does not end all; that the human personality survives the ordeal of so-called death; that the next world is not some distant place away among the stars; and that its ethereal beings, who formerly lived upon the earth, can, and do, return and hold converse with those whom they knew in the flesh.

Professor Hyslop declares that "the chasm which is usually supposed to exist between an embodied and disembodied spirit has no excuse for its existence except the imagination of unscientific men. It is flatly against all the laws and analogies of Nature and absolutely inexcusable in the minds of men who make the slightest profession of Science."

He was interviewed respecting the important deliverance of Sir Oliver Lodge, as set forth in the foregoing pages, and in reply to the New York correspondent of the London *Daily Telegraph* declared emphatically that what Sir Oliver Lodge had stated was *perfectly true*. "*Only ignorant people*" he declares, in unison with all other Scientific investigators, "now doubt that Mrs. Piper (one of the world's most highly developed and reliable mediums) and such as she, can communicate with the Spirit world. . . I have talked with Dr. Hodgson myself, and as for Frederick Myers, why, *talked with him only yesterday*."

"Miracles" in Melbourne.

Matter Passes Through Matter.—Unique Museum Brought by Unseen Agency.

We have so far devoted our attention to the startling wonders which have occurred, and which are still going on, in distant parts of the world. Equally marvellous events, however, have been happening in Melbourne for some years past—the production of phenomena which seem to unquestionably demonstrate the practicability of *matter passing through matter*. This will appear quite incomprehensible to those who have not witnessed this seeming miracle, and even those who have repeatedly seen it have no little difficulty in fully grasping the reality of what they have actually witnessed under the most convincing test conditions.

It is only when we come to reflect that modern-day Science—quite independent of the subject with which I am dealing—has definitely pronounced that there is no such thing as *solid* matter—this being merely "a mode of motion"—that the puzzle becomes a little less perplexing and we begin to see a streak of light showing through the veil of mystery.

That which we call solid matter, we are Scientifically informed, is really nothing more nor less than an aggregation of atoms held together by an attractive force known as the Law of Affinity. These atoms are, moreover, sub-divided into even smaller particles described as electrons or infinitely microscopic corpuscles of electricity. *Solid* matter, therefore, when reduced to its primitive element, is simply electricity or ether—this is the primal force out of which every conceivable thing in the Universe has been called into existence.

According to the Law of Vibrations expounded by Sir William Crookes some thirty years ago, it is only because these tiny, quivering particles are at a *low* rate of vibration on this earth plane that they assume a solid and visible form. With vastly *increased* vibrations, such as obtain in the ethereal spheres, they become sublimated and represent what Sir William Crookes euphoniously describes as Radiant Matter, which is invisible to the human eye.

Apparently, therefore, to dematerialise a solid object it is only necessary to *increase its vibratory forces* and thus reduce it to its primal constituent, which is electricity. Any being, or intelligence, possessing the power to perform this "miracle" would, of course, likewise possess the power of re-materialising the aforesaid object and restoring it to its former shape and appearance.

Now, it is claimed that there are actually invisible intelligences who *do* possess this power—the spirits of certain men, chiefly Hindus, who formerly lived upon the earth, where they acquired some knowledge of occult

forces, and who, by virtue of the increased knowledge they have gained in the spheres beyond, are enabled to perform acts which appear to most people quite incredible. By the application of certain chemical principles pertaining to the higher Natural laws, of which we know so little, it is explained that they can, in an instant of time, disintegrate the atoms of which matter is composed, transform them into ether, and in that condition translate an object from one part of the world to another with the velocity of thought, and, on reaching their destination, reintegrate the etherealised substance so that it appears exactly as it did before its transient dissolution.

I do not know that there is anything more wonderful in this than, by the application of heat, transforming water into steam, which is invisible, condensing the steam into vapour, reducing the vapour to water again, and subsequently, by lowering the temperature, transforming the water into a block of ice—an apparent *solid*. The vapour could go through the smallest crevice, but the block of ice could not. And yet they are really one and the same thing. In other words, in each of these processes the component parts remain the same. *It is only their form that is changed*, and that is exactly what, we are told, takes place in the dematerialisation and re-materialisation of matter.

Of course, it is quite impossible for mortals to comprehend these transcendent mysteries. They are beyond us altogether. We have simply to deal with the *fact*. And the fact that these amazing phenomena are occurring is demonstrated by the conclusive experiments of Crookes, Wallace, Zöllner, Lombroso, Morselli and other Scientific geniuses, to say nothing of what is actually happening in Melbourne to-day.

Professor Zöllner declares that "nothing is more convincing of the operations of invisible intelligences than the transport of material bodies from a space enclosed on every side," and even Professor Morselli, who cannot credit the Spiritual hypothesis, admits that objects, such as leaves, branches, stones and coins, are brought from a distance into the laboratory, *through walls or closed doors*, by some invisible power or agency, and he places these phenomena in the *foremost rank* as supporting the *Spiritual* theory.

A Wonderful Psychic Circle.

For some years past a private circle has been held weekly in Melbourne by Mr. T. W. Stanford, a gentleman of high repute and

Mr. T W. Stanford,

Prominent Psychic Investigator.

Mr. Stanford's Circle in Melbourne is one of the most remarkable and most illuminative Psychic Research Centres in the world, and the records of the Phenomena produced, as reported monthly in the "Harbinger of Light," are closely followed by all the leading Scientists of Europe and America.

well-known in business circles in the city. He is a brother of the founder of the Leland-Stanford University in California, and having been blessed with a fairly weighty share of this world's wealth, it was announced from America a few months ago that he had set aside a sum of, £50,000 as an Endowment Fund in connection with the above-mentioned University—of which he is himself a trustee—to provide scholarships for Australian youths desirous of following engineering pursuits. A fine public spirit underlies that generous action, and he, moreover, expends hundreds of pounds annually in prosecuting psychic research. I merely mention these facts to give the reader some idea of the status and character of the investigator with whose experiments I am about to deal.

Seven or eight years ago it came to Mr. Stanford's knowledge that an operative, named Charles Bailey, engaged at a boot and shoe factory at Collingwood, had exhibited mediumistic powers of a highly-developed and altogether unique character. Amongst other things it was stated that whenever he held a circle in his own house objects of various kinds were brought into the room by some unseen agency whilst he was in a state of trance, that he was controlled, or taken possession of, by certain Hindu spirits who spoke to those present in "pigeon English," explained that the objects brought had been transported with the instantaneousness of thought from India, that there was *nothing supernatural* in the operation, and that all the processes involved were based on some higher Natural law of which men upon the earth were entirely ignorant.

Mr. Stanford was at that time a Spiritualist of thirty years' standing, and had witnessed a great many phenomena of a more or less remarkable kind. He was accordingly greatly interested in the reports concerning Mr. Bailey and the singular phenomena which occurred in his presence, and in order that they might be investigated under circumstances absolutely precluding the possibility of fraud or deception, he commenced a series of sittings in his own office in the heart of the city. He invited between twenty and thirty ladies and gentlemen to constitute the circle, and thus was formed what has proved to be one of the most extraordinary and illuminative centres of psychical research in any part of the world.

The rumors of the peculiar character of the phenomena produced in Mr. Bailey's presence were speedily verified, and the sittings that have been held week after week, month after month, and year after year, have yielded a singularly rich harvest of valuable gifts. The precaution was taken to *thoroughly search the medium* prior to each sitting to safeguard the company against the possibility of fraud, but notwithstanding the imposition of the most exacting conditions the phenomena occurred with unerring regularity and with increasing variety as the psychic power of the circle increased.

A large heavy table—about 12ft. long and 4ft. or 5ft. wide—stands in the centre of the room; the medium sits in an armchair at one end, Mr. Stanford sits at the opposite end, and the circle is formed by the rest of the company sitting around the table, but about 3ft. from it. I have had the privilege of attending on several occasions, and the company—between twenty and thirty in number—always struck me as being "tolerably respectable," seeing that amongst those I met were clergymen, doctors, barristers, journalists, shrewd men of business and several cultured and intelligent ladies.

The physical phenomena—that is the bringing of the objects which are called by the French term, *apports*—are produced principally by the operations of two Indian controls named, respectively, Abdul and Selim, and before the proceedings commence the medium is carefully searched. As soon as the medium has become entranced—a matter of a very few minutes—an invocation or prayer is offered through the medium to God the Universal Spirit by an intelligence purporting to have been a clergyman in earth life, and the production of the phenomena follows.

It would be too great an encroachment on the space at my disposal to enumerate all the *apports* that have been "dropped out of space" on to the centre of the table, and therefore I have made the following selection of a representative character from which it will be gathered that the total constitutes

A Marvellous Oriental Collection:

Scores of tablets and cylinders, with incised figures and cuneiform inscriptions, purporting to have been brought from Babylon and Assyria, the legends upon each of which were translated and commented on by an intelligence speaking through the medium and giving the name of the late Dr. Robinson, the well-known Egyptologist, who likewise gave an elaborate account of the Aztecs of Mexico and the Incas of Peru.

Dozens of live birds brought from India, the Malay Peninsula and elsewhere, and some of which no ornithologist in Australia can name.

Many beautiful birds' nests from Egypt and India—some containing eggs and others unfledged young.

Several live fish enveloped in seaweed from the South Pacific.

Large quantities of seaweed, dripping with sea water, and permeated with sand; a live starfish being found in one of the heaps and dozens of "hopping insects" frequently found on the sands.

An African fetish composed of a human femur.

Two African divining rods, one tipped with ivory and the other with ebony.

A species of plastron made of the skin of a large tiger's head.

A leopard's skin measuring six feet from the neck to the end of the tail.

Greek, Egyptian and Roman manuscripts, mostly of papyrus.

One hundred antique coins.

Numerous exotic shrubs, some of which are now growing in Mr. Stanford's garden.

One blood garnet, two green sapphires, two chrysobels, two rubies, two cinnamon stones, six moonstones, three turquoises.

Nest with two eggs which was dematerialised in presence of the circle and taken back to the sitting bird.

Flying fish entangled in a piece of net and seaweed not to be obtained in these seas.

Lumps of clay as big as a man's fist, with stone spear-heads from Central America embedded therein.

Prayer manuscripts from Thibet, written on the bark of a tree.

Large quantity of small square fragments, said to be portion of Mosaic pavement, which it was intended to remove from Central America to Melbourne.

Set of carved ivory beads of exquisite workmanship, interspersed with shells and carved seeds from Indian Temple, threaded on a piece of skin.

Flag from the Soudan, used in the Battle of Omdurman, with letters from the Koran worked on either side, said to have been procured through the agency of Hassan, a soldier killed in the war and in communication with Abdul and Selim.

Quantity of red dust, called sacred earth. It half-filled a good-sized dish, and it was explained that such dust was only to be obtained in one place in India.

A bag made of Chinese silk and containing 144 pieces of Chinese money—brass coins.

Piece of Indian tapestry measuring 1ft., x 5ft., which completely enveloped the medium.

Belt made of skin of leopard's head from Africa.

A fetish doll from the Congo, made from human bones and buried in the fields to ensure good crops.

Picture, 12in. x 18in., taken from wall of a native hut in India—a Brahm picture representing a sacred cow.

Twelve leaves of palm tree were brought at one sitting with prayers written thereon.

Young bird was brought in nest shown a fortnight before when just hatched. It was taken away again with promise to return it and leave it when fully fledged. This promise was kept.

Manuscript from fort of Himalayas, about 2000 years old, containing astronomical memoranda.

Egyptian woman's veil made of dark brown canvas material, ornamented with coloured beads and coins. It is hung from the forehead with holes for the eyes.

Native waist dress from New Guinea made of grass.

Skull. This is one of the most remarkable *apports*. A request was made for some large object with the suggestion that a skull might convince unbelievers that such a thing could not be hidden away in the medium's clothing. A few weeks later it was requested by the controls that a black cloth should be brought to the circle. The corners of this were held by Mr. Stanford, a medical gentleman, and a lady sitter, and the skull was dropped into it at some distance from the medium. It was said to be from the Philippine Islands and the skull of an American soldier who had fallen in the war.

An Indian head-dress with coloured feathers.

Thibet charm. This was found in a hut, and is a peculiar-looking object. As with similar *apports* from Thibet it is a religious charm. The disc is of thin wood inscribed with Thibetian language; seven pieces of hammered copper are around. This is hung on to a piece of skin.

Fetish from India. Half a cocoanut. Inside it contains a packet of poison, and is said to be used against enemies with an invocation.

An anklet from Thibet, made of skin and ornamented with shells.

A fur hat from Thibet, the size of a large tea cosy and said to have belonged to the Thibetian executioner, made from the skin of a goat.

Several encaustic tiles from Roman strata in the mounds near Babylon.

Flower brought to a lady present without contact with medium.

Remarkable bird's nest lined with fur.

Handful of thin wafer-like biscuits, exceedingly fragile and different from anything seen outside India.

Two pieces of monolithic marble. If repolished it was said that fossilised fish would be found throughout.

Nest with two eggs and complete skeleton of bird which Abdul said represented "a tragedy of the jungle." The bird, he explained, while sitting, is attacked by a venomous insect, dies, and another enemy comes along and eats the flesh, leaving the skeleton as brought.

Six live birds arrived at one sitting from Singapore.

A bird's nest with two different sized eggs in it. The nest was made of feathers and cocoa-nut fibre, and it was explained that the nest was that of the Buhl-Buhl bird, in which the Bell bird often deposits an egg, the other egg being that of the Buhl-Buhl.

Dress of a cannibal—a most remarkable *apport*.

Lump of clay with Mosaics, three and half pounds in weight.

A live turtle, which lived for two or three weeks.

Beautiful silken garment belonging to Nautch dancing girl, its length being about nine feet. It was of blue silk material, covered in parts with close embroidery in crimson silk—the dress, however, was taken away again as it was thought the wearer might have died of fever.

Gorgeous costume of Chinese Mandarin, with pig tail and hat complete, reference to which is made below.

The collection in its entirety forms an exceedingly valuable and attractive museum. Mr. Stanford, in fact, carefully preserves each *apport* and the birds that are brought are kept in his aviary. It is no exaggeration to say that no assortment of the kind can be found anywhere else in Australia, and it is quite certain in regard to some of the objects brought from Thibet, in particular, that no traveller would be allowed to leave the country with the articles in his possession.

A Sensational Night.—The Medium Becomes Attired as a Chinese Mandarin.

The culminating point of Mr. Bailey's mediumship was reached on the evening of Friday, May 22nd of this year. It was a night specially set apart for a *test* of a very amazing character in order to bring home conviction to certain Pressmen who were present. It is pretty generally recognised that journalists are "fearful sceptics," and consequently they are sometimes singled out by these invisible operators for "a good hard knock."

There were no fewer than 26 ladies and gentlemen in attendance on this particular night, and the medium

having been thoroughly searched by three gentlemen, was afterwards seated on a cane chair and placed *on top of the table*. All the sitters sat around the table, and each was told by the spiritual Director of Ceremonies, so to speak, to clasp the hand of the other and thus complete the chain.

The order was also given that should any sitter relinquish his or her hold *for one second*, the fact was to be reported at once and the light turned up. The object of this instruction, of course, was to preclude the possibility of any accomplice assisting the medium. *Every sitter, in short, was a special detective*. The sensational scene that followed is thus described in the Sydney "*Sunday Times*," whose special representative was present:—

"The medium was dressed in an ordinary sac suit when he got on to the table, and when the light was placed in the cupboard and the lid closed complete darkness prevailed. But keen ears detected the creaking of the chair, the breathing of the medium, and minor movements he made while on his elevated platform. Ears that were not necessarily keen distinctly heard the swish of a moving body on three separate occasions in the vicinity of the medium, these noises being followed by a chuckling laugh and an exclamation in a voice said to be that of 'Abdul,' a Hindoo control, the words being, 'I got it!'"

The three swishing noises occurred within a quarter or half-minute of each other, and when the light was taken from the cupboard, after having been excluded for probably ten minutes in all—this being the longest period yet known for the bringing of an apport—the spectators beheld, to their great wonderment, a human form (that of the medium) fully dressed in a Mandarin costume—hat, pig-tail, coat, and divided skirt complete—and looking startlingly like a real Chinaman, the illusion being made all the greater and more surprising when the form got down from the table and walked round the room, talking words that appeared to be perfectly articulated Chinese.

"The control then operating, it was subsequently explained by the chief control, was the spirit of the Celestial, who had worn, this costume a few years ago, and been killed in it during a conflict with some national foe. The form felt for its sword, but that was absent. It took off the pig-tail and jabbered in a way that seemed to suggest horror and anguish of mind, and it finished up by lifting a chair in its teeth and balancing it in the air for a few seconds. This feat, though done with the medium's mouth, was so remarkable as to have been quite beyond the strength and dexterity of the medium in propria persona, who is a rather frail-built man."

What I Saw and did.

I have no reason to believe that I am suspected of being an over-credulous individual. Having had twenty-five years' training in a profession in which the full development of the critical and analytical faculties is absolutely essential to success, I have naturally approached these investigations in a scrutinising spirit, and knowing, moreover, that much fraud has hitherto been associated with the occurrence of these phenomena in different parts of the world, I have been studiously careful to safeguard myself from being made the victim of an imposture. I have searched Mr. Stanford's medium myself and have sat to his immediate left in the circle, *with my right arm touching his left arm and my right foot pressed hard against his left foot*.

On one occasion I have reason to suspect that the control considered that I was in need of a pretty stiff test to "straighten me up." He accordingly stopped the proceedings abruptly and said—"I see there are two or three Pressmen here to-night and we are going to give them a special test. One is sitting to the left of the medium (referring to myself) and I want him and the other on the right to make a *special search* of the medium, and after they have searched him they can thump him all over his body so that if he has anything fragile on his person it will be sure to be broken."

The light was full on at the time, and the two of us proceeded to act as detectives. We thoroughly ransacked the medium's pockets, felt up his trousers and under his arm pits, and made quite certain that he could have nothing bigger than a coin in his possession. Then we slapped him as directed, and did it with an amount of vigor that I am sure had the medium not been in a trance there would have been a stand-up fight!

However, when we had finished we were somewhat discouraged by the remark made by the invisible control that "we didn't know how to search a medium." An imperative order was thereupon given for the table to be pushed aside so as to leave a good clear space on the floor. This having been done, *the medium was lain prone on the floor* by the controlling intelligence and rolled over and over until he went whack against the table. Then he was rolled back again, and then once more in the other direction, until he again struck the table with force, whereupon Mr. Stanford proffered the advice that the control should not hurt the medium.

At the conclusion of this performance, which thoroughly satisfied everybody that if there was anything breakable on the medium it could not have escaped injury, the medium was re-seated in his chair and the table put back in position. I also resumed my seat next to the medium and was particularly careful to keep in *close contact with him* as we were told that as soon as the lights were lowered, to facilitate the re-materialisation process, an *apport* of a specially fragile character would be brought.

Abdul then assumed control and within three minutes he exclaimed in his broken English—"Me have 'em;

turn um lights up." We then saw in the medium's hands a beautifully-formed bird's nest containing four eggs. Abdul persisted in breaking one of the eggs, contrary to the wish of Mr. Stanford, just to show us, as he explained, that they were really eggs.

Supplement to the Harbinger of light.

Melbourne, March 1, 1909.

How I Know the Dead Return.

A Record of Personal Experience.

BY W. T. STEAD.

Cecil Rhodes once told me that early in life he had devoted much thought to the question whether or not there was a God. He came to the conclusion that there was a 50 per cent. chance that there was a God, and therefore that it was a matter of the first importance to ascertain what God wanted him to do. In like fashion I would ask the reader to consider whether or not there is any proof that the conscious life of his personality will persist after death. If he examines the evidence he will probably come to the conclusion that there is a certain per cent. chance that such is the case. He may put it at 50 per cent., at 90 per cent., or at 10 per cent., or even at a 1 per cent. off chance that death does not end all. In face of the fact that the immense majority of the greatest minds in all ages have firmly believed that the personality survives death, he will hardly venture to maintain that he is justified in asserting that there is not even a 1 per cent. chance that he will go on living after his body has returned to its elements. of course, if he should be absolutely convinced that not even such an irreducible minimum of a chance exists that he may be mistaken, if he thinks that he knows he is right and that Plato and the Apostle Paul were wrong, I beg him to read no further. This article is not written for him. I am addressing myself solely to those who are willing to admit that there is at least an off chance that all the religions and most of the philosophies—to say nothing of the universal instinct of the human race—may have had some foundation for the conviction that there is a life after death. Put the percentage of probability as low as you like, if there be even the smallest chance of its truth it is surely an obvious corollary from such an admission that there is no subject more worthy careful and scientific examination. Is it a fact or is it not? How can we arrive at certainty on the subject? It may be that this is impossible. But we ought not to [unclear: despar] of arriving at some definite solution of the question one way or the other, until we have exhausted all the facilities for investigation at our disposal. Nothing can be scientific than to ignore the subject and to go on living from day to day in complete uncertainty whether [unclear: we] are entities which dissolve like the morning mist when [unclear: or] bodies die, or whether we are destined to go on living [unclear: after] the change we call death.

Assuming that I carry the reader so far with me, I [unclear: proceed] to ask what kind of evidence can be produced to [unclear: ustify] the acceptance of a belief in the persistence of [unclear: personality] after death, not as a mere hypothesis, but as an [unclear: ascertained] and demonstrable fact.

I.

The recent applications of electricity in wireless telegraphy and wireless telephony, while proving nothing in themselves as to the nature or permanence of personality, are valuable as enabling us to illustrate the difficulties as well as the possibilities of proving the existence of life after death.

In order to form a definite idea of the problem which we are about to attack, let us imagine the grave as if it [unclear: were] the Atlantic Ocean, as it appeared to our forefathers [unclear: before] the days of Christopher Columbus. In order to [unclear: make] the parallel complete, it is necessary to suppose that [unclear: the] Atlantic could only be traversed by vessels from east [unclear: to] west, and that ocean currents or strong easterly gales [unclear: rendered] it impossible for any voyager from Europe to [unclear: America] to return to the Old World. We shall thus be [unclear: able] to form a simple but perfectly clear conception [unclear: of] difficulties which I am now about to discuss.

If Christopher Columbus after discovering America had been unable to sail back across the Atlantic, Europe would after a time have concluded that he had perished in an ocean which had no further shore. If innumerable other voyagers had set out on the same westward journey and had never returned, this conviction would have deepened into an absolute certainty. Yet Christopher Columbus and those who followed him might have been living and thriving and founding a new nation on the American continent.

What would have happened in those circumstances? In all probability the faith even of the most ardent

believers in the reality of Columbus's great vision would have grown dim. If it did not altogether die out, it would be due to the fact that from time to time, in the dreams of the night, their friends saw him alive and well in a strange new world. But everything would be shadowy and unreal as a dream.

Now let us transport ourselves from the time of Columbus to our own day. We must assume that the original physical impossibility of crossing the Atlantic from west to east still continues. But in the intervening centuries the men who had crossed from east to west have increased and multiplied, and have built up a great nation with an advanced civilisation on the American continent. Like us they discover telegraphy, like us they invent and use the telephone. After a time they discover and apply the principle of wireless telegraphy, and after that they perfect the wireless telephone.

The terrors of the unknown would not daunt for ever the intrepid spirits of European explorers. A ship or ships would be equipped to cross the Atlantic. When their crews and passengers landed on the further shore they would discover, to their infinite amazement, not only that a vast continent existed within five days' steam from Liverpool, *but* that those who were thought to have perished had founded a great commonwealth in the New World. What would immediately happen?

The newcomers, finding themselves unable to return, would at once endeavour to utilise all the resources of modern science to enable them to communicate their great discovery to the Old World. They would endeavour to perfect and extend the use of wireless telegraphy, so as to enable them to flash the good news to their friends on the European shore. At first they would fail from the lack of any receiving station on this side. But after a while, by some happy chance, a wireless message from America might be caught on some sea coast Mareoni station.

When that message arrived, how would it be received? In all probability it would be fragmentary, incoherent, and apparently purposeless. It would be set down to some practical joker or regarded as some random message sent out from somewhere in Europe. And so for a long time the attempt to communicate information would fail. After an interval a more coherent message would arrive. Efforts would be made to answer, but the replies might not arrive when anyone was in attendance at the other side; the instruments might not be properly attuned, the messages might be so mutilated as to be unintelligible. A few cranks who had never lost the faith, traditional and dim, that there was a world beyond the seething waste of waters, would go on experimenting, wasting time and money, and exposing themselves to the ridicule of the scientific world.

At last, after innumerable disappointments, it is possible that the captain of the last exploring expedition might succeed in getting through a message, clear, direct to the point, such as this:—

From Captain Smith, of the Resolute s.s., to Lloyds, London. Alive and well. Discovered new world filled with descendants of Christopher Columbus and his men.

What would follow the receipt of such a Mareonigram? It would probably arrive so many years after the expedition had sailed that no one would at first remember who Captain Smith was. When the records were looked up, and the existence of the ship and its commander recalled, there would be some sensation, and a good deal of discussion. Efforts to reach the unknown land would be renewed, but the majority of practical, common-sense men of the world would regard the message as a practical joke, while men of science would prove to their own complete satisfaction the absolute impossibility of any such new world existing, and, *fortiori*, of any such message being authentic.

But after a time more messages would come. Some method would be discovered of despatching replies and of receiving answers. At last the scientific world would wake up to the recognition of the fact that a *prima facie* case had been made out for the strange, the almost incredible, phenomena that seemed to point to the possibility that there was another world beyond the Atlantic, and that its inhabitants could by means of wireless telegraphy communicate with Europe. The difficulties they would encounter would be the identical difficulties which confront us in our quest for certainty as to life after death. But with patience and perseverance and careful allowance for the obstacles in the way of trans-oceanic intercourse, the existence of the American continent would in the end be established as firmly as I believe the existence of the Other World is very soon about to be established, beyond all question or cavil.

II.

I will now leave the illustration and address myself directly to an explanation of the evidence which has convinced me of the reality of the persistence of personality after death.

I may make the prefatory remark that I have what is called the gift of automatic handwriting. By that I mean that I can, after making my mind passive, place my pen on paper, and my hand will write messages from friends at a distance; whether they are in the body or whether they have experienced the change called death makes no difference.

The advantage of obtaining such automatic messages from a friend who is still on this side the grave is that

it is possible to verify their accuracy by referring to the person from whom the message comes. I may say, in order to avoid misapprehension, that in my case the transmitter of the message is seldom conscious of having transmitted it, and is sometimes surprised and annoyed to find that his unconscious mind had sent the message. As an illustration of this I will describe one such experience that occurred almost at the beginning of my experiments.

A lady friend of mine, who can write with my hand at any distance with even more freedom than she can write with her own, had been spending the week-end at Haslemere, a village about thirty miles from London. She had promised to lunch with me on Wednesday if she returned to town. Late on Monday afternoon I wished to know if she had left the country, and placing my pen on the paper I mentally asked if she had returned to London. My hand wrote as follows:—

"I am very sorry to tell you I have had a very painful experience, of which I am almost ashamed to speak. I left Haslemere at 2.27 p.m. in a second-class carriage, in which there were two ladies and one gentleman. When the train stopped at Godalming the ladies got out, and I was left alone with the man. After the train started he left his seat and came close to me. I was alarmed and repelled him. He refused to go away, and tried to kiss me. I was furious. We had a struggle. I seized his umbrella and struck him, but it broke, and I was beginning to fear that he would master me. when the train began to slow up before arriving at Guildford Station. He got frightened, let go of me, and before the train reached the platform he jumped out and ran away. I was very much upset. But I have the umbrella."

I sent my secretary up with a note saying merely I was very sorry to hear what had happened, and added, "Be sure and bring the man's umbrella on Wednesday." She wrote in reply, am very sorry you know anything about it. I had made up my mind to tell nobody. I will bring the broken umbrella, but it was my umbrella, not his."

When she came to lunch on Wednesday she confirmed the story in every particular, and produced the broken umbrella, which was hers, not his. How that mistake occurred in the transmission of the message I do not know. Perhaps by the solitary inaccuracy to emphasise the correctness of the rest of the narrative. I may say that I had no idea as to the train she was travelling by, and had not the slightest suspicion that she had experienced so awkward an adventure.

I may say that since then, for a period of fifteen years, I have been, and am still, in the habit of receiving similar automatic messages from many of my friends. In some the percentage of error is larger, but as a rule the messages are astonishingly correct. This system of automatic telepathy from friends who are still in their bodies and who are in sympathy with me is for me as well established as the existence of electric telegraphy, or any other fact capable of verification every day.

The next question is whether this system of automatic telepathy between the living—which corresponds to wireless telegraphy on land—can be extended to those who have crossed the river of death—an extension which corresponds to the transmission of Mareonigrams across the Atlantic.

Upon this point I will again relate my own experience. I had two friends, who were as devoted to each other as sisters. As is not unusual, they had promised each other that whichever died first would return to show herself to the other in order to afford ocular demonstration of the reality of the world beyond the grave. One of them, whose Christian name was Julia, died in Boston shortly after the pledge was given. Within a few weeks she aroused her friend from her sleep in Chicago and showed herself by her bedside looking radiantly happy. After remaining silent for a few minutes she slowly dissolved into a light mist, which remained in the roof for half an hour. Some months after the friend in question came to England she and I were staying at Eastnor Castle, in the West of England, when Julia came back a second time. Her friend had not gone to sleep. She was wide awake, and again she saw Julia as distinct and as real as in life. Again she could not speak, and again the apparition faded away.

Her friend told me about the second visit, and asked me if I could get a message from Julia, I offered to try, a next morning, before breakfast, in my own room my hand wrote a very sensible message, brief, but to the point, asked for evidence as to the identity of the transmitted My hand wrote "Tell her to remember what I said what last we came to Minerva." I protested that the message was absurd. My hand persisted and said that her friend would understand it. I felt so chagrined at the absurdity of the message that for a long time I refused to deliver. When at last I did so her friend exclaimed, "Did she actually write that? Then it is Julia herself, and no man take." "How," I asked, bewildered, "could you come Minerva?" "Oh," she replied, "of course, you don't know anything about that. Julia shortly before her death had bestowed the pet name of Minerva upon Miss Willard, the founder of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, and had given her a brooch with a cameo of Minerva. She never afterwards called her anything but Minerva, and the message which she wrote with your hand was substantially the same that she gave to me on the last time when Minerva and I came to bid her good-bye on her death bed.

Here again there was a slight mistake. Minerva had come to her instead of Julia going to Minerva, but other

wise the message was correct.

I then proposed that I should try for more messages. My friend sat at one end of a long table, I sat at the other. After my hand had written answers to various questions, I asked Julia, as another test of her identity, if she could use my hand to call to her friend's memory some incident in their mutual lives of which I knew nothing. No sooner said than done.

My hand wrote: "Ask her if she can remember when we were going home together when she fell and hurt her spine." "That fills the bill," I remarked, *as* I read out the message, "for I never knew that you had met with such an accident." Looking across the table, I saw that my friend was utterly bewildered. "But, Julia," she objected, "I never hurt my spine in my life." "There," said I, addressing my hand reproachfully, "a nice mess you have made of it! I only asked you for one out of the thousand little incidents you both must have been through together, and you have gone and written what never happened."

Imperturbably my hand wrote, "I am quite right; she has forgotten." "Anybody can say that," I retorted; "can you bring it back to her memory?" "Yes," was the reply. "Go ahead," I answered; "when was it?" Answer: "Seven years ago." "Where was it?" "At Streator, in Illinois." "How did it happen?" "She and I were going home from the office one Saturday afternoon. There was snow on the ground. When we came opposite Mrs. Buell's house she slipped her foot on the kerbstone and fell and hurt her back." When I read these messages aloud her friend exclaimed, "Oh, that's what you mean, Julia! I remember that quite well. I was in bed for two or three days with a bad back; but I never knew it was my spine that was hurt."

I need not multiply similar instances. The communication thus begun has been kept up for over fifteen years. I have no more doubt of the existence and the identity of Julia than I have of the existence of my wife or of my sister.

Here we had the appearance of the deceased in bodily form twice repeated on fulfilment of a promise made before death. This is followed up by the writing of messages, attested first by an allusion to a pet name that seemed to reduce the message to nonsense, and, secondly, by recalling to the memory of her friend with the utmost particularity of detail an incident which that friend had forgotten. No other medium was concerned in the receipt of these messages but myself. I had no motive to misrepresent or invent anything. As my narrative proves, I was sceptical rather than credulous. But things happened just as I have put them down. Can you be surprised if I felt I was really getting into communication with the Beyond?

III.

It will be said by some of those who will not give me the lie as to the accuracy of the foregoing narrative, that it [*unclear: lies*] not carry us beyond telepathy from the living. This be admitted if telepathy from the unconscious mind [*unclear: as regarded*] as an actual fact. In this case the [*unclear: unconscious*] mind telepathed what the conscious mind of the [*unclear: transmitter*] had entirely forgotten. The hypothesis of [*unclear: telepathy*] from the unconscious mind of the living can be [*unclear: invoked*] to account for almost any message said to be [*unclear: transmitted*] by the dead. But there is one class of messages [*unclear: for*] which telepathy from incarnate minds, [*unclear: conscious*] or un-conscious cannot account. That is the class of messages [*unclear: which*] relate neither to past nor present events, but which [*unclear: foretell*] an event or events which have still to happen.

Julia, on the very day on which she gave me the test [*unclear: messages*] recorded above, made a prediction, which was [*unclear: given*] me not really as a prediction but as a friendly [*unclear: warning*] intended to save another friend from making [*unclear: engagements*] which she would not be able to keep, as a certain [*unclear: time*] she would be three thousand miles away in England, [*unclear: My*] friend laughed the warning to scorn. The prediction [*unclear: was*] twice repeated, and both times treated with contempt. [*unclear: Engagements*] were entered into which, when the time came, [*unclear: had*] to be cancelled, because my friend found it necessary [*unclear: go to*] the distant place which Julia had named, and as [*unclear: alia*] had predicted.

It will be objected that the prophecy in this case may [*unclear: have*] helped to bring about its own fulfilment. Let us [*unclear: ad-it*] that for the sake of argument. The same objection [*unclear: cannot*] be urged against the next item of evidence I am [*unclear: out to*] produce. Some years ago I had in my [*unclear: employment*] a lady of remarkable talent, but of a very uncertain [*unclear: as per*] and of anything but robust health. She became so [*unclear: difficult*] that one January I was seriously thinking of part-with her, when Julia wrote with my hand, "Be very patient with E. M.; she is coming over to our side before the end of the year." I was rather startled, for there was nothing to make me think that she was likely to die. I said nothing about the message, and continued her in my employ. It was, I think, about January 15th or 16th when the warning was given.

It was repeated in February, March, April, May, and June, each time passage being written as a kind of re

minder in the body of a longer communication about other matters. "Remember, E. M. is going to pass over before the end of the year." In July E. M. inadvertently swallowed a tack. It lodged in her appendix, and she became dangerously ill. The two doctors by whom she was attended did not expect her to recover. When Julia was writing with my hand, I remarked, "I suppose this is what you foresaw when you predicted E. M. would pass over." To my infinite surprise she wrote, "No: she will get better of this, but all the same she will pass over before the year is out." E. M. did recover suddenly, to the amazement of the doctors, and was soon doing her usual work. In August, in September, in October, and in November the warning of her approaching death was each month communicated through my hand. In December E. M. fell ill with influenza. "So it was this," I remarked to Julia, "that you foresaw." Again I was destined to be surprised, for Julia wrote, "No; she will not come over here naturally. But she will come before the year is out." I was alarmed, but I was told I could not prevent it. Christmas came. E. M. was very ill. But the old year passed, and she was still alive. "You see you were wrong," I said to Julia, "E. M. is still alive." Julia replied, "I may be a few days out. but what I said is true."

About January 10th Julia wrote to me, "You are going to see E. M. to-morrow. Bid her farewell. Make all necessary arrangements. You will never see her again on earth." I went to see her. She was feverish, coughed badly, and was expecting to be removed to a nursing hospital, where she could receive better attention. All the time I was with her she talked of what she was going to do to carry out her work. When I bade her good-bye I wondered if Julia was not mistaken.

Two days after I received a telegram informing me that E. M. had thrown herself out of a four-storey window in delirium, and had been picked up dead. It was within a day or two of the end of the twelve months since the first warning was given.

This narrative can be proved by the manuscript of the original messages and by the signed statement of my two secretaries, to whom, under the seal of secrecy, I communicated the warnings of Julia. No better substantiated case of prevision written down at the time, and that not once but twelve times, is on record. However you may account for it, telepathy, conscious or unconscious, breaks down here.

IV.

The lady whose initials were E. M., and whose tragic fate I have just described, had promised me that if she died before me she would do four things. She had constantly written automatically with my hand during her life. She promised, in the first place, that she would use my hand, if she could, after death, to tell me how it fared with her on the other side. In the second place, she promised that, if she could, she would appear to one or more of her friends to whom she could show herself. In the third place, she would come to be photographed, and, fourthly, she would send me a message through a medium, authenticating the message by countersigning it with the simple mathematical figure of a cross within a circle.

E. M. did all four. (1) She has repeatedly written with my hand, apparently finding it just as easy to use my hand now as she did when still in the body.

(2) She has repeatedly appeared to two friends of mine, one a woman, the other a man. She appeared once in a dining-room full of people. She passed unseen by any but her friend, who declares that she saw her distinctly. On another occasion she appeared in the street in broad daylight, walked for a little distance, and then vanished. I may say that her appearance was so original it would be difficult to mistake her for anybody else.

(3) She has been photographed at least half a dozen times after her death. All her portraits are plainly recognisable, but none of them are copies of any photographs taken in earth life.

(4) There remains the test of a message accompanied by the sign of a cross within a circle. I did not get this for several months. I had almost given up all hopes, when one day a medium who was lunching with his friend of mine received it on the first attempt she made at automatic writing. "Tell William not to blame me for what I did. I could not help myself," was the message. Then came a plainly but roughly drawn circle, and inside it the cross. As one knew of our agreement as to the test but myself I did not know the medium, I was not present, nor was my friend expecting any message from E.M.

Is it surprising, then, that after such experiences I have no more doubt of the possibility of communicating with the so-called dead than I have of being able to send this article to the Editor of the *Fortnightly Review*?

V.

I have referred to spirit photography. Let me disarm any sceptical reader by admitting that nothing is more easy than to fake bogus spirit photographs, and further that an expert conjurer can almost always cheat the most vigilant observer. The use of marked plates, which I handle, expose, and develop myself, no doubt afford some

protection against fraud. But my belief in the authenticity of spirit photographs rests upon a far firmer foundation than that of the fallible vigilance of the experimenter. The supreme test of an authentic spirit photograph is that a plainly recognisable portrait of a dead person shall be obtained by a photographer who knows nothing whatever of the existence of such a person, and that no visible form shall be seen by the sitter in front of the camera.

I have had such photographs not once but many times. I will here only mention one. The photographer whose mediumship enables him to photograph the Invisibles is a very old and rather illiterate man, to whom this faculty was at one time a serious hindrance to his photographic business. He is clairvoyant and clairaudient. During the late Boer war I went with a friend to have a sitting with him, wondering who would come.

I had hardly taken my seat before the old man said: "I had a great fright the other day. An old Boer came into the studio carrying a gun. He fairly frightened me, he looked so fierce, so I said I to him, 'Go away; I don't like guns.' And he went away. Now he's back again. He came in with you. He has not got his gun now, and he does not look so fierce. Shall we let him stay?"

"By all means," I replied. "Do you think you could get his photograph?"

"I don't know," said the old man; "I can try." So I sat down in front of the camera, and an exposure was duly made. Neither my friend nor I could see any other person in the room but the photographer and our-selves. Before the plate was removed I asked the photographer:

"You spoke to the old Boer the other day. Could you speak to him again?"

"Yes," he said; "he's still there behind you."

"Would he answer any question if you asked him?"

"I don't know," said the old man; "I can try."

"Ask him what [*unclear*: his] name is!"

The photographer appeared to put a mental question, and to listen for a reply. Then he said:

"He says his name is Piet Botha."

"Piet Botha," I objected. "I know Philio, Louis, Chris, and I do not know how many other Bothas. But Piet I never heard of."

"That's what he says his name is," doggedly replied the old man.

When he developed the plate there was seen standing behind me a hirsute, tall, stalwart man, who might have been a Boer or a Moujik. I said nothing, but waited till the war came to an end, and General Botha came to London. I sent the photograph to him by Mr. Fischer, who was Prime Minister of the old Orange Free State. Next day Mr. Weasels, another Free State delegate, came to see me.

"Where did you get that photograph," he asked, "the photograph you gave to Mr. Fischer?"

I told him exactly how it had come.

He shook his head. "I don't hold with superstition. Tell me, how did you get that portrait? That man did not know William Stead—that man was never in England."

"Well," I replied, "I have told you how I got it, and you need not believe me if you don't like. But why are you so excited about it?"

"Why," said he, "because that man was a near relative of mine. I have got his portrait hanging up in my house at home."

"Really," I said. "Is he dead?"

"He was the first Boer Commandant killed in the siege of Kimberley.")

"And what was his name?"

"Pietrus Johannes Botha," he replied, "but we always called him Piet Botha for short."

I still have the portrait in my possession. It has been subsequently identified by two other Free Staters who knew Piet Botha well.

This, at least, is not a case which telepathy can explain. Nor will the hypothesis of fraud hold water. It was the merest accident that I asked the photographer to see if the spirit would give his name. No one in England, so far as I have been able to ascertain, knew that any Piet Botha ever existed.

VI.

What is wanted is that those who profess to disbelieve in the existence of life after death should honestly attempt to define the kind of evidence which they would consider convincing. I have narrated in this paper what seems to me conclusive evidence of the continuance of personality after death. All of these incidents occurred in my own personal experience. Their credibility to my readers depends upon their estimate of my veracity. These things actually occurred as I have written them down. Supposing that they had happened to you, my reader, could you refuse to admit that there is at least a *prima facie* case for a careful exhaustive scientific examination into the subject? What more evidence, what kind of evidence, under what conditions, is wanted,

before conviction is established?

I ask no one hastily to accept anything on other people's testimony. It is true that all people are not mediums, any more than all telephones can take Mareoni messages I am fortunate in being my own medium, which eliminate one possible hypothesis. But there are plenty of honest mediums, some possibly in your own family if you cared to seek for them.

One last word. For the last fifteen years I have convinced by the pressure of a continually accumulation[*unclear: .*] mass of first-hand evidence of the truth of the [*unclear: persists*] of personality after death, and the possibility of [*unclear: in*] course with the departed. But I always said, "I [*unclear: will*] until someone in my own family has passed [*unclear: beyond*] grave before I finally declare my conviction on this subject.

Twelve months ago this month of December I saw [*unclear: at*] eldest son, whom I had trained in the fond hope that[*unclear:]*] would be my successor, die at the early age of this [*unclear: thire*] three. The tie between us was of the closest. No [*unclear: o*] could deceive me by fabricated spurious messages from [*unclear: at*] beloved son.

Twelve months have now passed, in almost every week[*unclear:]*] which I have been cheered and comforted by messages [*unclear: from*] my boy, who is nearer and dearer to me than ever [*unclear: before*] The preceding twelve months I had been much abroad. heard less frequently from him in that year than I has heard from him since he passed out of our sight. I have [*unclear: not*] taken his communications by my own hand. I knew hi so well that what I wrote might have been the [*unclear: unconscious*] echoes of converse in the past. He has communicated [*unclear: with*] me through the hands of two slight acquaintances, and [*unclear: they*] have been one and all as clearly stamped with the [*unclear: impress*] of his own character and mode of thought as any of [*unclear: the*] letters he wrote to me during his sojourn on earth.

After this I can doubt no more. For me the problem [*unclear: is*] solved, the truth is established, and I am glad to have [*unclear: this*] opportunity of testifying publicly to all the world [*unclear: that*] so far as I am concerned, doubt on this subject is [*unclear: hence*] fourth impossible.

[*unclear: C.*] Stephens Printers [*unclear: Street*].

The nest, with the remaining *three* eggs, was placed in the centre of the table about six feet from the medium, and *he did not touch it again*. Yet when we went to look at it at the close of the circle, we found, to our amazement, that there was only *one* egg left. The other two, apparently, had been dematerialised and spirited away to make the test complete. Objects brought have frequently been thus taken away, and sometimes, at Mr. Stanford's request, a bird, brought by him for the purpose, has been *dematerialised* and has vanished mysteriously, *never to be seen again*.

On another occasion Mr. Stanford informed Abdul that "there was a gentleman present who would like a bird." The reference was to myself. "Me not mean to bring bird to-night;" was the reply, "but me tell Selim." Selim, apparently, acquiesced in the request, for a few minutes later a lovely bird with yellow head and delicately marked brown body, was placed in the medium's hands as he sat in the chair and I had a good look at it. It was put in a cage by Mr. Stanford, when it at once began to *hop* about, and I also heard it *chirp*. That bird went to the aviary. It is there now, and I believe it cannot be named.

One of the most convincing *apports*, the arrival of which I witnessed, was a large mass of seaweed, dripping with seawater and permeated with sand. It was explained by Abdul that it had just been brought from the Semaphore, South Australia. *I was very watchful* again that night; it fell on the table at a distance of live feet from the medium and immediately it appeared the room was filled with a strong saline odour. It could not possibly have been brought into the room beforehand or we would have smelt it. Besides, the medium had been carefully searched and therefore an accomplice would have been necessary. This implies fraud, and as Professor Morselli declares, "*only ignorant people*" now entertain the fraudulent theory when the experiments are conducted under test conditions.

I remember being full of expectancy on another evening when we were told that an effort was to be made to materialise a hand. The light was lowered and a few minutes later a luminous cloud—such as described by Sir William Crookes when a materialisation was about to take place—was distinctly visible in the centre of the table five or six feet from the medium and three feet from where I sat on this particular occasion. The luminosity alternately increased and decreased in intensity, but nothing further resulted from the phenomenon, and it was subsequently explained by the controlling intelligence that the power was not sufficiently strong to enable the hand to become visible.

A cool breeze, such as referred to by Sir William Crookes and Professor Morselli, is often felt by the sitters, and sometimes it amounts to a decided current.

Rigid Tests in Sydney.

There is no necessity to add to my personal experiences at this extremely interesting circle, and therefore I will proceed to give a very brief outline of some of the *particularly rigid tests* to which this medium has been subjected. At the request of an eminent Sydney doctor and several Scientific friends associated with him, Mr. Bailey went to Sydney in 1903 for the purpose of giving a series of sittings. The members of the circle were *allowed to impose their own conditions*, which were of a particularly stringent character, but in spite of every precaution taken to detect fraud, similar phenomena occurred to those that had been witnessed in Melbourne. The full details of these experiences were set out in an official Report contained in a book of 140 pages and entitled, "Rigid Tests of the Occult." The thoroughness with which two or three of the more sceptical investigators searched the medium before each sitting may be described as follows:—

The coat pockets were first overhauled, the lining was felt all over, then the coat was folded, placed on a chair beside Dr. X, and left there during the sitting. The control meanwhile separated the arms, so that the arm-pits could be searched by sight or touch; the hands, including the spaces between the fingers, being also examined by at least two pairs of eyes and hands. Then, while the arms were still extended outwards the clothes were searched, the pockets turned out, the linings examined, the non-possibility of secret pockets or receptacles noted, and every inch of the body from head to foot pressed hard and stroked down deliberately and systematically, somewhat after the manner of massage. As one of the more sceptical searchers remarked, when asked if he was satisfied, "Satisfied I why, not a threepenny bit could have escaped."

After this exacting scrutiny *the medium was placed in a bag*—with his arms and head free—secured beyond the possibility of opening without detection, and yet under these exceptionally stringent circumstances, the following objects were brought into the room on various occasions :

Ten coins of the reign of the Ptolemys.
Three Ancient Roman coins.
One Egyptian Scarabaes.
Twenty precious stones.
Three live Indian jungle sparrows.
One bird's nest
Eight Tablets.
One newspaper in Arabic.
One shovel-nosed shark, one foot long.
Some dripping seaweed.
A half baked Chupatty Cake.
A terra cotta Cylinder weighing upwards of two pounds.

The Medium Put in a Cage.

What were called "Special Test Sittings" were also held. On one of these occasions *every garment of the Sensitive was removed, including boots sox and underwear*. He was subjected to "a deliberate and most careful search of his whole body by appointed searchers. *He redressed in other clothes, not his own, also searched, and was then linked to the already searched seance room.*" Immediately the company had entered the room—which was an apartment in the private house of the medical gentleman who had instituted the investigations—the door was locked and sealed on the inside.

The Sensitive, still kept under close observance, was then *placed in a cage* covered with mosquito netting at the sides and top; the cage was screwed down to the floor, and adhesive plaster placed around its base. As one of the sitters observed—"You couldn't even get a threepenny bit into the cage," and yet even under these very rigid conditions the phenomena continued as before, the *apports* falling *inside the cage* without injury either to the netting or frame work.

Boxing Gloves Used.

To add still further to the completeness of the "Tests," what was considered by the most sceptical observer to be an *absolutely crucial and convincing test* was resorted to. This was nothing more nor less than searching the Sensitive as heretofore and, in addition, placing on his hands a pair of the largest-sized boxing gloves tied securely at the wrists and sealed. In this grotesque guise he was popped into the cage and his prison house was screwed down and sealed as on former occasions. "Within a second," says the Report, "down fell something hard with a noise inside the cage. . . . and in a few seconds more another solid article fell into the cage as if

from a height." The *apports* thus brought consisted of two baked clay tablets with cuneiform writings thereon, one of which was broken as the control was unable to catch it with his clumsily-gloved hands.

This unique test having failed to stop the manifestations, the gloves, the seals of which were found to be intact, were taken off and thus the hands of the Sensitive—who still remained in the cage—were left free to catch any live object that might possibly be brought. The proceedings were then continued, various *apports* began to arrive, and by the time the Seance concluded it was found that the following assortment of presents had mysteriously come to hand:—

Two baked clay tablets.

Two live birds-Indian jungle sparrows.

One Bird's Nest.

14 ancient coins, some of them of the Ptolemy reigns in bronze and electrum with the head of Jupiter Ammon, and on the obverse the double eagle of the Ptolemys: others of the early Christian period, with the head of Constantine the Great and varied figures on the obverse.

An Egyptian scarabeus, described as of soap-stone species and said to have been found at Lenderah.

A plant, about five inches high from clay to top, with abundant leaves and green and healthy looking.

"This," continues the narrator, "completed our specially stringent tests, though, indeed, every test was stringent and should convince any reasonable person."

It is little wonder that Professor Larkin should write from the aerial solitudes of his world-renowned Observatory—"How I do wish I could be there at each Session," the allusion, of course, being to Mr. Stanford's circle.

Bailey at Milan—More Stringent Tests.

The astounding character of these phenomena was subsequently reported to Professor Falcomer, a distinguished investigator into psychic problems connected with the Roya! Technical Institute in Venice, and it was suggested in 1904 that Mr Bailey should be invited to visit Italy for a rigorous examination of his extraordinary powers. The Society for Psychic Studies at Milan acted on the hint and paid his passage thither, Fourteen sittings were held and in the official Report of the Society there is abundant evidence to show that the results were of a satisfactory character.

In addition to thoroughly searching the medium on similar lines to those followed in Sydney, he was likewise placed in a bag and put inside a kind of cabinet, the top and sides of which were covered with fine network, so that while he could be distinctly seen there could be no possible contact with any person outside of it. The investigators included gentlemen of high literary and scientific attainments, and notwithstanding any condition they sought to impose the following *apports* were among the more important brought by invisible carriers :—

A small bird's nest with an egg in it, Dr. Ferrari and Signors Odorico and Avanzini testifying that the nest was still warm.

A bird almost black and warm to the touch, which afterwards dissolved and disappeared.

A number of precious stones, uncut.

A nest with a small bird sleeping in it.

A small black-headed bird was placed in the right hand of the medium and a nest containing a young bird in the left.

A plant which was seen in a flower pot suddenly disappeared.

Several Indian chupatties in a state of paste, which were said to have been taken from an Indian cook who was, at that moment, preparing them for the oven.

A fish about six inches long, accompanied by a strong saline odour. A bird was also brought at the same time, but both subsequently vanished.

A luminous cross became visible (it was Good Friday) from eight inches to a foot in height; observed by all present.

A number of Egyptian coins and Babylonian tablets.

Indian woman's head-dress consisting of a large band with a sea shell and five antique coins depending from it, said to possess magical properties

An empty cage was procured and a live bird was placed in it by invisible agency.

A child about five years of age materialised, and phosphorescent lights were seen floating about the room.

Two or three peculiar and exciting incidents also occurred. An entity, purporting to be the execrable Nana

Sahib, of Indian Mutiny fame, took possession of the medium, inveighed and gesticulated violently; and at another time a voice, quite different from that of the medium's, exclaimed in terrified tones:

"Where am I ? Who are you ? I cannot see. I do not understand what has happened to me. Whose body is this in which I find myself? I want light, light." When the light was turned up, it was seen that the medium was in a stupor of alarm, and the spirit which had taken possession of him continued to cry out in a thick cavernous voice, "Give me light—make me understand—tell me what has happened to me."

Then the medium sank down, like a man in a heavy lethargy. The troubled spirit withdrew, and Dr. Whitcombe taking control, explained that "the unhappy spirit was a criminal, who had died in one of the prisons of New York, that he is wandering about in a state of spiritual darkness, and does not yet comprehend that he is dead."

The names of the same Indian spirits as those which had operated at Mr Stanford's circle in Melbourne, and in Sydney, were announced as the agents in the production of the phenomena, and in the report of the last sitting it is stated that something greatly irritated them, leading to an outburst of ill-feeling quite incompatible with success, the result being that an Egyptian manuscript promised to one of the sitters was not forthcoming.

This reminds me of a strange occurrence I once witnessed at Mr. Stanford's circle. The Indians usually perform first, but on this particular evening they were late in arriving on the scene, and consequently it was arranged that a speaker, described as Professor Clifford, formerly Professor of Mathematics at the London University, should lead off with an address on "Atoms." He had scarcely begun to speak when the medium suddenly fell down in his chair as though he had been roughly handled. Mr. Stanford inquired "what was the matter," but the medium, or rather the controlling spirit, was quite unable to speak. He seemed agitated and "out of breath." A few minutes later, however, he recovered and then explained—"It is alright, friends; the Indians have come; they thought I was an interloper and *tried to turn me out*; but we have arranged for them to come on next." The address was then proceeded with and was one of the most erudite Scientific discourses I had heard for many a day.

In this connection, I may add that the medium—this erstwhile boot operative—at almost every sitting delivers *highly intellectual addresses* on Scientific, Historical, Archaeological, Philosophical, and Religious subjects, whilst he is in the trance condition, and that sometimes he enters so deeply into his theme that none but a thoroughly-cultured mind could possibly follow him. Whence all this knowledge ? And how are we to account for the marked peculiarities which invariably characterise the respective speakers ? Is this what Paul refers to when he alludes to "*the gift of tongues*"

And what about these remarkable exhibitions of ill-felling or "squabbling" which sometimes occur ? Do they indicate, as alleged, that we *can* forward into the next sphere all our peculiarities of temper and disposition and that it is only as we become freed from our earth-bound conditions, atone for our evil deeds and wasted opportunities for doing good, and progress to a higher state of being, that we rise superior to these natural propensities and take on a more purified and spiritual condition ? Is this what is meant by "*Working out our own Salvation* ? "

"Why do they Bring these Peculiar Things?"

I am now going to anticipate a question which I am sure many of the readers of these details will ask—"Why on earth do they bring these peculiar things ?" In the first place it does not really matter *why* these objects are brought. The all-important consideration is the stupendous fact that they *are* brought. This is the *unanimous* declaration of the most illustrious Scientists of the time. However, the question raised is not a difficult point to answer.

The motive actuating these unseen intelligences is, of course, to demonstrate to people on the earth that they have survived the ordeal of death and that there exists another real and, in many, respects, perfectly natural, though invisible, world—a world of moral, intellectual and spiritual activity, whose inhabitants are ceaselessly ministering to the needs of their earthly brethren and endeavouring to prove by actual experimental demonstration that there is a life beyond the grave. Is it possible to afford more convincing proof by any method other than the one adopted—the bringing of tangible, visible objects, which can be handled and preserved, and whose arrival can only be explained by the hypothesis that the operators are the spirits of men who previously lived upon the earth ?

But why bring birds' nests with eggs from India, dripping seaweed and live fish ? Let the reader try to suggest anything that could possibly be brought which would produce a more convincing series of tests !

If these invisible agents were to bring a cedar pencil, a handkerchief, a toothpick or a pocket knife, it might reasonably be suspected that either the medium or one of the sitters had the articles secreted about his or her person and that they had escaped detection. But no such objection can be raised when the *apports* brought are of such a character that it would be quite impossible to overlook them in the course of a careful search—a piece

of tapestry 11ft. long and 5ft. wide, for instance, or the flowing robes of a Chinese mandarin with hat and pig tail complete.

It is the very *nature* of the objects that constitute the peculiarly convincing character of the tests. Many of the articles received cannot be purchased "for love or money" and no ornithologist in Australia can name some of the peculiar birds that have come to hand.

Besides, it has to be remembered that these spirit performers are said to have been Hindus in earth life, and were at that time probably interested in the manifestations of occult forces as the Yogi and Fakirs of India are to-day. They have apparently carried forward with them into the next world all the predilections and peculiarities of temperament which characterised their earthly career, and consequently they take as much delight in producing these phenomena to-day as they probably did when performing less marvellous feats in the flesh.

Of course, to people who imagine that the spirit of man—the *real* man—undergoes some *miraculous* change at death, becomes suddenly transformed into some *mysterious* being, totally unlike it was before, and goes off to some mystic spirit world away among the stars, never to return, the explanation offered must appear quite meaningless. It therefore remains for them to analyse their reasons for their pre-conceived theory, and see if they can find any *evidence* to support it.

A General Survey.

Great Minds on a Great Theme.

For the information of those who have not hitherto devoted any attention to this profoundly interesting subject, and whose only knowledge of it is derived from the police court prosecutions of charlatans and imposters—who hold a similiar relationship to Spiritualism as hypocrites do to the Church—it may be as well to explain that Spiritualism is not a thing of yesterday. It is, on the other hand, as old as mankind itself, and its teachings are hoary with antiquity. Thousands of years ago it pervaded the religions of Greece and Rome, of Assyria, Phoenicia, Persia, India, Egypt and China; both the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures abound in its phenomena, and in every savage race we find the prevailing belief in the survival and return of the spirit to earth.

Zoroaster, the Persian seer and one of the great reformers of Asiatic religion, proclaimed the existence, of good and evil spirits who, occasionally, he said, revealed themselves to human beings; the Hebrews evoked spirits with the aid of certain formulae, of which the principles were consecrated by the Talmud; all the Prophets possessed mediumistic gifts and were known as Seers; Porphyry, a Greek Philosopher of the Neo-Platonic School says that "spirits are invisible; nevertheless they reveal themselves sometimes in visible form;" Plato taught the same thing; Socrates, being clairvoyant and clairaudient—spiritual senses which are to-day Scientifically acknowledged—both saw and heard his guardian spirit; whilst Pindar, Plutareh, Plotinous and Philo the Jew, were avowedly of a similar belief; the Romans believed that every human being is accompanied by a guardian spirit from the moment of his birth, and Cicero declared the air to be "full of immortal spirits, "adding that "they knew and taught many things unknown to mortals."

In the New Testament we find St. Paul enumerating the "gifts of the Spirit," and amongst these he mentions the "discerning of spirits." What did he mean by that? To "discern" is to "see." To discern spirits is therefore to *see* spirits. And if they are to be *seen* they must be *here*. To say that they are not here is tantamount to saying that Paul did not know what he was talking about. But Paul did know. He, had, doubtless, seen them and, therefore, he was able to declare—"We are encompassed about by a great cloud of witnesses." He, moreover, understood their mission. *It was not Satanic*—for he exclaims, "Are they not all *ministering spirits*, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation."

I do not, however, think that this statement is literally correct. Paul may not be responsible for that. They are not *all* ministering spirits in the sense in which Paul meant. Many of them are malign in nature and intent. They have carried forward their evil tendencies and, consequently, are unclean and deceivers still. Hence St. John wisely issues the warning—"Beloved, believe not every spirit, but *try the spirits*, whether they are of God?" Every level-headed investigator *tries*, or tests, the communicating intelligence in order to establish his identity, and that is what Sir Oliver Lodge and Professor Hyslop have been doing with such remarkably successful results.

During the dark interval of the Middle Ages spirituality was almost crushed out of existence; the most hideous religious wars supervened, and all the mediums were sent to the stake as "witches" or "wizards." The movement, therefore, received a tremendous set-back, but in later years it recovered by spasmodic outbursts,

and in the year 1848 Modern Spiritualism came into active life in an obscure township in the State of New York. It spread like wild-fire throughout the country and during the succeeding 50 years made marvellous progress in every nation in Europe. *To-day it commands the attention of the intellect of the world* and seems destined to eventually cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.

Those who are keeping abreast of recent developments can easily perceive that the subject will soon be the dominating thought in the minds of men and that the time is drawing near when the man who is ignorant of its mentally-illuminating influence will be considered sadly deficient in intellectual culture.

It was well-known in certain inner circles that the late Queen Victoria was anything but a stranger to this ancient belief, and it will not surprise a few to learn that the late Mr. Gladstone was an Honorary Member of the English Psychical Research Society, and that, in writing to its Secretary, he stated—"The work in which you are engaged is the most important that can possibly occupy the human mind—*by far the most important*"

John Wesley, the honored Founder of Methodism, was likewise personally familiar with many of the phases of psychic phenomena. Read what he has to say about the mysterious happenings in his father's house, and when you find the excitement is growing too intense, take up, as a sort of sedative, his delightful sermon on "Good Angels," from which it will be found that, as he expresses it,—*"If our eyes were opened we would see—*
A convoy attends,
A ministering host of invisible friends."

He, moreover, brings these "ministering friends" down to earth and makes them work. Some discharge the functions of doctors, others are nurses, and others, again, defend us from assaults in *body* and soul.

"And who can hurt us," he joyfully continues, "while we have armies of angels and the God of angels on our side ? . . . Does He frequently deliver us by means of men from the violence and subtlety of our enemies ? Many times He works the same deliverance by these invisible agents. These shut the mouths of the human lions so that they have no power to hurt us. And frequently they join with their human friends (although neither they nor we are sensible of it) giving them wisdom courage or strength, without which all their labour for us would be unsuccessful. Thus do they secretly minister, in numberless instances, to the heirs of Salvation, while we hear only the voices of men and see none but men around us. . . . In the meantime, though we may not worship them (worship is due only to our common Creator) yet we may esteem them very highly in love for their works' sake."

The whole sermon, in fact, is a Spiritualistic discourse from beginning to end, and to still further emphasise his views on the reality of Spiritual phenomena the following extract may be quoted from his Letters:—

"What pretense have I to deny well-attested facts because I cannot comprehend them ? It is true that most men of learning in Europe have given up all accounts of apparitions as mere old wives' fables. I am sorry for it and I willingly take this opportunity of entering my solemn protest against the violent compliment which so many that believe in the Bible pay to those who do not believe it. I owe them no such service. They well know (whether Christians know it or not) that the giving up of these apparitions is, in effect, giving up the Bible, and they know, on the other hand, that if but one account of the intercourse of men with spirits is admitted, their whole castle in the air (Deism, Atheism, and Materialism) falls to the ground."

Dr. Adam Clarke, the celebrated Wesleyan Minister and distinguished Commentator, was evidently of a similar opinion to his illustrious chief and pronounces thus—"I believe there is a supernatural and spiritual world, in which human spirits, both good and evil, live in a state of consciousness. I believe that *any of these spirits* may, according to the order of God, in the laws of their place of residence, *have intercourse with this world and become visible to mortals*"

Canon Wilberforce takes a most inspiring view. He says:—"It is a strengthening, calming consideration that *we are in the midst of an invisible world of energetic and glorious life*, a world of spiritual beings than whom we have been made for a little while lower. Blessed be God for the knowledge of a world like this. It is evidently that region or condition of space in which the departed find themselves immediately after death; probably it is nearer than we imagine, for St Paul speaks of our being surrounded by a cloud of witnesses. *There, it seems to me, they are waiting for us.*"

The Dean of Rochester (Dr. Reynolds Hole) writing to a friend in grief, in November, 1877, said:—"The 'dead' are, I believe, *more with us and can do more for us* than the living. In a very short time you will *know* this."

Ven. Arehdeacon Colley, Rector of Stockton, War-wickshire, and who insists on writing after his name the words, "And a Spiritualist," says:—"Spiritualism comes as a *real God-send* to save men from the Sadducean Materialism that looks for no hereafter beyond the grave." And he further declares—"If the Church ignores the *testimony of Modern Spiritualism*, or speaks of it as necessarily evil, or Satanic, it will indubitably grow beyond the Church to guide it Christianly."

Arehdeacon Wilberforce, speaking at Newcastle-on-Tyne in 1881, remarked:—"The strength of Spiritualism lies in the knowledge, partial and imperfect though it be, of the future life, while *the weakness of*

the Churches, as opposed to the strength of Modern Spiritualism, is in the ignorance of that life, and *in the misapprehension of Scripture concerning it*"

Rev. Dr. J. P. Newman, of Madison Avenue Congregational Church, New York, observes:—"In Bible times the two worlds met and there was communication between them as there is now between New York and London, though not so frequently of course. . . But do communications between the two worlds continue to this day? *Let us rise to the sublimity and purity of this great Bible truth and console our hearts therewith.*"

Rev. Arthur Chambers, M.A., Associate of King's College, London, and Vicar of Brockenhurst, Hants, in his delightful work—"Thoughts of the Spiritual," referring to the antagonistic attitude assumed by many professing Christians towards the phenomena of Spiritualism, says—"No doubt these good people would be terribly shocked by the suggestion that had they been living when Jesus manifested Himself after death they would, in all probability, no more have believed the fact than did the ecclesiastical authorities who put Him to death. As far as testimony is concerned, the fact of the *post mortem* appearance of the Lord Jesus Christ *is not so well or so universally attested as are the spiritual phenomena of the present day. The Christian folk who profess to believe the one and scout as absurd the other, do well to remember this. Let them be consistent.* . . Thus we regard these manifestations of Spirit life as *an ordering of God.*"

Rev. John Page Hopps, well-known in England for his robust and inspired preaching, says:—"What you say about the interest now excited by things psychical is, I imagine, true the world over. Everywhere the interest increases both in width and depth. Believers in our spiritual happenings are eager: unbelievers are modifying their scorn or are becoming antagonists who believe in the happenings but excitedly trace them to the Devil or to demons. Scientists, novelists, poets, newspaper scribes and scribblers are all busy, and flutter about the subject at various rates of excitement; and meanwhile, *the evidence in confirmation of our testimony is becoming overwhelming*"

Rev. R. Heber Newton, D.D., of New York, one of the ablest thinkers amongst the Broad Churchmen of the American Episcopal denomination, declares himself thus:—"If one mind on earth can thus communicate, without physical media, with another mind, it is no difficult thing to believe that *unseen intelligences* can thus communicate."

Bishop Mercer, the well-known and popular Anglican prelate of Tasmania, says:—"Taking the human being as the telephone, *the transmission of spiritual messages* would depend largely for their clearness on the maintenance of the connection and the condition of the instrument."

Dean Parkyn, of Ballarat, when speaking at the graveside at Hamilton in September last, said:—"My brethren, these things (referring to several deaths that had recently taken place) are happening constantly all around us, and I say that man is foolish beyond the power of speech to express who lives only for the seen and forgets that which is unseen. I know you cannot *see* the other world. *But it is all around us, and I believe at this very moment we are encircled by a cloud of invisible intelligences.*"

These are only a few of the Church authorities from whose utterances I might quote. But they will suffice. Now let us pass on to the realms of Literature, Philosophy, and Art.

Dr. Alfred Russel Wallace, F.R.S., F.G.S., says:—"Up to the time when I first became acquainted with the facts of Spiritualism, I was a confirmed philosophical sceptic, rejoicing in the works of Voltaire, Strauss, and Carl Vogt, and an ardent admirer—as I am still—of Herbert Spencer. *I was so thorough and confirmed a Materialist* that I could not at that time find a place in my mind for the conception of Spiritual existence, or for any other agencies in the universe than matter and force. Facts, however, are stubborn things. . . *The facts beat me.*"

Sir William Crookes, F.R.S., replying to some of his critics:—"It was taken for granted by the writers that the results of my experiments would be in accordance with their pre-conceptions. What they really desired was not *the truth*, but an additional witness in favour of their own foregone conclusions. When they found that the facts which those investigations established could not be made to fit those opinions, why—'so much the worse for the facts.' . . I have observed some circumstances which seem *conclusively* to point to the agency of an *outside intelligence*, not belonging to any human being in the room."

Professor Lombroso, the great Italian Scientist, writing to Professor Falcomer, of Venice, in 1896, said—"I am, in Spiritualism, like a pebble swept along by a current. At present I lie upon the bank, but every fresh wavelet carries me further onward, and I believe that I shall end by swallowing it all, even the astrality—yes, I shall finish by accepting it completely." Since this was written Lombroso has, indeed, "swallowed it all," and now tells us that he has "conversed with and embraced his deceased mother."

Professor Flournoy, of the University of Geneva, writes—"The question of immortality, and the intervention of Spirits, maintains its Scientific importance, and deserves to be discussed with the calm serenity, with the independence and with the analytical rigour which are proper to the experimental method."

M. Camille Flammarion, the great French Astronomer, says—"Although Spiritualism is not a Religion, but a Science, yet the day may come when Religion and Science will be reunited in one single synthesis."

M. Theiers, Ex-President of France, declares emphatically—"I am a Spiritualist, and an impassioned one, and *I am anxious to confound Materialism* in the name of Science and good sense."

John Ruskin affords a notable instance of what Spiritualism is capable of doing in the regeneration of men. Holman Hunt the celebrated artist, whose impressive picture, "The Light of the World," was recently exhibited in Australia, had a conversation with Ruskin on the question of the Immortality of the Soul, which the great writer and philosopher once denied. Reminded of his former disbelief Ruskin brightened up and replied—"Yes, I remember it very well. That which revived this belief in my mind was, more than anything else, the *undeniable proofs of it offered by Spiritualism*. I am not unacquainted with the mass of fraud and follies which are mixed up with this doctrine, but it *contains sufficient truth to convince me of the evidence of a life independent of the body* and it is this which I find so interesting in Spiritualism."

Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe was a medium and a Spiritualist. She says—"I did not write Uncle Tom's Cabin; *it was given to me; it passed before me*. And in her "Key" she explains how she obtained the material for her immortal work.

Charles Dickens, the novelist, was also a mediumistic soul, and in a letter to his friend Forster, he wrote—"When in the midst of this trouble and pain I sit down to my books, some beneficent power *shows it all to me* and tempts me to be interested, and I don't invent—really I do not—but *see it and write it down*."

M. Leon Faure, Consul-General of France, declares emphatically "I have long, carefully and conscientiously studied spiritual phenomena. Not only am I convinced of their irrefutable reality, but *I have also a profound assurance that they are produced by the spirits of those who have left the earth*; and, further, that they only could produce them."

J. Herman Fichte, German Philosopher, says—"It is absolutely impossible to account for these phenomena, save by assuming the action of superhuman influences, or unseen spirit intelligences."

M. Victorien Sardou, the eminent French dramatist, has produced a play, entitled "Spiritualism," and has announced that—"He has had frequent interviews with the spirits of friends who are 'dead,' and that he has received messages, *spirits guiding his hand to write them as they were communicated to him*. He is convinced of the *objective reality* of the spirit world and of its *desire and power* to enter into relations with humanity."

Professor W. F. Barrett, F.R.S., Professor of Experimental Physics and Dean of the Faculty of the Royal College of Sciences, Ireland, states—"The impressive fact of the phenomena is the *intelligence* behind them and the evidence of *an unseen individuality as distinct as our own*."

Professor Herbert Mayo, Professor of Anatomy and Physiology, King's College, London, avers—"That the phenomena occur there is overwhelming evidence, and it is *too late* now to deny their existence."

Professor Challis, Plumian Professor of Astronomy and Experimental Philosophy, Cambridge University, asserts—"The testimony has been so abundant and consentaneous that either the facts must be admitted to be such as reputed or *the possibility of certifying facts by human testimony must be given up*."

Professor Robert Hare, Emeritus Professor of Chemistry in the University of Pennsylvania, and inventor of improvements in the Oxy-hydrogen blow-pipe, says—"Far from abating my confidence in the inference respecting the agencies of the spirits of deceased mortals, I have had even more striking evidences of that agency than those given in the work I have published."

W. M. Thackeray, author and novelist, delivers himself thus—"It is all very well for you, who have probably never seen any spiritual manifestations, to talk as you do; but if you had seen what I have witnessed, *you would hold a different opinion*."

H. W. Longfellow, poet, and a thorough-going Spiritualist, says:—"The spiritual world lies all about us, and its avenues are open to the *unseen feet of phantoms that come and go* and we perceive them not save by their influence, or when at times a mysterious Providence permits them to *manifest themselves to mortal eyes*."

Sir Edwin Arnold, author of "The Light of Asia," speaks in this strain—"All I can say is this: that I regard many of the manifestations as genuine and undeniable, and inexplicable by any known law, or collusion, arrangement, or deception of the senses; and that I conceive it to be the duty and interest of men of Science and sense, to examine and prosecute the enquiry as one that has fairly passed from the regions of ridicule."

To this batch of illustrious names might be added those, past and present, of Professors A. de Mingen, W. James (Harvard University), Butlerow, Hoffman, Wagner, Ochorowitz, Pertz, Schiebner, Mapes, Falcomer and upwards of a score of others; Lords Brougham, Adare, Dunraven, the first Lord Lytton, Lindsay, Lyndhurst and Radnor; the Grand Duke Constantine of Russia, Sir Charles Isham, Archbishop Whately, Rev. H. R. Haweis, M.A., Rev. W. E. Channing, and a great number of American clergy; the late Countess of Caithness; Shakespeare, Mrs. Oliphant, Theodore Parker, Washington Irving, Charlotte Bronte, Horace Greeley, Victor Hugo, Alex. Dumas the elder, Abraham Lincoln, William Howitt, S. C. Hall, W. Blake, the poet-painter, Flaxman, the sculptor, Alexander von Humboldt, R. S. Wyld, the astronomer, Mrs. Browning, the late Robert Chambers, a number of eminent members of the medical faculty in all parts of Europe, and many others celebrated in Literature and Art, whilst Mr. W. T. Stead, in an "In Memoriam" article on the late Sir Henry

Campbell-Banner-man, Prime Minister of Great Britain, in the "Review of Reviews" of July of this year, says that in his last days the dying statesman "was heard speaking from time to time as of old to the life-long companion of all his joys and sorrows, his beloved wife, *graciously permitted to return from the other side to cheer and comfort with her visible presence* the husband who was so soon to rejoin her in the land of endless life."

So from the world of Spirits there descends
A bridge of light connecting it with this.

The Religious Aspect.

Misconceptions Corrected.

I do not propose to deal at any length with either the Philosophic or the Religious aspect of this question. The object of this treatise is rather to set forth the present position of the movement in relation to Science and to show that, so far as the acknowledged leaders of present-day Scientific thought are concerned, they have committed themselves unreservedly to the conclusion that the material and immaterial worlds interblend; that, as in days of old, we are still receiving undoubtedly genuine communications from the Beyond, and that it is equally undoubted that materialisations of visitors from the invisible realms occur.

A passing reference, however, may be made, in a general way, to the religious teachings of Spiritualism, if only to endeavour to remove certain serious misconceptions which evidently lurk in the minds of certain people. I am induced to thus far depart from my original intention because of a recent experience, and because I have reason to believe that the misapprehension underlying that experience is far too prevalent.

Not many weeks ago I met a dear old Christian lady who, to my surprise, was greatly concerned in respect to my Spiritual welfare. "I am so sorry," she said, "to hear that you have given up Christ and taken up with Spiritualism." I beamed on the good old soul as benignantly as my horrified feelings would permit, and ventured to suggest that she had been slightly misinformed. "But haven't you given up Christ, then?" she inquired in much more joyous tones. "Given Him up," I exclaimed, "Why, I never found Him properly until I began to study this subject. This has made Him a *reality* and has shed new light upon His miracles." The aged, saintly soul looked both perplexed and elated, and when, at her request, I had given her my views of the Man of Sorrows, the tears welled in her eyes and she went away with the parting assurance—"I am going home now to pray for myself, *instead of praying for you!*"

The moral of this little incident is obvious—"Judge not that ye be not judged," a command which so many professing Christians persistently disregard, to the incalculable injury of their sacred Cause.

Oh we judge each other harshly,
Knowing not life's hidden force,
Knowing not the fount of action
Is less turbid at its source.

Seeing not amid the evils
All the golden grains of good,
We should love each other better
If we only understood.

It is only necessary to add that Spiritualism recognises God as the Supreme and Beneficent Ruler of the Universe, the Father and Lover of All, that Christ is the foundation and superstructure combined of the Spiritualistic edifice, and that the watchwords of the sincere adherents of the cause are the commands of Jesus—"Pray without ceasing," and "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

The sublime and practical teachings of the Sermon on the Mount form the basis of the Higher Spiritualism, whose ethical ideals are so exalted as to be almost unattainable by mortals, and if mankind were permeated with its Christ-like perfection there would be no selfishness in the world to-day, no wars, no oppression of the weak,

no neglect of the poor, and no battenning of the few at the expense of the many—this earth would be a Paradise, and the great millennial reign of peace would dawn upon a socially-regenerated and Spiritually-uplifted world. That is what the Religion of Spiritualism means!

It is, moreover, a religion that makes men *think*. It seems to me that the last thing the majority of mankind do to-day is to *think* on any serious subject at all. They appear to have utterly failed to grasp the significance of the Saviour's assurance—"Seek and ye shall find." It is only the *thinkers* who really *seek*. This fact is clearly revealed in the history of the human race. The man who *thinks* is never satisfied, and, consequently, he is always *seeking*—seeking some further revelation of divine Truth, and when he finds it he proclaims it to the world—and is generally ridiculed for his pains! That has happened through all the ages, it is happening to-day, and it will continue to happen all the while a comfortable state of ignorance is preferred to the enlightening influence of the inflow of Truth.

The ocean of Truth is illimitable and we can never hope to fathom its depths all the while we are subject to the limitations of the flesh. But that is no reason why we should not grasp as much of it as we possibly can, and patiently await the fuller knowledge which will be revealed in the realm beyond. Yet the men who, in this respect, are doing the bidding of their Master, are often jeered at by their fellows and not infrequently persecuted by more or less insidious methods.

And the persecutors are those who, by their narrow-mindedness, are unconsciously arresting their own Spiritual development and at the same time thwarting the Divine intent. Their prejudice acts as a shutter erected before the mind, and the light of Truth consequently finds it impossible to enter. Concerning such as these the Rev. Arthur Chambers, M.A., a robust thinker and Associate of King's College, London, in his "Thoughts of the Spiritual," which every orthodox and every unorthodox Christian ought to read, says:—

"They, the prejudiced and unconvincible ones, must miss the inspiration and comfort of realising, at the present time, things Spiritual, and must wait for the higher revealments, which others gain, until the light of another world shall have dawned upon them, and the mistakes of Time shall be rectified in Eternity. . . Men, as a rule, in regard to any teaching which is new to them, do not ask—'Is it true?' but, 'Is it in agreement with what we have been taught?' If it is not in agreement, then, according to many, there exists the strongest probability that it is false.

"The rejection of the Larger Hope by so many of our co-religionists of the present day, is due to no argument that can be sustained by an appeal to the Bible or reason, but that it is different from the ideas that have gained currency in the past. That mental attitude was, of old, the bar to the inlet of Divine light on the minds of men, and it is the bar to-day.

"One of the hardest facts for some to learn is, that however extended may be their vision of truth, there are other truths lying beyond the horizon of their present knowledge, which are undreamed of, perhaps, by them. . . Man's knowledge of Divine truth is progressive; and men, by the exercise of mind, may, in obedience to an acknowledged law of God, understand the Gospel far better to-day than it was understood five hundred or a thousand years ago. . . Thought is the evidence of the Soul's life, and, like all life that is not declining, it cannot remain stationary.

"There are many Christians whose mental condition exhibits spiritual poverty. They accept certain religious views for no other reason than that they have been authoritatively pronounced to be 'orthodox' by some leader, or Council or Church. They never allow themselves to think about those views. Nay, more, they consider it positively wrong to do so. . . You may prove to them that the passages of Scripture upon which have been reared huge doctrinal superstructures of horror and unreason are mistranslations. They will only shake their head, and tell you that your mind has been ensnared by the Evil One. You may show that what one Council has declared to be true, another Council has proclaimed untrue. That will not provoke them to independently consider the matter. They have antecedently settled to whom they will listen.

"Convinced that their assent to certain doctrines will secure to them God's favour and a passport to Heaven, they consider that there is a decided virtue in not permitting the mind to think. . . The Christian, for the very reason that he is a Christian, is meant to be pre-eminently a being of Thought. All restriction and coercion of Mind is, therefore, harmful to his Spirit. If he be living in communion with God, the rigorous energising of his mind, which for a while may even lead him to hold erroneous views, is more conducive to his spirit's growth than any sleepy acquiescence in doctrines, accepted without thought and conviction, can ever be."

And this is the language of a prominent Church of England clergyman, an Associate of King's College, London, and to-day the Vicar of Brockenhurst. Hampshire, whose enlightening work entitled : "Our Life after Death," has met with such a phenomenal demand that it has passed through *one hundred and four editions*. He is an inspired and fearless writer, and furnishes a striking illustration of the fact that it is to the *sincere and open-minded* man that God speaks—the man who is prepared to accept the Divine invitation—"Come, let us reason together."

The spirit of bigotry, still so rife amongst us, has always been in evidence throughout the annals of

mankind; and the experience of Jesus himself was no exception to the general rule. He was undoubtedly regarded as the greatest *heretic* of His day. That was why the orthodox Church assailed Him so violently and why a spiritually-darkened priesthood eventually instigated His death. And men and women are to-day termed "heretics" if they dare to emulate their Master by proclaiming what they believe to be Truth.

And this term, forsooth, is supposed to represent an epithet involving obloquy. Obloquy, indeed! There is no obloquy about it to the man who knows that the Captain of his Salvation was similarly described. He rather rejoices to be considered worthy to bear this imaginary stigma and is inspired with the knowledge, to quote the language of Archbishop Clarke, of Melbourne, that "*experience has shown that the heretic of to-day has often been proved to be the bearer of the torch of Truth on the morrow.*"

"He that confesseth Me before men, him will I confess before My Father which is in Heaven." And the *real and practical* way to "confess" Jesus is by proclaiming the truths He came to reveal and to emulate His example by working for the Spiritual emancipation of the world. That which is regarded as heterodox to-day will, a few years hence, be stamped with the hall-mark of orthodoxy. The flowing tide of religious thought is already running in that direction, and its impetus will increase as "the thoughts of men are widen'd with the process of the suns."

In Religion, as in Science, Politics and the amelioration of our social conditions, there must necessarily be *progress*. If this law had not obtained in the past we should still be imbued with those crude notions of God which seemed to satisfy the immature conceptions of the races of antiquity. The religious ideas of one age, in short, are discarded by succeeding generations, who formulate an entirely different set of creeds and beliefs, and these, in turn, are modified or cast aside in favor of other, and more modern views. Every student of sacred history is, of course, familiar with these developments in *progressive revelation* and thus history repeats itself in this direction as in many other ways. In other words—

Our little systems have their day,
They have their day and cease to be,
They are but broken lights of Thee,
And Thou, O Lord, art more than they.

The Conclusion of the Matter.

To briefly review the mass of evidence submitted in these pages I presume it will be, at least, admitted that however much these phenomena may have been ridiculed in the past, the time has arrived when it must be acknowledged that, to quote the words of the most brilliant Scientists of the age, they are "*absolutely real—absolutely genuine.*"

A pronouncement of this character is of portentous importance, apart altogether from the *cause* of the manifestations, and when we come to consider the latter point in the light of the conclusions arrived at by so many eminent minds, we are faced by an hypothesis which is sufficiently startling to make the most rigid mental fabric quiver.

We are, in short, told by all the best-endowed and most conspicuous leaders of Scientific thought that conclusive demonstrative proof has been obtained that the Spiritual world, which has hitherto been placed in the abysmal depths of the stars, is really in *immanent contact with the earth*, and that its ethereal denizens, who formerly "lived and moved and had their being" with their fellows in the flesh, *can and do, communicate with us and manifest themselves in tangible form.*

This conclusion is so momentous that it is little wonder that these Scientific *intellectuelles* have devoted such a great number of years to their investigations before determining to announce to the world the conviction at which they have arrived. Sir Oliver Lodge says "*Not easily and not early*" has this supreme information been broken to wondering mankind. It is the outcome of unusually-protracted experiments, and such an overwhelming volume of corroborative evidence, that there has been no possible escape from arriving at this stupendous decision. The more searching the inquiry the more deeply-rooted has become the certainty that the human personality survives the ordeal of death and that Man possesses a spirit that will never die.

This admission is the more striking when we remember that most of these gifted investigators were impregnated with rank Materialism when commencing their work of exploring the Invisible. The idea of a Spiritual existence was altogether foreign to their mode of thought. Their mental vision was bounded by the physical, and to them the grave ended all. The scales, however, have now fallen from their eyes, the veil has been rent in twain, and they to-day find themselves confronted with a future life guaranteed by such an abundance of *mental and objective* evidence that *it cannot be overthrown.* One after another, in rapid

succession, they are being supported by similar declarations from other eminent minds in various parts of the world, and *millions* of "ordinary people" are adding their testimony in support of the intellectual giants who are in the van of Spiritual progress.

Let the world laugh at these men if it likes! Ignorance is always swift to jeer at intellect, and prejudice is ever ready to quench the flame of Truth. But neither ignorance nor prejudice can avail to stem *this* tide if it is the Spirit of Truth that is breathing upon the waters. The philosophers of Padua refused to look through the telescope of Galileo because they considered it impious to drag the planets down to earth and to dissect the moon. But the planets have, nevertheless, been brought within our grasp and the innermost recesses of the lunar orb have been laid bare to the eye of Man.

The advance of Science, in fact, has been impeded at every turn, and there are well-meaning people to-day who would even give the quietus to its efforts to demonstrate to groping humanity that a glorious country awaits the righteous just beyond the confines of death, that the Soul of Man has been endowed with an immortal spark, and that there is—

One God, one law, one element
Towards which the whole creation moves.

Personally, I do not require the verdict of these Scientific inquirers to assure me that there is a life to come. I know it. I know it instinctively—an instinct derived from a deeply-religious and spiritually-minded mother. But I also know that there are thousands of better men than I—men who are among the flower of Creation, whom the Church can never reach, and to whom the light will never come unless it be revealed through the agency of these convincing tests.

Jesus performed "many wondrous works" to undermine the scepticism by which He was confronted, and the divine power of God is working to-day for the fulfilment of a similar purpose. Call it Spiritualism, or by any other name you prefer, it emanates from the Supernal realms and its manifestations may be those "greater things" which the Master declared would be witnessed by mankind. To-day it may truly be said—

There are rifts within the darkness,
And the light is breaking through.

It is already shining in the lives of the great minds I have mentioned, and in a letter recently received by a Melbourne friend from Professor Larkin he makes the courageous and significant confession—"You know how strenuously I have written during just 40 years this month all over the world in 70 different papers and magazines on Natural Science and rigid Materialism—over 4000 articles *which I now see clearly were on the wrong side*. Now I am studying and writing all the time on *psychology and mental subjects*."

Professor Larkin has been inquiring into the phenomena of Spiritualism, and like every other *thorough and earnest* investigator, has received conviction of their undeniable reality. Hence his renunciation of Materialism and his declaration in the *Harbinger of Light* of August this year—

"We are on the eve of starting a colossal movement all over Christendom. . . Then the true teaching of Jesus will burn and blaze and glow in all its original splendour, with a brilliancy brighter than the sun. And its truth will flash like lightning. Many millions will then believe that there really exists a world just beyond this"

These are very striking words from such a source, and a singular triumph for the spiritualising influence of this transcendent theme. It has taken Professor Larkin many years to reach this stage in his development, but he has gripped the Truth at last and has now discovered that Death is only a name.

There is no death; what seems so is transition.
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life Elysian
Whose portal we call death.

So sang Longfellow. And so have sung all the inspired poets of all the ages.

Millions of spiritual creatures walk the earth unseen

Both when we sleep and when we wake

says the immortal Milton. And Tennyson takes up the strain when he exclaims—

Eternal process moving on,
From state to state the spirit walks.
That nothing walks with aimless feet,
That not one life shall be destroyed,
Or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete.

Tennyson was himself a trance medium. He acknowledged this much in a letter to a friend in 1874, and corroboration of the fact is to be found in his Memoir written by his son. Only a Spiritualist could have written "In Memoriam," more particularly the verse—

How pure at heart and sound in head,
With what divine affections bold
Should be the man whose thoughts would hold
An hour's communion with the dead.

Two thousand years have elapsed since the advent of Christ, and now *a new revelation* is about to dawn on the world. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear (understand) them now. Howbeit when he, the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth, for he will not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak, *and he will show you things to come.*" The Spirit of Truth may have started on his mission; mankind may be witnessing some of the wonders he has been sent to reveal, and the clay may not be very far distant when the fiat will go forth in the name of *official* Science that Heaven has been discovered and that the doctrine of Immortality has been Scientifically proved.

This would be the most joyful news proclaimed to the world since the herald angels sang—"Peace on earth, good-will to men." It would unite the earth to the Spiritual realms and link mankind by a chain of love to the very throne of God. It would be the crowning triumph of Scientific research and men and women would then drink deep from the Supernal fount of eternal Truth.

Death would be robbed of its mystery, and from the knowledge thus gained, the right-living man—the man who had shown his love to God by loving his fellow men, who had tempered justice with mercy, who had walked humbly in the sight of his Maker and whose life had been consecrated by the humanitarian spirit of Christ—would no longer regard his approaching transition with dread, for he would know for a *certainty* where he was going and that he had nothing to fear when he had "crossed the bar," whilst the selfish and evil-living man would know with equal certitude, from the experiences of others who had "gone before," that a just and exacting *self-imposed* retribution awaited his arrival on the other side and that he would assuredly have to face the consequences of an ill-spent life in all their remorse-engendering detail.

In that day the Scientist and the Theologian will walk along together, the one teaching Man how he ought to live and the other offering experimental proof of a life beyond the grave. When that beneficent era dawns there will be a great awakening of all the Spiritual forces of the earth; Religion will become established on the immutable rock of Scientific Truth; the Materialist will become an interesting factor of the past; the human family the wide world o'er will recognise the Fatherhood of God and the Universal Brotherhood of Man; Jesus will be understood, and His peerless life and sacrificial death will become a truly vitalising, truly energising, truly potent force in moulding the characters and shaping the destinies of men.

Copyright.

Modern Print, Warrnambool

Pamphlet No. 1. The Laymen's League of the Church of the Province of New Zealand, Commonly called "The Laymen's League."

(ESTABLISHED AT AUCKLAND, MAY, 1909.)

Manifesto

By the Council of the League

(Being a Paper read at a Meeting of Members of the League and other Churchmen, held at the Lecture Hall of the Y.M.C. Association Rooms, Auckland, Thursday, June 24th, 1909.)

Objects of the League.

(A.) The Association of Lay Churchmen within the Diocese of Auckland for the purpose of Defending the Rights of the Laity against the encroachments of Ecclesiasticism in matters appertaining to Church Government and Church Ritual. (B). To Educate, by means of Literature, Lectures, and open Discussion, the Church people of the Diocese regarding the Dangerous Character of the Romeward Movement within the Church. (C). To devise and make known among Churchmen an Effective Mode for restraining and dealing with the evils referred to in "A" and "B."

Officers of the League, 1909-10.

President: (Not yet appointed).

Vice-Presidents: Dr. R. Bedford, Messrs. R. Cameron, J. Dawson, R. C. Carr, Jno. Smyth, R. T. Warnock, T. C. Williams.

Members of Council: Dr. R. Bedford (V.P.), W. Birss, E. W. Burton, R. Cameron (V.P.), J. Dawson (V.P.), R. R. Hunt, T. H. Marshall, S. Rollinson, H. Symons and W. J. Speight (Chairman). Hon. Treasurer : S. L. Abbott.

Hon. Secretary: J. A. Warnock.

Applications for Membership of the League may be made through any present member, or may be sent addressed to "J. A. Warnock, Hon. Secretary, Box 418, G.P.O." All persons, upon joining, are required to sign the following

Declaration :—"I hereby declare that I am a Member of the Church of the Province of New Zealand, commonly called 'The Church of England,' and that I am in agreement with and accept the 'Objects' of the Laymen's League above set out as the basis of my membership of the League."

The Annual Subscription is nominal, each member fixing the amount himself.

Donations are solicited from members and others wishing to help the Literature Fund of the League. There will be need of a constant use of the printing press, which will entail heavy charges against the Council. Many persons, while not becoming members of the League, may desire to assist in this direction. They are invited to do so.

Communications of a confidential character should be addressed to "The Chairman of the Council, Box No. 418, G.P.O., Auckland"; other letters to the "Hon. Secretary."

Manifesto.

Introduction.

What the League implies.

With a full sense of the gravity of their action, certain members of the Church, resident in the Diocese of Auckland, have founded "The Laymen's League of the Church of the Province of New Zealand, "with the purpose, if so desired, of extending its operations beyond the Diocese. In taking this decisive step, they fully realise that the establishment of such a Society raises great issues, which are connected with the most serious aspect of man's life, his attitude towards his Creator and his Redeemer. The existence of the League is the outcome, on the one hand, of dissatisfaction with the government of the Church and with the conduct of Divine Service; on the other hand, of disgust and alarm on the part of many of the most loyal sons of the Church at the open attempt now being made by many of the superior and inferior clergy in England, and in some of the colonies, to restore doctrines and practices of which our National Church was purged at the time of the

Reformation, because "they much blinded the people and obscured the Glory of God."

While the Council of the League have had constantly before them that sense of responsibility which compels them to discharge what they believe to be their duty to themselves, their children, and their country, they have been unmindful neither of the respect they hold to the high officers of the Church, nor of the charity which is due to the honest convictions or to the ignorant prejudices of fellow churchmen, with which they expect to be brought into conflict. Above and beyond all things, they seek to govern and control their own conduct in such direction and fashion as may secure the blessing of Our Heavenly Father.

The Council consider it due to all members of the Church that a clear statement should be made, both of the causes which called the League into existence and of the policy which it purposes to pursue. For the Church of England has entered on what may prove to be an extended period of unrest and danger, because of the present movement to undo the main work of the Reformation, which has received countenance and encouragement from those in high places.

Some Aspects of the Present Position in England.

Mass Vestments.

For the edification of our fellow churchmen, we find it incumbent upon us to refer at some length to the present trouble within the Church; and first of all, we purpose setting forth for their consideration a summary of information on the subject of the Mass Vestments, which form the most important element in the controversy of the present day. It is well that our people should have the fullest and most accurate information about their history and significance, and to that end it will be necessary that our remarks should assume a historical character. We hold that there is ample reason for entering on such a discussion, not only because of the attitude of indifference taken up by so many people to-day on the subject of unauthorised vestments, but because it has been quietly assumed in certain quarters that the Laity of our Church have tacitly acquiesced in their adoption. We have been recently told on high authority, that at the present time in England "No one cares a snap of the fingers about the subject of Ritual." Now, while we know this statement to be absolutely inaccurate as regards the Old Country, we are painfully aware that in our own land the subject does not receive the attention it should, owing to want of knowledge of the real significance of some Ritualistic practices. People frequently say, "What does it matter what the parson puts on or off during the Services in the Church? The extraordinary millinery they use is just a fad of the younger Clergy, and can do us no harm. Of course they look absurd, cutting such antics in such garbs; but if they choose to make fools of themselves, what is that to us?" This carelessness on the part of the Laity springs from want of information about the hidden meaning of these vestments; and their adoption is becoming more general, owing to the prevailing apathy of our people. If vestments had no doctrinal significance, indifference might be excused in the Laity. But, surely, it is no time for indifference when garments are being openly paraded which are typical of doctrines false to the principles of our Church. For the Clergy, who assume these vestments, do so because they hold that a priest so habited, instead of commemorating with his people Our Lord's death in the Sacrament of Holy Communion, is discharging the office of a *sacrificing priest*, who can, by power inherent to his Order, perform the miracle of transforming material bread and wine into the material Body and Blood of Our Lord, which he presumes to offer in sacrifice to God as a propitiation for the sins of the people.

View of those who use the Vestments.

If it is desired to know the meaning of the chasuble and the other vestments, we appeal to the declarations of those who wear them, and of those who want them. The dress is connected with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, i.e., the presence of Christ's material body in the Sacrament, with a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, with the offering of it to Almighty God by the *sacerdos*, or sacrificing priest. These are the three ideas which invest the dress of the priest with a symbolism which no man can consider innocent or uncontroversial. As history shows, the acceptance of doctrine by the Church of Rome was in two advancing stages. The first at the Council of Lateran, in 1215, when the word "Transubstantiation" was sanctioned, and the second at the Council of Trent, in 1545-63, where the doctrine of the Lateran Council was finally inserted as an article of faith to be rejected on peril of salvation. That the dress is associated with the doctrine is proved by two most impressive functions. The first is Ordination. The very words used at the ordination by the Bishop when he blesses the ordinand as he assumes the chasuble are: "The blessing of God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit descend upon thee, and may thou be blessed in the sacerdotal order and offer propitiatory sacrifices for the sins and offences of the people!" After the chasuble has been placed on the shoulders of the newly-ordained priest, his hands are anointed with Holy Oil, so that he may consecrate "Hosts, which are offered for the sins and negligences of the people." The Council of Trent pronounces that, in

connection with the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Church employs "Mystic benedictions, lights, incense, vestments, whereby the majesty of so great a Sacrifice may be recommended." The other function referred to is called "Degradation;" the form to which Cranwell was subjected. It consists in the un-doing in revolting detail of every solemnity connected with the Ordination of a Priest. He is stripped of all his Mass Vestments, one by one, and then declared to be "incapable of celebrating the Mass." There can be, therefore, no possible doubt as to the significance attached to the vestments as ordered in the Roman Church.

View of those who want to use them.

So much for those who in an alien Church *wear* the vestments; let us now turn to those who in our own Church *want* them. Lord Halifax, the mouthpiece of the Ritualistic propaganda in the Church in England, with whose name and sacerdotal teaching we purpose making the readers of future publications of the League thoroughly familiar, has declared that "Our Communion Office is and will continue to be the *Mass in Masquerade*, till it is performed with all the externals accustomed to be used in the rest of the Western Church," meaning, of course, the Church of Rome.

History of the Chasuble.

It is a historical fact that the coat known as "the chasuble" was, in former days, the regular "overall" worn by the ordinary poor of the South of Europe, including the monks. And when the fashion of the common people changed, the monks and secular clergy retained the garment as their ordinary dress.

The following extract from an article by the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford, and Prebendary of Lincoln, will be of interest in this connection. He says:—

Thus it appears that the chasuble, beginning as the ordinary outer garment of the poor, was retained by the Clergy when other people changed the fashion of their clothes, and thus became their ministerial dress. But down to the end of the thirteenth century the idea of its being a sacrificial garment had not arisen. Its accepted meaning was charity. But in the thirteenth century Innocent III. and the Fourth Lateran Council introduced such wide-reaching modifications of the Christian Faith as almost to change its character. In 1215 Transubstantiation became the authorised belief, and auricular confession the authorised practice of the Latin Church. Transubstantiation, which is the basis of the sacrifice of the Mass, and compulsory confession, profoundly altered the conception entertained of the priesthood. The presbyter now became a sacrificing priest, and the victim that he sacrificed was no other than Christ Himself, while in the confessional he sat as the representative of God. His vesture must indicate the stupendous office which he held. The most noticeable, because the outside, garment that he wore was the chasuble; the chasuble therefore must symbolise sacrifice. By degrees it attracted to itself this character, and in the course of the subsequent centuries it became recognised as the priestly sacrificial vestment, while it underwent considerable changes in form. But if the chasuble did not symbolise sacrifice for at least 1300 years, why should it be supposed to symbolise it now? The whole theory of the symbolical meaning of vestments, which first grew up in the nineteenth century, is partly a pretty and quaint, partly a fantastic and foolish, imagination. Ritualistic fancy has again declared the chasuble to be necessary for the priest who offers the Sacrifice of the Mass, or celebrates the Holy Eucharist. Mr. Passmore pronounces it to be "an ecclesiastical vestment indispensable to, and characteristic of, the Holy Sacrifice of the Altar" (Sacred Vestments vii). The Ritual Reason Why tells us that the priest removes his chasuble when preaching "because the sermon is not directly a part of the sacrifice," and that he lays it on the altar "because it "is a sacrificial vestment." (No. 430). The Congregation in Church is daring enough to state, without any regard to historical fact, that the alb, girdle, amice, maniple, stole, and chasuble "have been worn at Holy Communion from the days of the Holy Apostles;" the cloak which St. Paul left at Troas having, been, no doubt, his chasuble! And it states that it is the sacerdotal or priestly vestment worn by the celebrant at the Holy Eucharist (pp. 54, 176). This theory is a reason why so strong a desire is entertained for restoring the use of the pre-Reformation vestments in the Church of England. It is not merely a matter of æstheticism, but of doctrine, although the sketch above given of the history of the chasuble proves that the connection between it and the doctrine, which it is now supposed to symbolise, is an arbitrary dictum of the later Middle Ages, unknown for more than a thousand years.

The views of those who USE, and of those who Want the chasuble, have been pithily summarised thus : "Historically, then, the chasuble means the Mass; it was retained by the Church of Rome because it meant the Mass; it was rejected by the Church of England because it meant the Mass; it was revived by the Ritualists because it meant the Mass."

Extended reference necessary

This extended reference to illegal vestments has seemed necessary, inasmuch as around the "sacrificing

priest" circles nearly all the error of a reactionary and disloyal trend that has crept into our Church in recent years. But, though it may on a future occasion be interesting to enter into an examination and refutation of the claims made by Ritualists, that some of these condemned vestments have a kind of warrant, notwithstanding the judgment of the Privy Council, we do not purpose to pursue the subject further than to say, that the lay mind, as distinguished from the Clerical, is accustomed to derive the significance of a term from its use. This principle pervades our literature, our law, and even Holy Scripture. Applying it to the subject before us, we recognise in the chasuble the doctrines that the Papacy has accepted, defined, and authorised. These same doctrines the Church of England has branded as "blasphemous fables," and "pernicious impostures." How can we retain these words, and at the same time accept the invitation, so complacently tendered us by five of our Bishops, to look upon as "innocent and fanciful" vestments, which symbolise doctrines so sternly denounced by the Thirty-first Article.

Convocation.

"Letters of Business."

The Royal Commission, set up to deal with disorders in the Church of England, reported in 1906 that "Letters of Business" should be issued to Convocation with instructions to consider the necessity for the preparation of a new Rubric, regulating the vesture of Clergymen "At the time of their ministrations, with a view to its enactment by Parliament." A scheme was set on foot, by means of what the "Times" called "an honourable collusion" between the Bishop of Chester and the Archbishop of Canterbury, for the purpose of obtaining Canonical sanction for the use of Mass vestments. The scheme was nipped in the bud, however, by the powerful protest of the Laity. Of course, the object of the Archbishop was to secure the passing of a Canon, without consulting Parliament, which it was hoped might legitimate the discarded vestments in use before the Reformation. Eventually, through the action of the Church Association, a promise was obtained from the Premier, "That His Majesty would not be advised to consent to any such step until after a full and free discussion in Parliament itself of every proposed change."

Canon Law, without Parliament.

Of course, had the Canon been adopted, it could not possibly have legalised what is now forbidden by Statute. In Laud's time the Canons of 1640, framed and passed by arrogant ecclesiastics in the manner it was hoped this proposed Canon would have been, were hung up for all time, as a warning to future Archbishops. "Eternal vigilance" on the part of the Laity against the encroachment of Ecclesiasticism in high places is evidently quite as necessary as in matters appertaining to our national liberties.

Six months after, in 1907, Letters of Business were issued by the Crown to Convocation, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, as a preliminary to the holding of Convocation, announced, in the name of the Committee of the whole House of Bishops, the appointment of five Bishops to act as three sub-committees; the first, with the Bishop of Salisbury for its chairman, to draft a memorandum in regard to the ornaments; the second, presided over by the Archbishop in person, to suggest the "course of procedure in regard to the laws concerning public worship and the ornaments;" and a third, under the Bishop of St. Albans, to present a draft "Showing what changes, if any, ought to be suggested in the Prayer-Book generally."

Action of biased subcommittees of House of Bishops.

It is to be noted that each of the chairmen named had publicly committed himself to a definite policy of reactionary change on the special subject entrusted to him. Indeed, so clear were these five bishops as to the long need of changes, that the Archbishop, in a speech of February 14th, 1907, declared "if the Royal Commission had been sitting a quarter of a century ago, it would have recommended Parliamentary action, but," added His Grace, "the recent commission did not do that." As a matter of fact, this was what the Commission, as already stated, had actually done, it had asked for suggestions from Convocation, "with a view to their enactment by Parliament."

In February, 1908, the first of the three reports advocating the restoration of the Mass vestments appeared. The five bishops frankly adopted the platform of Lord Halifax and the Ritualistic English Church Union, and by placing themselves at the head of the party pledged to the restoration of the outward trappings of the Mass, they demonstrated the depth and width of the cleavage which now stands revealed between the Bishops and the Laity of the Church of England. Recent information appears to show that Convocation has decided against the proposal to seek the approval of Parliament to any alteration of the Prayer Book; for it evidently fears that Parliament, if it considered the subject at all, would make more stringent the existing regulations against mass

vestments.

The Church in New Zealand.

English changes affect New Zealand.

So much regarding the Church in England; and what of our own? As a branch of the English Church, we are directly affected by all that happens within her. If a considerable section of her chief officers, clerical and lay, is engaged in the mission of undoing the great work accomplished by the Reformers three centuries since; if the Sacrifice of the Mass is to be reintroduced in any of her Churches; if English mothers are once more to be lured to lay their sins before a priest and to look to him for absolution, instead of directly approaching their God; if English children are to be trained in the corrupt beliefs of Southern Europe, and taught to pray to Virgins and to Saints; if lawful authority is to be flouted and disregarded by lawless churchmen in a word, if the priest is to be exalted into a worker of miracles, and Our Lord degraded by the introduction of the canker of idolatry and materialism into spiritual commemoration of His Sacrifice for sin, instituted by himself, then must the Churches in England's Dependencies suffer because of treason within the Mother Church And, since the ranks of the Clergy in the colony are being, to a very large extent, recruited from sacerdotal sources, there is the certainty that the teachings given in our Churches, schools, and societies, will be increasingly tainted with the sacerdotal spirit so prevalent in certain Dioceses in England.

Our constitutional position

Let us try and see where we stand. The Church of the Province of New Zealand is a voluntary association of Members of the English Church living in New Zealand, desiring to be recognised as a branch of the Church of England; with a "Constitution," giving power to make its own laws and regulations, Except in relation to certain definite matters which are described in the constitutional compact as "fundamental." These may not be altered so long as Church and State remain united in England, or so long as New Zealand remains a part of the British Empire. These Fundamental Provisions are six in number, and cover:—Declaration of Doctrine; Power to accept alteration in Formularies made by the Church in England; and the creation of a representative governing body of the Church—the General Synod. In addition to the six Fundamental Provisions, which it is "not within the power of the General Synod or of any Diocesan Synod to alter, add to, or diminish," there are twenty-four non-fundamental provisions, which may be dealt with by Synod, under stringent rules laid down. These refer in the main to matters of internal government of the Provincial Church. The Declaration of Doctrine set forth in the First Fundamental Article, makes our local Church "hold and maintain the Doctrine and Sacraments of Christ as the Lord had commanded in His Holy Word, and as the United Church of England and Ireland hath received and explained the same in the Book of Common Prayer in the form and manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and in the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. And the General Synod hereinafter constituted for the government for this branch of the said Church shall also hold and maintain the said Doctrine and Sacraments of Christ, and shall have no power to make any alteration in the Authorised Version of the Holy Scriptures, or in the abovenamed Formularies of the Church." Article Two gives power to adopt any change which may be made by the Mother Church. From these conditions it will be at once seen how almost indissoluble is the tie which binds us to the Church of England. But although this may be evident to the ordinary mind, and the wisdom of the restrictions placed upon us recognised, to many ecclesiastical minds it does not so present itself.

Attempts to alter "Fundamentals."

For many years past there has been an insistent agitation, fostered mainly by the clerical section of the Church, for a change in Clause Six, so as to provide power for Synod to alter the Fundamental Provisions. Indeed, in 1892, an Act was passed by the General Synod in this direction, providing for the addition to Clause Six of the words, "Save in the manner hereinafter provided." The provision consisted in it being required that for an alteration of a Fundamental Provision, legislation in that direction, by any Synod, must be confirmed by the following Synod But it did not need the declension by the Synod of 1905 to confirm the action of the Synod of 1902, to render such action null, it was ultra vires from the start.

Bishop Selwyn.

Bishop Selwyn, to opinions, frequently not his own, have recently been attributed, had a short but effective way of dealing with such a proposal, for we find that he, presiding as Bishop of New Zealand, over the session of General Synod, held at Christchurch in 1865, in an elaborate statement regarding the powers of Synod under

the Constitution recently adopted, announced that he should "feel himself justified in refusing to put from the chair any proposal for altering the Fundamental Provisions."

Warning to Churchmen.

It is necessary to remind churchmen of this alteration made by Synod in 1902, in order to place on record that though it has appeared in the "authorised" edition of the Constitution, issued after the session of 1902, it is absolutely illegal and without warrant; but its history needs to be preserved, as further attacks will be made upon the Fundamentals. The Laity should jealously retain the protection which the Fundamental Articles afford, against false doctrine and Romish ceremonies obtaining sanction, even though we may for a time appear powerless to prevent them being taught and practised. The Council of the League believes it is correct in stating that, so doubtful are the advocates of alteration as to the strength of their position, and so determined are they to obtain, under the guise of "Autonomy for the Church," power to revolutionise the New Zealand Church, that the aid of Parliament will be invoked at no distant date. Should this surmise prove correct, it will be the duty of the Laity to strenuously oppose the project, and of the Laymen's League to lead the opposition.

Powers Assumed by the Episcopate.

Government by "Orders" endangered.

By its Constitution the Church is governed by all three Orders: Bishops, Clergy, Laity, each having in Synods and in some subordinate bodies, equal rights, the consent of all three being necessary for action taken. But of late there has sprung into existence a distinct violation of this fundamental equality, and a determination has been evinced by the Episcopate to count of little value, and even put aside, the opinion of the Clergy, and of the Laity in particular, when found to be in antagonism to that of the Bishops. Facts bearing out this statement are known to members of Synod and of some Church Boards, but, for present purposes, it will be sufficient to give a single instance from the transactions of Synod, and one from the business of a Board.

"Order of The Good Shepherd."

It is but a short time since a member of Synod called attention, by way of resolution, to the proposed establishment under a "Constitution," stated to be issued by "authority," of a Sisterhood pledged to celibacy, poverty, and obedience. This Sisterhood was to be a continuation of what was known in Auckland as "The Mission to Streets and Lanes," a very excellent institution, working under rules approved by Diocesan Synod many years since. The name of the newly-constituted body, according to the "authorised" Constitution, was to be "The Order of the Good Shepherd." The work of the Society, both in its old form and in its new, was undoubtedly of a high character, deserving of all praise. But the Constitution of the "Order" in its new form contained elements of a nature which required to be carefully considered before embodiment in the rules governing a Sisterhood connected with the Reformed Church of England. But these rules, strange to say, though an enlargement and material alteration of those originally adopted by Synod for the government of the Mission to Streets and Lanes, were never submitted to Synod at all, and their authority had to be challenged by resolution. On the express terms of a resolution unanimously passed, providing that the rules would be recast and brought before the following year's Synod for confirmation or otherwise, a vote condemnatory of this conventual institution was avoided. Next year, however, the Chapter, which was the body nominally responsible for the Constitution in its objectionable form, distinctly ignored the resolution of Synod, and failed to produce or make any reference to the revised rules. When questioned, the clerical representative of the Chapter calmly informed Synod that the establishment of the Sisterhood was a "spiritual matter" for which that "spiritual body," the Chapter, was not responsible to Synod. This statement was made in face of the fact that the Chapter exists by Act of the Synod, and it is required by that Act to report its proceedings year by year to the Synod. As there existed no sufficient firmness in the Synod to assert its rights, the extraordinary position has been reached that, by the action of the Diocesan, the Sisters were "received," and the institution goes on under an unlawful constitution, containing what many members of the Church believe to be unChristian and unnatural rules for the control of women.

Once the power of the Bishop and the Chapter to do this thing is admitted, there is nothing in Synod to prevent them from transforming a self-governing Church into a system where the so-called governing body can act merely at the will or caprice of one of its three orders—the Episcopate. The day when this action took place marks the blasting in the minds of many laymen, anxious to assist to the utmost of their ability in the advancement of the spiritual life of the Diocese, of the hope they had cherished that under the new regime the Diocese would be governed with a spirit entirely free, as formerly, from ecclesiastical autocracy. This statement

of a painful incident is put on record with a sense of extreme regret : but it is necessary that the facts should be stated in order that those of the Laity who do not recognise the seriousness of the position thereby created, may be aroused to a sense of the danger which threatens their rights as Churchmen in consequence of the new policy of the Episcopate.

St. John's College Trust.

In the matter of Church Trusts, the same desire to exercise the spirit of ecclesiastical domination appears to prevail. We will indicate one instance of this. The College of St. John the Evangelist, at Tamaki, is under the control of Trustees, appointed by General Synod, and of Governors named, one by each Bishop of the Provincial Church, except by the Bishop of Auckland, who is *ex officio* Chairman of the Board of Governors. For a considerable time, extending probably over two or three years, there were divergent views among the Board of Governors in regard to the control and management of the College, which disagreement came into prominence and publicity in the matter of the arbitrary exclusion from the College of holders of certain scholarships by the act of the then Warden. This action was approved of by the Chairman, but failed to secure unanimous approval from the Board; some members, clerical as well as lay, held the rustication of the scholars to be beyond the power of the Warden, and indeed of the Board itself, unless wrong doing on the part of the scholars concerned had, after a full inquiry, been first proved. No proof was ever offered. On the contrary, one scholar, by the threat of an action at law, obtained compensation to a considerable amount for the forfeiture of scholarship without trial. This compensation the Trustees were called upon by the Governors to pay, though they had had no voice whatever in the wrongful treatment of the scholars; and the Board did pay upon the deliberative and casting vote of the Right Reverend the Chairman, given at a Board meeting at which but four members were present. As a result, one of the Trustees felt himself called upon to resign his position, believing, that if compensation were due, it should be paid by the persons who did the wrong to the scholars, and not taken out of Scholarship or College Funds.

Bishops assume sole control.

This "contumacy" on the part of members of both bodies, led to the suggestion, which came in a memorandum from the very Warden under whom the trouble with the scholars had arisen, of getting rid of the clerical and lay members of the Board of Governors altogether. The proposal met with but little support from either Trustees or Governors, but, at a subsequent selection of Governors, at the time of the holding of last General Synod, all the Bishops who had the right to name Governors, except the Bishop of Dunedin, named themselves. It was a monstrous perversion of the right of selection, which could only have been resorted to for the purpose of getting rid of men who had proved themselves not only not pliant, but fearless. All who desire to understand how overbearing and arbitrary this self-appointment by the Bishops was, have but to refer to the terms of Section 3 of Canon II., Title E., which provides for the mode of appointment of a Governor. An appeal against the action of these Bishops was sent forward to the Standing Commission, sitting at Dunedin, a body which interprets Church Laws, the members of which had no hesitation in declaring the Bishops' appointments of themselves as Governors as absolutely invalid. This appeal, we are glad to be able to place on record, was made by a Clerical Governor who had been displaced and who stated his case with such force and clearness that there could be but one result. Most people would think this decision conclusive, not so these Bishops. Forced to name fresh persons, they reappointed those former Members of the Board, who in the past had been found tractable, and dispensed with the services of the remainder of the old Members. Once more freedom of opinion, judgment, and speech were put aside, when it interfered with the views and designs of high Ecclesiastics. And yet there are to be found good people in our midst who express astonishment at the establishment of a "Laymen's League."

Summary.

To sum up then, the Council of the League says :—

- There is in England a widespread movement, generally deemed and called "a conspiracy," to Romanise the National Church.
- The germ of this pestilent thing has reached our land. There are Clergy among us, few, we are glad to think, who know well what it means, and yet are prepared, when they deem the time ripe, to go the full length of reunion with Rome on Rome's terms. Others not so far advanced, are found striving to lead their people in the attempt to discover forced meanings in the Sacraments and Ceremonies of the Church, which do violence to the plain terms of Her Articles, and to the clearly expressed intentions of the compilers of the Prayer Book. A third section, made up mainly of younger men, who know little, and seem to care less, about the principles that lie at the roots of Churchmanship, follow the newest

ecclesiastical fashion in doctrine and in ritual, so long as it carries the approval of their superiors.

Appeal to the Clergy.

May we venture to plead with the Clergy of all three divisions. To the first we say, "If you are honestly convinced that Truth is to be found in the Roman rather than in the Anglican Communion, why not go there at once and ease your souls? Surely you are not seeking to follow the wicked example set in England by men who remain in our Communion in order to do Rome's work of proselytism more effectually?"

Of the second section, Clergy who adopt ritualistic practices, but do not attach much, if any, doctrinal significance to them, deeming them merely "fanciful and innocent," we ask: "Are you acting loyally to the Church or by the people, whose salvation it is your function to 'help and not to hinder,' when, because of your own stubborn will and inflated conception of office, you indulge in practices, preach doubtful doctrine, or assume a lordship which results in driving from their Church men with their families, who were born in our Church, sealed with its seal, and nourished by its truths, long before you were ever admitted to the exercise of the Ministry. God calls to account the steward of His Vineyard as well as the humblest labourer therein. For your own sake, for your people's spiritual welfare, and for the triumph of God's Kingdom on earth, consider these things.

To the Clergy of the third class, the younger men, we would say in the words of the exhortation delivered to them at their Ordination, "Ye ought to apply yourselves, as well as that ye may shew yourselves dutiful and thankful unto that Lord, Who has placed you in so high a Dignity, as also to beware, that neither you yourselves offend, nor be occasion that others offend."

To the Clergy, as a whole, we say : "We give God thanks that it is but a fraction of your Order, who in this Diocese afflict the people in the direction we have dwelt upon. The great body of you we believe to be out of sympathy with the ritualistic movement in its grosser form. God keep you so, and save you from the influence of bad example! The establishment of this League will, we trust, assist you in your honest course. It will have a steadying effect on the Diocese, and, perhaps, beyond it. And we believe that, given wise counsels in the conduct of the League, the Church of New Zealand will, in future years, have reason to be thankful for its existence.

O, the pity of it, to see honest old-fashioned English Churchmen driven with their families from their Parish Church to seek the ministrations of the Pastors of other Christian bodies, or to join themselves to sects which, in the desperate effort to escape from the arrogance of a priesthood, are serving God under the guidance of lay Preachers only, or, worse still, "to forsake the gathering together," as the manner of most now is, and to drift away with the multitude of the careless and indifferent! The Reformation freed England from the superstition of the dark ages; there is grave danger that the restoration of that same superstition will plunge the Empire into a darker age of paganism, from which not even denominational schools will save it. For let the Clergy mark this—it was one thing for a sacerdotal caste, the sole repository of the Nation's learning, to impose on a benighted country a system as full of priestly claims as of religious error; it will be found a very different undertaking to set again the yoke of Ecclesiasticism on the neck of a Laity in whom has been fulfilled the saying "The truth shall make you free."

Responsibility of the Laity.

Brethren of the Laity, recognise, and teach your children to recognise, the greatness of the heritage which, in our pure religion and free Church, God has given us. Resist, with might and main, the beginning of error, false doctrine, and tyranny within the Church. See for yourselves how far innovations, foreign to the principles of our Church, have been introduced here. Let each bring to the touchstone of Holy Scripture and the Book of Common Prayer, the teaching and ritual of the Church in which he worships. At this stage of the League's existence it is not thought well to single out particular persons or churches for its attention, and we trust that there may be no need in the future. But should any of you desire aid, beside that of your fellow parishioners, against the encroachment of error, the League, as far as it is within its power, will render it. This is our bounden duty. For the Church of Christ is not so much a body, clerical and lay, but a body more lay than clerical; from this it follows that lay action is not incidental or occasional, but an essential part of all Church action whatever. The action of the Laity is competent in matters of doctrine and government, from the very nature of Christianity and of the Church; it follows from this that The Laity are Responsible if False Doctrine is Formally Accepted by the Church.

Graphic Border

[Publications of the League may be had Free, upon application to any of the Officers, or at the Auckland Sunday School Union Depot, 141 Queen Street.]

How easy and natural is the slip from Ritualism to Romanism is well exemplified in the case of "Father"

Hugh Benson, son of a late Primate of England, who, speaking to a Roman Catholic audience, stated :—

"At that time (when he was in the English Church) I believed that we had the true priesthood and we practised Catholic doctrine. We had what we believed to be the Mass, we observed silence during the greater part of the day, we wore a certain kind of habit with a girdle, and some wore a biretta. We used the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, supplementing it with a great part of the Catholic Breviary, and I for months—I might say years—before I became a Catholic, recited my rosary every day. . . . At the conclusion of the missions which I conducted as part of my public work, I used to hear far more confessions than I have heard as a Catholic priest. . . . On practically every point except the supremacy of the Pope, we believed the teaching of the Catholic Church, taught most of her doctrines, as thousands of Anglican Clergy are doing to-day, and it is this High Church teaching that is building the bridge over which Anglicans will come into the true fold."

Professor St. George Mivart, F.R.S., a well-known Roman Catholic writer, in the *Nineteenth Century*, after referring to the "absurdly grotesque" conduct of Ritualists in some respects, says :—

"But these facts should not blind us to the good work the High Church party in the Establishment is doing. The English people are sadly inaccessible to the Catholic clergy on account of old habits and traditional prejudices, and modern Catholic worship is often strange and repellant to them. But the Ritualistic ministers of the Establishment can easily obtain a hearing, and succeed in scattering the good seed of Roman doctrine far and wide. We now frequently meet with devout practices which, forty years ago, were unheard of, save to be denounced and scouted outside the small Catholic body. But Ritualists are rapidly making the word Protestant to . . . stink in the nostrils of their congregations, and causing them to regard it as a detestable form of belief. Thus, not only are our ancient Churches being renovated and decorated in the Roman spirit, and so prepared for us, but congregations to fill them are being gathered together. The devout and noble-minded men who form the advance army are preparing the way for a great increase of the [Roman] Catholic church in England."

Printed and Published by Wilson & Morton, for the Laymen's League, at their Registered Printing Office, Queen Street, Auckland. 24/6/09.—10.000.