Robert G. Ingersoll.

Robert G. Ingersoll, who is known throughout the length and breadth of the United States as a freethinker of the boldest type, as a public speaker of fine intellectual endowment, possessing in a rare degree the gifts of eloquence and wit, and above all, as a man of high character, is the son of a New-School Presbyterian Minister. He was born in Western New York, but his father moved, when his son was very young, into Ohio, and thence into Illinois, both of these states not being "howling" wildernesses at the time, because American forests are oppressively silent—but regions almost wholly uninhabited. Robert's early years were thus passed face to face with the unsubdued forests and prairies, and this life doubtless helped to form his habit of independent thought and utterance, and to give him a physical constitution that can endure extreme and continuous toil when he chooses to test it.

Col. Ingersoll has been a freethinker from his earliest boyhood. He says, "I can't remember when I believed the Bible doctrine of eternal punishment. I have a dim recollection of hating Jehovah when I was exceedingly small." Before he was 10 years old he had repeated discussions with his father, in which he argued against his father's creed. The conditions that make one man a freethinker and another a chief among believers are not easily traced. Somewhere in the physical organisation they lie; it may be a mere difference of weight of brain. The freethinker will spring from the most unlikely stock, and more than one stout Calvinist tree has borne infidel fruit. It certainly cannot be said that Robert's scepticism was the result of a stern upbringing, although the austerity of an old-style Presbyterian household, especially on Sundays, undoubtedly intensified his natural unbelief in any form of faith that causes a man to seek anywhere but in his own heart or in nature for truth, scientific, religious, or ethical. An early recollection bearing on this period is attributed to Robert's brother. The old clergyman once got a little angry at his son's inborn infidelity, but when the boy said, "Well, father, if you want me to lie, you may make me pretend to believe like you, but if you want me to be honest, I must talk as I do," the wise father preferred to have a sincere child rather than a hypocrite. Before his death, the father gave up the idea that this life is a period of probation, abandoning the doctrine of eternal punishment.

When still a mere boy, Robert left home, wandering in the west, and working at various places, until he contrived to educate himself for the legal profession. He soon became famous in his district—that of Southern Illinois—as a lawyer of unmatched eloquence and influence with juries. Probably he is without an equal as a jury-lawyer in the country-to-day. Certainly he has no equal in the West. Stories are told in Illinois of his power over juries that rival the strongest illustrations of the influence of eloquence in the annals of the English or American bar. His marvellous power of drawing poetical pictures of domestic life, and of arousing sympathy on behalf of his client, enabled him to carry the toughest cases. The jury were emotionalised, and consequently impervious to the most skilfully put legal arguments from the opposite side. He abandoned criminal practice, because "it wore on him so much." When he had an uncertain murder case on hand it absorbed him; all his sympathies were enlisted; he could not sleep or take up any other work until his client was safe. This absorption is almost suicidal to an emotional nature, especially if it is a large nature.

Of Col. Ingersoll's war record very little has been made known. When the war broke out, his constitutional detestation of slavery in every form, found outlet in the active work of raising a regiment of cavalry, of which he was placed in command, and assigned to the Western Department. He was in the battle of Shiloh and other engagements. The following narrative should be taken as showing the popular estimate of his character, as a man of ready wit, and of infinite good-fellowship, rather than as being literally accurate. On one occasion he
was ordered to guard a ford, with instructions to delay an advancing army of Rebels as long as possible, in order that the army of the North might make certain counter movements. He held his position for some time, but the enemy came up in such overwhelming force, that he had no course left but to order a retreat—every man as best he could to save himself. It was devil take the hindmost. As Col. Ingersoll was galloping away with his men as fast as their horses could get over the ground, his horse stumbled in a lane and threw him. Just as he fell several balls struck the logs, near him, and on looking up he saw some Rebels raising their carbines at him. With characteristic quickness and presence of mind, he shouted at the top of his voice; "Hold on there! Don't make blank fools of yourselves. I've been doing nothing else for the last five minutes, but wishing for a good chance to recognise your blank Confederacy." A southern officer ordered the men to stop, and laughing at the unknown Yankee's impudence they took him prisoner. At that time he was little known outside Illinois and Indiana.

As he is one of the wittiest and best talkers in America, in private as well as on the platform, he was soon a great favourite, and Forrest, whose command captured him, treated him with the greatest consideration, once telling him that he would get him exchanged the first chance that offered, because he was getting so popular with the Rebels that he began to doubt the fidelity of his own men.

The following remark touching Ingersoll's military career is, without doubt, a true utterance of the tender great-hearted gentleman. He says—"I was not fit to be a soldier; I never saw our men fire but I thought of the widows and orphans they would make, and wished that they would miss."

As a lecturer Col. Ingersoll's career has been an unqualified success. By his anti-Christian themes, and his reputation as an infidel, he necessarily drove from him a very large part of the ordinary lecture-goers, because the majority of these are church-going people. But, on the other hand, he called around him a new class everywhere,—mostly men, and chiefly young men or old ones; not so much middle-aged men. The young men wanted to hear him, the old ones were the confirmed free-thinkers. The ordinary lecture audience, everywhere in the east, is composed of about equal numbers of the sexes, generally more women than men; but Ingersoll's audiences showed something like five men to every woman, and sometimes the disproportion was even greater. The women in America, as in Great Britain, are the chief supporters of the church, and tend to Conservatism in everything. But when women did go to hear his lecture on "The Liberty of Man, Woman, and Child," they were the most delighted and enthusiastic listeners ever seen in any audience. They forgave his poor opinion of the church for his good opinion of the women. No more popular lecture has perhaps ever been delivered than this magnificent plea for human liberty. The same lecture has been delivered under the titles of "Intellectual Development" and "Skulls," and the substance of it has been reprinted in England with still another title; but everywhere, whether spoken or read, it has commanded admiration. To his more recent lectures, notably to the United States, women have been attracted in large numbers, and have evinced the liveliest interest. The generous passion, the tremulous sympathy, the truth and powerful discourse, "What shall I do to be saved?" delivered in Chicago, women have been attracted in large numbers, and have evinced the liveliest interest. The generous passion, the tremulous sympathy, the truth and poetry of feeling which mark Col. Ingersoll's addresses, remove from Freethought the reproach of being a synonym for intellectual baldness. He has elevated womanhood; and in winning the heart and arousing the active emotions of women, he is preparing the final victory of Freethought.

The business side of Col. Ingersoll's lecturing career has been thought worthy of special notice by his numerous critics. It is believed that some of his audiences have yielded more money than has ever before been recorded, even in a country of phenomenal lecturing successes. Accordingly he has been taunted with aiming merely at popularity, and of roystering around as the popular advocate of Atheism at 25,000 dollars a year. To this Col. Ingersoll has made the following pungent reply:—"Is it honest in Dr Collyer to assail my motive? Let him answer my argument. Is it honest and fair in him to say I am doing a certain thing because it is popular? Has it got to this, that in this Christian country where they have preached every day hundreds and thousands of sermons,—has it got to this, that infidelity is so popular in the United States? If it has, I take courage. And I not only see the dawn of a brighter day, but the day is here. Think of it! A minister tells me in this year of grace, 1879, that a man is an infidel simply that he may be popular. I am glad of it. Simply that he may make money. Is it possible that we can make more money tearing down churches than in building them up? Is it possible that we can make more money denouncing the God of slavery than we can praising the God that took liberty from man? If so, I am glad."

If Freethought advocacy brings Colonel Ingersoll a handsome income, it is no more than the fitting reward of his splendid gifts and services. It is not surprising that this should be grudged by clergymen, who envy him his liberty as well as his power and success; just as ineffably dull and stupid critics are charmed at the popular response to his swift and incisive wit. But if common report be true, Colonel Ingersoll spends as handsomely as he earns. He has a theory that the moment a man starts out to save, he becomes selfish, and begins to petrify. He says, "I despise a stingy man. I have known men who would trust their wives with their hearts and their honour, but not with their pocket-book; not with a dollar. When I see a man of that kind, I always think he knows which of these articles is the most valuable. Think of making your wife a beggar! Think of her having to ask you every
day for a dollar, or for two dollars, or fifty cents! 'What did you do with that dollar I gave you last week?' Think of having a wife that is afraid of you! Oh, I tell you, if you have but a dollar in the world, and you have got to spend it, spend it like a king, spend it as though it were a dry leaf, and you the owner of unbounded forests!' This is a philosophy, however, by no means incompatible with a very shrewd outlook upon the outgoings and inscomings of the dollars.

In the conversational art Colonel Ingersoll is said to be as striking as he is in oratory. Indeed, except in his great passages, his private talk excels in pathos, in rare insight, in poetic imagery, and in delicate fancies. He has often an oriental style of rhetoric in his most familiar conversations. He employs such phrases as abound in Hafiz, and Saadi, and in many of the sacred books of the East, phrases that blend mental states with the memory of familiar things. For example, if an ultra conservative had to be described, an ordinary speaker might say that he is a man of stubborn prejudices who refuses to listen to argument, and then says that because he never makes any progress, the world stands still. The oriental singer would however say something like this: "He stretches himself on the couch of contentment, and draws the cap of prejudice over the eyes of reason, and swears that the car of progress is shackled by the gods in the streets of eternal repose." Of course, this illustration is absurdly exaggerated, but it suggests the oriental imagery, of which Ingersoll's talk is full. In his lectures this rhetorical artifice is generally most effective, although by repetition it becomes transparent, and tends to degenerate into mere use of stock metaphors. On the other hand his humour is western, and wholly American. He is swift as lightning in repartee, keen and also kind in his wit, unless he is talking of religious dogmas, and then his sarcasm is merciless, and meant to wound, and no woman is quicker to respond to the gentlest breath of pathos. Often after his lecture of two hours, delivered after travelling a long distance in the cars, he has sat up talking with friends until past midnight; and his talks on such occasions are remembered as being better on the average than his best public orations, though possibly friendship has helped this opinion by kindly exaggeration. His conversation is full of phrases that would be conceded gems in a great writer. Speaking of a sanguine man, he said, "Show him an egg, and instantly the air is full of feathers." He has remarkable power of concrete illustration, and ripples with bright sayings. Then, again, his conversation has a breadth that pertains rather to the men of old, and the listener constantly wonders whether Burns, Rabelais, Voltaire, or Shakspeare has had the greatest effect in forming his spoken style.

It needs no special art to divine that in his family life, Col. Ingersoll is blessed among men. An unfriendly reader might charge him with being unable to keep woman out of his lectures. Every freethought speech he has delivered contains some splendid pleadings for the full freedom and equality of woman. When he speaks on this subject, or of fireside joys, his words have a deep and homely eloquence, that reveals the heart firmly resting on tried affection. He is remarkable among Americans in having preserved his family life sacred from the eye of vulgar curiosity, and only in so far as he has himself permitted the public to cross the threshold shall any reference be made here to a side of his life which should be free from the intrusion either of praise or blame. His residence in Peoria, Illinois, and latterly in Washington, is dedicated by gracious presences to a simple and cordial hospitality, to the charms of friendship, and the freedom of an abounding comradeship. With intellectual and untrammeled life, a generous, wise, and genial host, whoever enters finds a welcome, seasoned with kindly wit and Attic humour, a poetic insight, and a delicious frankness, which renders an evening there a veritable symposium. The wayfarer who passes is charmed, and he who comes frequently goes always away with delighted memories. What matters it that opinions differ; such as he and his make common life the sweeter. An hour or two spent in the attractive parlours of the Ingersoll homestead, amid that rare group, lends a new meaning to the idea of home, and a more secure beauty to the fact of family life.

It is not amiss to say that a man's conduct in his home is the true test of his character. To his family, to his immediate relatives, and the friends who are his daily companions, Col. Ingersoll is as nearly perfect as any man can be. His home is his heaven, and he wants no other heaven. There is probably no happier family group to be found anywhere, and had he been a Christian his home would have been held up as a model Christian household. He has himself made public reference to his daughters. Neither of the two young ladies has ever been inside a church. The Colonel said that one night when the children—they were quite young at the time—were in bed, and he supposed them to be asleep, he was reading a sermon about the tortments of hell to his wife. Suddenly one of the girls rose up in bed and asked, "Who said such things about God?" He told her it was a sermon, and that the doctrine was taught in the church. "Then," said the young girl, "I'll never go inside of one." And she has never been within a church, although when in Europe her father advised her to visit some of the old cathedrals.

In the world of politics Colonel Ingersoll fills a unique position. Holding no office, he nevertheless, by his mastery of the public ear, wields a power hardly inferior to that of politicians of the first rank. He enjoys the friendship of Secretary Blaine and others member of the government, and in the stir of the presidential elections the principles and men of the Republican party have no more eloquent advocate and defender.

In free America as well as in England to avow free thought is to place a barrier in the path to political
honours. Colonel Ingersoll has already had a taste of martyrdom. It will be remembered that some years ago he was appointed American Ambassador to the Court of Berlin, but had to forego the preferment on account of the active bigotry of the orthodox. An incident is told which further illustrates this: A gentleman went to see Colonel Ingersoll when he lived in Peoria, and finding a fine copy of Voltaire in his library, said, "Pray, sir, what did this cost you?" "I believe it cost me the governorship of the State of Illinois," was the swift and pregnant answer.

On that evil day when Garfield was shot, Colonel Ingersoll was in the Station-house at Washington, and is reported to have sprang forward to interpose between the assassin and his victim. The exciting three weeks that followed found him a busy man. It was well that amid the first fierce fury of anger and excitement, and the subsequent more bitter, if not as noble outpouring of faction's suspicions, and inuendoes, so manly a man, so sagacious a counsellor, was enabled to hold so positive a balance. Cabinet officers, legal functionaries, detectives, citizens—all felt his wise humane instincts and capacious brain, influencing for fair equipoise and calmer judgment.

In 1876 Colonel Ingersoll in a short, but finely conceived, oration, proposed Mr Blaine as the nominee of Illinois for the Presidency. In this speech, as well as those delivered in the contest in 1880, which resulted in the return of Garfield, an English reader will perceive a certain extravagance of eulogy as well as a subordination of close argument to rhetoric. But America's problems are not ours, and Colonel Ingersoll's mode of political persuasion is manifestly well suited to the temper of his audiences, and nicely calculated to win votes. His political meetings in the fall of 1880 elicited a quite unprecedented enthusiasm. At a great meeting in Brooklyn he was introduced by the Rev. H. Ward Beecher as "the most brilliant speaker of the English tongue of all men on this globe," and a great wave of emotion seems to have swept over the vast audience at the spectacle of freethinker and clergyman occupying a common platform in a spirit of liberty and fraternity.

As a politician, Colonel Ingersoll grounds his faith on certain broad principles, to the enunciation of which, and ignoring small party shifts, he bends his oratorical art. He is a Republican because that party crushed the infamy of slavery; because it is in favour of free speech, and honest ballot; because it is honestly redeeming the public debt; because it everywhere fosters humanising influences; because it secures the equal rights of all under the great Republic. Flashes of humour, familiar references, flights of imagination are in turn at the command of the orator to drive these principles home to the minds and hearts of his hearers. His skill in putting his points reminds one of the best models of ancient times. He is supporting the candidature of Garfield:—"I belong to a party that is prosperous when the country is prosperous. I belong to the party that believes in good crops; that is glad when a fellow finds a gold mine; that rejoices when there are forty bushels of wheat to the acre; that laughs when every railroad declares its dividend; that claps both its hands when every investment pays; when the rain falls for the farmer; when the dew lies lovingly upon the grass. I belong to the party that is happy when the people are happy; when the labouring man gets three dollars a day; when he has roast beef on his table; when he has a carpet on the floor; when he has a picture of Garfield on the wall."

Hardly less neatly planted is this blow at the Democrats and their candidate:—"A man is a Republican because he loves something. A man is a Democrat mostly because he hates something. A Republican takes a man, as it were, by the collar, and says, 'You must do your best, you must climb the infinite hill of human progress as long as you live.' Now and then one gets tired, lets go all hold, and rolls down to the very bottom of the hill, and as he strikes the mud, he springs upon his feet transfigured, and says, 'Hurrah for Hancock.'"

His fertility of illustration is remarkable. In the interminable discussion of the currency question, there has not yet been placed upon record a wittier, truer, or more luminous passage than the following:—"The greenback, unless you have the gold behind it, is no more a dollar than a bill of fare is a dinner. You cannot make a paper dollar without taking a dollar's worth of paper. We must have paper that represents money. I want it issued by the Government, and I want behind it either a gold or silver dollar, so that every greenback under the flag can lift up its hand and swear, 'I know that my redeemer liveth.'"

Of the alertness of a memory, richly furnished with capital stories, and the irresistible way in which they are used as apt illustration of a position or principle, every discourse of Colonel Ingersoll furnishes proof. Speaking of the Democratic party in connection with the collection of the revenue, he recounts:—"Two ministers were holding a revival meeting in a certain place. After the services one of them passed around the hat. When it was returned, he found in it pieces of slate pencils and nails and buttons, but not a solitary cent, and his brother got up and looked at the contribution and said, 'Let us thank God!' 'What for?' said the other. 'Because we've got the hat back.'" The moral was obvious.

He has moreover a power of lucid, pithy, and quaint phrasing that fixes a truth on the memory. "The Republican party lives on hope; the Democratic on memory; the Democrat keeps his back to the sun, and imagines himself a great man because he casts a great shadow;" this is a definition which combines literary charm and argumentative force. Or take this utterance on money, which is not unworthy to stand with the epigrammatic endeavours of Emerson and Ruskin on the same subject: "Money is the most social thing in this
world. If a man has a dollar in his pocket, and meets another with two, the solitary dollar is absolutely homesick until it joins the other two."

The weapons which Col. Ingersoll draws from his intellectual armoury to smite the giant orthodoxy are generally common sense and wit. He evidently cares little about the results of Biblical criticism, or refinements in theological belief. He pins the Christian down to the Bible, and says: "Do you believe this book inspired by God? Answer yes or no. Don't tell me it is a poem, or that it is to be taken in spirit, and not in fact. It is the word of God, or it is not the word of God. If it is the former you must accept the burden of its falsities, and immoralities. If the latter, be honest, acknowledge that the world has been mistaken, and let us unite in driving the cloud of superstition from the heart of man." This is the answer he furnishes to critics of every hue—Unitarian, Liberal Christian, Moodyite. It is a matter not of theology, but of plain honesty.

His common-sense, sledge-hammer-like logic would, however, not be the unique thing it is were it not allied to a keen sense of drollery, and a swift wit. He has subjected so-called sacred themes to a breadth and boldness of treatment that startles readers out of their conventional propriety. Christians who find nothing shocking in the idea of a hell, profess to be horrified by a non-theological use of the name. You may speak of flames, but you must not mention brimstone. Even freethinkers have a gingerly way of touching Bible themes; some from an affectation of superiority; others out of supposed respect to dominant opinion. No Bible personage, or subject has immunity from Col. Ingersoll's onset. The lightnings of his wit play around the once august figure of Moses. Deity itself is made to enact the comic role. In the words of one of his critics, Col. Ingersoll seems to say to orthodoxy, "I will dethrone your God today amid peals of laughter; blow his being down the wind on the wings of my epigrams." The sting of all this lies in the fact that the wit tells, that the laughter becomes contagious. Clergymen in the States have confessed that they are ashamed longer to preach the doctrine of hell. Theology may resist grave argument, it may even bear up under eloquent denunciation, but when it becomes a subject for a people's laughter its days are numbered.

This humoristic method is not less effective when dealing with church rites, as the following quotation may show:

"Roger Williams was a Baptist, but how he, or any one not destitute of good sense, could be one, passes my comprehension. Let me illustrate:

Suppose it was the Day of Judgment to-night and we were all assembled, as the ghosts say we will be, to be judged, and God should ask a man:

"Have you been a good man?"
"Yes."
"Have you loved your wife and children?"
"Yes."
"Have you taken good care of them and made them happy?"
"Yes."
"Have you tried to do right by your neighbours?"
"Yes."
"Paid all your debts i'"
"Yes."
And then cap the climax by asking:
"Were you ever baptized?"

Could a solitary being hear that question without laughing? I think not. I once happened to be in the company of six or seven Baptist elders (I never have been able to understand since how I got into such bad company), and they wanted to know what I thought of baptism. I answered that I had not given the matter any attention, in fact, I had no special opinion upon the subject. But they pressed me, and finally I told them that I thought, with soap, baptism was a good thing."

Of course Col. Ingersoll has been decried as a mere iconoclast.

"I have just published a little book, entitled 'Some Mistakes of Moses,' in which I have endeavoured to give most of the arguments I have urged against the Pentateuch in a lecture delivered under that title. The motto on the title-page is, 'A destroyer of weeds, thistles, and thorns is a benefactor, whether he soweth grain or not.' I cannot for my life see why one should be charged with tearing down and not rebuilding simply because he exposes a sham, or detests a lie. I do not feel under any obligation to build something in the place of a detested falsehood. All I think I am under obligation to put in the place of a detected lie is the detection. Most religionists talk as if mistakes were valuable things, and they did not wish to part with them without a consideration. Just how much they regard lies worth a dozen I don't know. If the price is reasonable I am perfectly willing to give it, rather than to see them live and give their lives to the defence of delusions.

'Most of the clergymen envy me; envy my independence; envy my success; think that I ought to starve; that
The people should not hear me; say that I do what I do for money, for popularity; that I am actuated by hatred of all that is good, and tender, and holy in human nature; think that I wish to tear down the churches, destroy all morality and goodness, and usher in the reign of crime and chaos. They know that shepherds are unnecessary in the absence of wolves, and it is to their interest to convince their sheep that they—the sheep—need protection. This they are willing to give them for half the wool. No doubt most of these ministers are honest, and are doing what they consider their duty. Be this as it may, they feel the power slipping from their hands. They know that they are not held in the estimation they once were. They know that the idea is slowly growing that they are not absolutely necessary for the protection of society. They know that the intellectual world cares little for what they say, and that the great tide of human progress flows on careless of their help or hindrance."

The Church long enjoyed the right to brand the intellectual freeman as infidel, unbeliever. But the rolling years have brought a sweeping revenge. Who are now deemed the believers; Bruno, Galileo, Servetus, Darwin, or the priests that have burned, persecuted, and mocked? The freethinker to-day has a different charge laid upon him. Disintegration is not enough, he is told; he must also be a system-builder. Perceiving the ruins of the great temples of the past, is it surprising that he is infected with no desire to raise fabrics of his own?" "Liberty," says Ingersoll, "is the shrine at which I worship, and will ever worship." For the fetters of dogma he substitutes intellectual freedom; for the love and service of God he substitutes faith in man and work for man. No narrower creed contents him.

Physically as well as mentally, Col. Ingersoll is a massive man. His face is one of marked intellectuality and feeling, and bears out what his discourses have already evinced that his is a rounded, harmonious nature. As a speaker he is distinctly an original. His style is akin to that of Mr Bright in the qualities of stately simplicity, homely pathos, and generous passion. He lacks Mr Bright's perfect dignity. His humour is too active for the sustenance of a mien implying some amount of outward passivity. In the blending of sound human sense, invective, and wit, he has no rival; and the word-paintings, the sustained flights of imagination, and the march of the rhetoric in his great passages are a revelation in the use of the English tongue.

The True Story of my Parliamentary Struggle.
By Charles Bradlaugh.
Price Sixpence
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So much misapprehension and misrepresentation prevails as to what has really taken place in the House of Commons with reference to my Parliamentary struggle, that I reprint the Report of the Second Select Committee and the Evidence taken before such Committee, together with my three speeches at the bar and the resolutions of the House: these together giving the actual facts.

Ordered,—[Tuesday, 25th May 1880] :—That Mr. Bradlaugh, the Member for Northampton, having claimed at the Table of this House to make an Affirmation or Declaration instead of the Oath prescribed by Law, founding his claim upon the terms of the Act 29 & 30 Vict. c. 19, and the Evidence Amendment Acts of 1869 and 1870, and stating that he had been permitted to affirm in Courts of Justice by virtue of the said Evidence Amendment Acts: And it having been referred to a Select Committee to consider and report their opinion whether persons entitled, under the provisions of the Evidence Amendment Act, 1869, and the Evidence Amendment Act, 1870, to make a solemn Declaration instead of an Oath in Courts of Justice, may be admitted to make an Affirmation or Declaration instead of an Oath in this House, in pursuance of the Acts 29 & 30 Vict. c. 19, and 31 & 32 Vict. c. 72; And the said Committee having reported that in their opinion such persons cannot be admitted to make an Affirmation or Declaration, instead of an Oath in pursuance of the said Acts:

And Mr. Bradlaugh having since come to the Table of the House for the purpose of taking the Oath prescribed by the 29 & 30 Vict. c. 19, and the 31 & 32 Vict. c. 72, and objection having been made to his taking the said Oath, it be referred to a Select Committee to inquire into and consider the facts and circumstances under which Mr. Bradlaugh claims to have the Oath prescribed by the 29 & 30 Vict. c. 19, and 31 & 32 Vict. c. 72, administered to him in this House, and also as to the Law applicable to such claim under such circumstances, and as to the right and jurisdiction of this House to refuse to allow the said form of the Oath to be administered to him, and to report thereon to the House, together with their opinion thereon.

Ordered,—[Friday, 28th May 1880] :—That the Committee do consist of twenty-three Members.

Committee nominated of—

• Mr. Whitbread.
• Sir John Holker.
• Mr. John Bright.
Lord Henry Lennox.
Mr. Massey.
Mr. Staveley Hill.
Sir Henry Jackson.
Mr. Attorney General.
Mr. Solicitor General.
Sir Gabriel Goldney.
Mr. Grantham.
Mr. Pemberton.
Mr. Watkin Williams.
Mr. Walpole.
Mr. Hopwood.
Mr. Beresford Hope.
Major Nolan.
Mr. Chaplin.
Mr. Serjeant Simon.
Mr. Secretary Childers.
Mr. Trevelyan.
Sir Richard Cross.
Mr. Gibson.

THAT the Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers, and Records.
THAT Five be the Quorum of the Committee.

Report.

The Select Committee appointed to inquire into and consider the facts and circumstances under which Mr. Bradlaugh claims to have the OATH prescribed by the 20 & 30 Vict., c. 19, and 31 and 32 Vict., c. 72, administered to him in this House; and also as to the LAW applicable to such claim under such circumstances; and as to the right and jurisdiction of this House to refuse to allow the said form of the OATH to be administered to him; and to Report thereon to the House, together with their Opinion thereon:—HAVE agreed to the following Report:—

In pursuance of the terms of the reference to your Committee, they have inquired into and considered (1) the facts and circumstances under which Mr. Bradlaugh claims to have the oath prescribed by the Parliamentary Oaths Act, 1866, and the Promissory Oaths Act, 1868, administered to him in the House, (2) the Law applicable to such claim under such circumstances, and (3) the right and jurisdiction of the House to refuse to allow the form of the said Oath to be administered to him.

In order to carry out such inquiry and consideration, your Committee thought it right to examine Sir T. Erskine May as a witness before them. Mr. Bradlaugh applied to be permitted to make a statement to your Committee, and the application was granted. After such statement had been made by Mr. Bradlaugh, he submitted himself for examination, and was examined by any Members of your Committee who desired to put questions to him. Under the circumstances appearing in the Evidence and in the Appendix to this Report, your Committee admitted in evidence a letter written by Mr. Bradlaugh to certain newspapers, dated 20th May, 1880. All the evidence taken by your Committee appears in the Appendix to this Report.

The facts, and circumstances under which Mr. Bradlaugh claimed to take and subscribe the Oath are as follow: On Monday, the 3rd of May, Mr. Bradlaugh came to the Table of the House and claimed to be allowed to affirm, as a person for the time being by law permitted to make a solemn affirmation instead of taking an oath; and on being asked by the Clerk upon what grounds he claimed to make an affirmation, he said that he did so by virtue of the Evidence Amendment Acts, 1869 and 1870. Whereupon Mr. Speaker informed Mr. Bradlaugh, "that if he desired to address the House in explanation of his claim, he might be permitted to do so." In accordance with Mr. Speaker's intimation, Mr. Bradlaugh stated shortly that he relied on the Evidence Further Amendment Act, 1869, and the Evidence Amendment Act, 1870, adding, "I have repeatedly, for nine years past, made an affirmation in the highest courts of jurisdiction in this realm; I am ready to make such a declaration or affirmation." Thereupon Mr. Speaker acquainted the House that Mr. Bradlaugh having made such claim, he did not consider himself justified in determining it; and having grave doubts on the construction of the Acts above stated, he desired to refer the matter to the judgment of the House. Thereupon a Select Committee was appointed to consider and report their opinion whether persons entitled, under the provisions of the Evidence Amendment Acts, 1869 and 1870, to make a solemn declaration instead of an oath in courts of
justice, might be admitted to make an affirmation or declaration instead of an oath, in pursuance of the Acts 29 & 30 Vict, c. 19, and 31 & 32 Vict. c. 72; and on the 20th of May the Committee reported that, in their opinion, persons so entitled could not be admitted to make such affirmation or declaration instead of an oath in the House of Commons.

On the day after the receipt of this Report, Mr. Bradlaugh presented himself at the table of the House to take and subscribe the Oath; and was proceeding to do so, when Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, one of the Members for Portsmouth, objected thereto, and Mr. Bradlaugh having been ordered to withdraw, Sir H. D. Wolff moved, "That, in the opinion of the House, Mr. Bradlaugh, the Member for Northampton, ought not to be allowed to take the Oath which he then required to be administered to him, in consequence of his having previously claimed to make an affirmation or declaration instead of the Oath prescribed by law, founding his claim upon the terms of the Act 29 & 30 Vict. c. 19, and the Evidence Amendment Acts of 1869 and 1870; and on the ground that under the provisions of those Acts the presiding judge at a trial has been satisfied that the taking of an oath would have no binding effects on his conscience." This Motion was superseded by an Amendment appointing your Committee.

**The Law Applicable to Mr. Bradlaugh's Claim.**

Your Committee have been furnished by Sir T. Erskine May with a list of precedents which illustrate the jurisdiction and proceedings of the House in regard to the taking of Oaths. These precedents, and others which Mr. Bradlaugh placed before your Committee as bearing on the case, will be found in the Appendix to this Report. They may generally be divided into three classes: first, cases of refusal to take the Oath; secondly, claims to make an Affirmation, instead of taking the Oath; and, thirdly, claims to omit a portion of the Oath of Abjuration. Among them there is no precedent of any Member coming to the table to take and subscribe the Oath, who has not been allowed to do so, nor of any Member coming to the table and intimating expressly, or by necessary implication, that an oath would not, as an oath, be binding on his conscience. The present case is, therefore, one of first impression.

Now there is not only a *prima facie* right, but it is the duty of every Member who has been duly elected to take and subscribe the Oath, or to affirm according to the Statute. No instance has been brought to the attention of your Committee in which any inquiry has been made into the moral, religious, or political opinion of the person who was desirous to take any Promissory Oath, or of any objection being made to his taking such Oath. It would be impossible to foresee the evils which might arise if a contrary practice were sanctioned. But the question remains whether, if a Member when about to take the Oath should voluntarily make statements as to the binding effect of the Oath on his conscience, it is not within the power of the House to take such statements into consideration, and determine whether such member would, if he went through the form of taking the Oath, be duly taking it within the provisions of the Statute. In the present instance, when Mr. Bradlaugh claimed under the Parliamentary Oaths Acts his right to affirm, and also stated that he had on several occasions been permitted in a Court of Justice to affirm, and had affirmed under the Evidence Amendment Acts, 1869 and 1870, he thereby in effect informed the House that on such occasions a judge of such court had been satisfied that an oath would have no binding effect upon his conscience. Your Committee did not think it right to accept this implication as conclusive without permitting Mr. Bradlaugh an opportunity of making a statement to, and giving evidence before, them. Nothing that has come before your Committee has affected or altered their views as to the effect of that which occurred when Mr. Bradlaugh claimed to affirm, as above stated.

**As to the Right and Jurisdiction of the House.**

As to the right and jurisdiction of the House to refuse to allow the form of the Oath prescribed to be taken by duly elected Members to be taken by them, your Committee are of opinion that there is and must be an inherent power in the House to require that the law by which the proceedings of the House and of its Members in reference to the taking of the Parliamentary Oath is regulated, be duly observed. But this does not imply that there is any power in the House to interrogate any Member desirous to take the Oath of Allegiance upon any subject in connection with his religious belief, or as to the extent the Oath will bind his conscience; or that there is any power in the House to hear any evidence in relation to such matters.

And your Committee are of opinion that by and in making the claim to affirm, Mr. Bradlaugh voluntarily brought to the notice of the House that on several occasions he had been permitted in a Court of Justice to affirm, under the Evidence Amendment Acts, 1869 and 1870, in order to enable him to do which a Judge of the Court must have been satisfied that an Oath was not binding upon Mr. Bradlaugh's conscience; and, as he stated he had acted upon such decisions by repeatedly making the Affirmation in Courts of Justice; and, as above stated, nothing has appeared before your Committee to cause them to think Mr. Bradlaugh dissented
from the correctness of such decisions, your Committee are of opinion that, under the circumstances, the Compliance by Mr. Bradlaugh with the form used when an oath is taken would not be the taking of an Oath within the true meaning of the Statutes 29 Vict. c. 19. and 31 & 32 Vict. c. 72; and, therefore, that the House can, and in the opinion of your Committee ought, to prevent Mr. Bradlaugh going through this form.

But your Committee desire to point out to your Honorable House the position in which Mr. Bradlaugh will be placed if he is not allowed either to take the Oath or to affirm.

If the House of Commons prevent a duly elected Member from taking the Oath or Affirming, there is no power of reviewing or reversing that decision, however erroneous it may be in point of law.

But it appears to your Committee that if a Member should make and subscribe the Affirmation in place of taking and subscribing the Oath, it would be possible, by means of an action brought in the High Court of Justice, to test his legal right to make such Affirmation.

The Committee appointed to inquire into the law relating to the right of certain persons to affirm in effect recorded that Mr. Bradlaugh was not entitled by law to make the Affirmation.

But, from the fact that this Report was carried by the vote of the Chairman, thus showing a great division of opinion amongst the members of that Committee, the state of the law upon the subject cannot be regarded as satisfactorily determined. Under these circumstances it appears to your Committee that Mr. Bradlaugh should have an opportunity of having his statutory rights determined beyond doubt by being allowed to take the only step by which the legality of his making an Affirmation can be brought for decision before the High Court of Justice.

The House, by an exercise of its powers, can, doubtless, prevent Mr. Bradlaugh from obtaining such judicial decision; but your Committee deprecate that course.

Your Committee accordingly recommend that should Mr. Bradlaugh again seek to make and subscribe the Affirmation he be not prevented from so doing.
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Sir Thomas Erskine May, K.C.B.; Examined.

1. CHAIRMAN: You are the Clerk of the House of Commons?—I am.
2. You, I believe, are perfectly acquainted with what took place when Mr. Bradlaugh came to the table of the House, and proposed to make his affirmation instead of taking the oath?—Yes, I was personally present on that day.
3. Will you have the kindness to state to the Committee exactly what took place on that occasion, in order that we may have the facts upon our proceedings?—I will read what occurred, mainly from the Votes and Proceedings of the House, in which an accurate and authentic record of the proceedings of that day will be found. It appears that on Monday, the 3rd of May, 1880, "Mr. Bradlaugh, returned as one of the Members for the borough of Northampton, came to the table and delivered the following statement in writing to the Clerk: 'To the Right Honorable the Speaker of the House of Commons. I, the undersigned Charles Bradlaugh, beg respectfully to claim to be allowed to affirm, as a person for the time being by law permitted to make a solemn affirmation or declaration, instead of taking an oath. (Signed) CHARLES BRADLAUGH.' And being asked by the Clerk upon what grounds he claimed to make an affirmation, he answered: By virtue of the Evidence Amendment Acts, 1869 and 1870. Whereupon the Clerk reported to Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Bradlaugh, Member for the borough of Northampton, claimed to make an affirmation or declaration instead of taking the Oath prescribed by law, in virtue of the provisions of the Evidence Amendment Acts, 1869 and 1870. Mr. Speaker thereupon informed Mr. Bradlaugh that if he desired to address the House in explanation of his claim he might be permitted to do so. Mr. Bradlaugh addressed the House in accordance with Mr. Speaker's intimation, and then he was directed to withdraw." The Committee will observe that there is no entry in the Votes of the words used by Mr. Bradlaugh; it is not customary on such occasions to make an entry of the observations made, which are considered to be part of the debates of the House, which are not recorded in the Votes and Proceedings; and there was no shorthand writer authorised by the House to take notes, and therefore there could have been no authentic record upon which one could rely.
4. Have you any reason to believe that something was said upon that occasion by Mr. Bradlaugh other than what appeared upon the Votes?—Mr. Bradlaugh's observations were very short. He repeated that he relied upon the Evidence Further Amendment Act, 1869, and the Evidence Amendment Act, 1870, adding, "I have repeatedly, for nine years past, made an affirmation in the highest courts of jurisdiction in this realm; I am ready to make such a declaration or affirmation." Substantially those were the words which he addressed to the Speaker.
5. What took place after that?—Whereupon Mr. Speaker addressed the House as follows: "I have now formally to acquaint the House that Mr. Bradlaugh, Member for the borough of Northampton, claims to make an affirmation or declaration instead of the oath prescribed by Law. He founds this claim upon the terms of the 4th clause of the Act 29 and 30 Vict., c. 19, and the Evidence Amendment Acts, 1869 and 1870. I have not considered myself justified in determining this claim myself, having grave doubts on the construction of the Acts above stated, but desire to refer the matter to the judgment of the House."
6. That is substantially all that took place upon that occasion?—I presume the Committee will scarcely desire that I should proceed through all the subsequent Votes of the House in regard to the appointment of the Committees.
7. There is nothing beyond what you have stated which is material for the Committee to consider?—No, nothing besides what happened on that day in reference to this matter.
8. You are, of course, acquainted with the terms of the reference to this Committee.—Yes.
9. What were the proceedings which took place after the Report of the former Committee?—The Report of the Committee was ordered to lie upon the table, and no further proceedings were taken upon it; it lies upon the table at present.
10. Mr. Gibson: On what day was it laid upon the table?—On the 20th of May, the day on which the House assembled for business.
11. Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I think some of the members of the Committee would like to have some
account of what took place in the interval between the time when Mr. Bradlaugh claimed to make the
affirmation, and the time when he appeared at the table to take the Oath?—Mr. Bradlaugh claimed to the
Oath; and the Clerk was proceeding to administer the same to him, when Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, Member
for Portsmouth, rose to take objection thereto, and submit a motion to the House; whereupon Mr. Speaker
directed Mr. Bradlaugh to withdraw." And then, as the Committee are aware, several proceedings occurred,
which extended over some days: the Committee will scarcely desire them to be read.
12. Chairman: Those proceedings are really stated in the Order of Reference to this Committee?—Yes.
13. Mr. Gibbon: At what date did this Parliament meet for the first time?—On Thursday, the 29th of April.
14. And on what day did Mr. Bradlaugh claim to make the affirmation?—On Monday, the 3rd of May.
15. The swearing of Members had been going on in the meantime, had it not?—The swearing of Members
began on Friday, the 30th of April.
16. You are acquainted with Mr. Bradlaugh's appearance; are you yourself aware whether he had been in
the House during the swearing of Members on any of the intervening days?—He had been about the House,
unquestionably.
17. Mr. Serjeant Simon: Mr. Bradlaugh was present, I believe, and voted when the Speaker was
elected?—Yes; none of the members had then been sworn.
18. Chairman: Since this Committee has been appointed; have you made a search into the Journals of the
House for any precedents which bear upon the question before the Committee?—Yes, I directed the Clerk of
the Journals to make a search for every precedent which would tend to illustrate the jurisdiction and
proceedings of the House in regard to the taking of oaths.
19. What is the result of the search?—The result of that search is the paper which is upon the table to-day,
and in the hands of all the Members of the Committee.
20. I see that one of those is a precedent of a Member disabled for having sat in the House without taking
the Oath; then there is a precedent of a Member being admitted to sit without taking the Oath of Allegiance and
Supremacy; then there are precedents of Members being discharged for declining to take the Oath; then there is
a precedent of a Member, being a Quaker, refusing to take the Oath; then there is a precedent of a Member
expelled for absconding, and not taking the Oath; then there is a precedent of a Member refusing to take the
Oath of Supremacy; then there is a precedent of a Member, being a Quaker, claiming to make an affirmation;
then there are precedents of Members omitting the words in the Oath of Abjuration, "on the true faith of a
Christian;" and lastly, the precedent of a Member stating that he had a conscientious objection to take the Oath.
I should like to ask whether there is any precedent amongst those of a member coming to the table and stating
that he was ready to take the Oath, and any objection being taken to him in consequence of that
statement?—No, there is no precedent to that effect, unless it might be argued that the case of Mr. O'Connell, in
1829, was, to a certain extent, analogous. He claimed, as the Committee are aware, to take the Oath recently
provided by the Catholic Relief Act, and which, he contended, was the oath that he was entitled to take; it was a
question of law whether that was the oath which he could take.
21. In that case he refused to take the old oath, and he offered to take the new oath under the Catholic
Relief Act?—That is so.
22. And the House refused, I believe, to allow him to take that oath?—That was the case. I may state briefly
that these precedents may generally be divided into three classes: first, cases of refusal to take the oath;
secondly, claims to make an affirmation instead of taking the oath; and thirdly, claims to omit a portion of the
Oath of Abjuration. With one or two exceptional cases, those three classes comprehend all the cases which have
been laid before the Committee.
23. Mr. Bradlaugh (through the Committee): I should like to ask upon that whether the case of Daniel
O'Connell was not a case of absolute refusal by the Member to take the oath required by law?—I think the best
way will be, perhaps, to read the precedent from this paper, and then any inference can be drawn from it. It is at
page 5. "Precedent of Member refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy; Daniel O'Connell, Esq., professing the
Roman Catholic religion, returned knight of the shire for the county of Clare, being introduced in the usual
manner, for the purpose of taking his seat, produced at the table a certificate of his having been sworn before
two of the deputies appointed by the Lord Stewart, whereupon the Clerk tendered to him the Oaths of
Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration; upon which Mr. O'Connell stated that he was ready to take the Oaths of
Allegiance and Abjuration, but that he could not take the Oath of Supremacy, and claimed the privilege of
being allowed to take the oath set forth in the Act passed in the present Session of Parliament 'for the relief of
His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects'; whereupon the Clerk having stated the matter to Mr. Speaker, Mr.
Speaker informed Mr. O'Connell that, according to his interpretation of the law, it was incumbent upon Mr.
O'Connell to take the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy and Abjuration, and that the provisions of the new act applied only to Members returned after the commencement of the said Act, except in so far as regarded the repeal of the declaration against transubstantiation; And that Mr. O'Connell must withdraw unless he were prepared to take the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration. Whereupon Mr. O'Connell withdrew.

Motion, That Mr. O'Connell be called back and heard at the table. Debate arising, a Member stated that he was requested by Mr. O'Connell to desire that he might be heard. Debate adjourned. Resolved, That Mr. O'Connell, the Member for Clare, be heard at the bar, by himself, his counsel or agents, in respect of his claim to sit and vote in Parliament without taking the Oath of Supremacy. Mr. O'Connell was called in and heard accordingly: and being withdrawn; Resolved, That it is the opinion of this House that Mr. O'Connell, having been returned a Member of this House before the commencement of the Act passed in this Session of Parliament 'for the relief of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects,' is not entitled to sit or vote in this House unless he first take the Oath of Supremacy. Ordered, That Mr. O'Connell do attend the House this day, and that Mr. Speaker do then communicate to him the said resolution, and ask him whether he will take the Oath of Supremacy. And the House being informed that Mr. O'Connell attended at the door, he was called to the Bar, and Mr. Speaker communicated to him the resolution of the House of yesterday, and the order thereon, as followeth. 'Then the resolution and the order are repeated. 'And then Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the said order, asked Mr. O'Connell whether he would take the said Oath of Supremacy? Whereupon Mr. O'Connell requested to see the said Oath, which being, shown to him accordingly, Mr. O'Connell stated that the said Oath contained one proposition which he knew to be false, and another proposition which he believed to be untrue; and that he therefore refused to take the said Oath of Supremacy. And then Mr. O'Connell was directed to withdraw, and he withdrew accordingly:' and then a new writ was ordered.

24. Mr. JOHN BRIGHT: Were those oaths separate oaths?—Yes, they were three separate oaths.

25. And they require three separate acts in taking them?—Yes.

26. Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I think the result is that the House first determined that the Oath of Supremacy which ought to be taken by Mr. O'Connell was the old oath, and not the oath under the Catholic Relief Act?—Certainly.

27. And having determined that it was the old oath that required to be taken, Mr. O'Connell refused to take it?—Certainly.

28. Mr. BRADLAUGH (through the Committee): Have you searched for any precedent affecting the taking of the oath by a Member alleged to be disqualified or ineligible; has your attention been called to the case of John Home Tooke, in Volume 35 of Parliamentary History, in the year 1801, commencing at page 956?—No, my attention has not been directed to any questions of incapacity: it has been confined to questions arising out of the taking of the oaths prescribed by law.

29. As a fact, was Mr. John Horne Tooke's capacity to sit in the House challenged in this case?—Yes, as being in Holy Orders, but not in relation to any question of taking the oath.

30. The next question that I have to ask is whether your attention has been called to the case of the alleged ineligibility of Francis Bacon, the King's Attorney General, in 1614, cited in the Commons Journal, Volume I., pp. 459 and 460?—No, my attention has not been directed to any questions of incapacity: it has been confined to questions arising out of the taking of the oaths prescribed by law.

31. There is one other question that I should like to ask, and that is whether your attention has been called to any case in which the House has discussed and dealt with the election of a Member, before that Committee was sworn?—With regard to the Jews, that would apply to Baron Rothschild and to Alderman Salomons.

32. I do not mean a case of a Member refusing to be sworn, but a case in which the House has dealt with the election before the Member had been sworn; has your attention been called to that?—No.

33. There is one case, the case of John Wilkes; the cases of O'Donovan Rossa and Mitchell were cases of legal disability; has your attention been called to any case in which the House has dealt with the election of a Member before he was sworn except for statutory disability?—Sir John Leedes sat in the House without having taken the Oath, and therefore he had clearly vacated his seat, and a new writ was issued.

34. I mean a case in which the Member has not been sworn, and in which there has been a discussion upon his eligibility outside the precedents which you have handed in; I refer to the case of John Wilkes, which is to be found in 38 Commons Journals, p. 977, and Cavendish's Parliamentary Debates, Volume I., extending over many hundred pages, commencing at 827. May I ask Sir Erskine May whether the practice has not been that when a Member appears to take the Oaths within the limited time, all other business is immediately to cease and not to be resumed until he has sworn and has subscribed the roll?—That was the old practice, but it has been superseded by a recent Standing Order under the Parliamentary Oaths Act of 1866, and the rule is now different; Members can be sworn until the commencement of public business and afterwards; but no debate or business may be interrupted for that purpose.

35. That is not quite the question that I wish to put; the question that I wish to put is whether it is not now and has not always been the practice of the House that within a limited time, whatever that time may be, if a
Member appears to take the oaths all other business is immediately to cease and not to be resumed until he has been sworn and has subscribed the Roll?—That was the old practice, when the oaths were required to be taken before four o'clock, but it has since been altered. This is the present Standing Order under which the oaths are administered, and this order was made in pursuance of the Parliamentary Oaths Act of 1866: "That Members may take and subscribe the Oath required by law at any time during the sitting of the House before the Orders of the Day and Notices of Motions have been entered upon, or after they have been disposed of, but no debate or business shall be interrupted for that purpose."

36. Then I again repeat my question, whether the practice has not been that a Member so appearing under the Standing Order just read to take the oath, all other business is immediately to cease and not to be resumed until he has been sworn and has subscribed the Roll?—I have already stated that such was the old practice, which has been distinctly and specifically superseded by the last Standing Order, which is now in force.

37. Is that the Standing Order which you have just read?—Yes, that is the Standing Order now in force.

38. Of course it will be a matter for argument whether it has altered it or not, but is there any other Order altering this practice except the one which you have just read?—There is no other Standing Order, and that Standing Order was made, as I have already stated, in pursuance of the Parliamentary Oaths Act of 1866, which authorised the House to make regulations with regard to the swearing of Members.

39. But except so far as it may have been altered by the Standing Order which you have just read, was the practice that a Member appearing to take the oath all other business was to cease, and not to be resumed until he had sworn and subscribed the Roll?—Yes, certainly.

40. Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The present Standing Order is dated the 30th April, 1860, is it not?—It is.

41. Mr. BRADLAUGH (through the Committee): Are you aware that the House has refused to make any inquiry as to what is consistent, or what is not consistent with the Oath of Allegiance taken by a Member?—I presume that the reference must be to a case which arose in debate. That I do not consider, in any way, in point in the present inquiry, but the question was this: "In one case an attempt was made to obtain from a Member who was about to bring forward a motion, a repudiation of statements made elsewhere, which were alleged to be at variance with the oath he had taken; but the Speaker stated that it was no part of his duty to determine what was consistent with that oath, and that the terms of the motion were not in violation of any rules of the House." That was a point of Order, and had no reference whatever to the taking of the Oath.

42. Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL: What was the motion?—It is in the 210th volume of "Hansard's Debates," 3rd Series, page 252. It is at page 197 of my book, in a note.

43. Mr. JOHN BRIGHT: In what year?—On the 19th March, 1872; there is merely an incidental reference to it.

44. Mr. BRADLAUGH (through the Committee): Are you aware of any precedent for the dealing by the House with the election of any Member not disqualified by statute or common law, until after that Member had sat and been sworn?—My attention has not been directed to any precedent bearing upon that precise point, but I apprehend that the fact of whether the Member had been sworn or not would not interfere with any proceedings. For example, under an election petition, if a Member's seat were contested, under the old system, the matter would have proceeded in the usual way, without reference to the question of whether the Member had taken the Oath or not.

45. But in such a case the Member would have been sworn, and would have sat until the question was decided?—Not necessarily; under the terms of the question I assume that he had not taken his seat.

46. Are there not very numerous cases in which with a petition against a Member for alleged statutory disqualification that Member has been sworn and has sat until the decision?—Unquestionably; there can be no doubt about it; it frequently happens.

47. Then I ask whether there is any precedent whatever for the House dealing with a Member's election or his right to sit, except in cases of absolute statutory disqualification, until that Member has taken his seat and the oaths?—So far as I understand the question, I should say that whether the Member has been sworn, or not, the matter of his disqualification, or of his right to sit would be open to the decision of the House.

48. I am not arguing the point at the moment; I am only trying to get at the fact. If you have not looked for it, of course I cannot have it; but is there, so far as you know, any precedent of such a thing ever having happened?—I know of none; but I have not searched for any such precedent.

49. Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL: It would not appear, would it?—I hardly know how it would appear; unless one's attention were specifically drawn to any case, there would be no means of discovering it.

50. Mr. BRADLAUGH (through the Committee): I will ask whether that question was not raised in the case of Wilkes, and whether it was not in the consideration of that case fully discussed, and whether the House did not resolve that any such dealing with a member was subversive of the rights of the whole body of electors of this kingdom?—I do not understand how that case has any bearing upon the present question.

51. There are three cases: one of expulsion, two of election annulled, and then ultimate reversal of the
whole of that and expungement by the House?—Yes, but that has no bearing upon the present case. Of course, I am familiar with the case of Wilkes, but not in connection with any matter arising out of the administration of oaths, which is the special matter referred to this Committee.

52. Have you had your attention called to the Journal of the House of Commons, Vol. I., page 460, in which Sir Francis Bacon, the King's Attorney General, having sworn to his qualification, which was challenged, the House said, "Their oath, their own consciences to look into, not we to examine it?"—That case is not one of the precedents that we have collected.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: They are entered extremely curiously, and one can only take the decision. It begins on page 459, "Eligibility of the Attorney General," and it does not show there that it is Sir Francis Bacon: but I have learnt that by looking up the other records; and there being then a statutory declaration which lasted until a few years ago for all counsel, solicitors, and practising men of the law, it was objected that the King's Attorney General could not sit; it appears that he had to swear to his qualification, and the question of his oath and of his disqualification, being Attorney General, were put, and the House said, "Their oath, their own consciences to look into, not we to examine it," and they left him in the House, resolving that no future Attorney General should sit in it.

CHAIRMAN: That was the case which was raised as to whether the law officers of the Crown, who had for certain purposes seats in the House of Lords, had seats in the House of Commons.

Mr. BRADLAUGH: Not quite that. There was an obsolete statute of the 46th Edward III., which was only repealed eight or nine years ago, but which does not seem to have been attended to, by which all practising barristers and solicitors were disqualified for sitting for counties.

53. Mr. BERESFORD HOPK: Wilkes's precedent being expunged, is it still legible in the Journal, and could it be produced for historical information?—Certainly.

54. Major NOLAN: With regard to the evidence about O'Connell, I think you stated that an Act was passed to enable O'Connell and his co-religionists to sit in Parliament?—Not to enable O'Connell to sit in Parliament, but to enable Roman Catholics to sit in Parliament.

55. O'Connell was not allowed to take advantage of that Act until he was re-elected?—No, because he had been elected prior to the passing of the Act, and the Act was clearly prospective.

56. Was the wording of that particular statute the reason why he was not allowed to take advantage of that Act?—Certainly; distinctly.

57. Would it be possible for the present or any future Parliament to pass an Act which would enable a man who had been elected previous to the passing of the Act to sit in the House?—It is not for me to say what Act of Parliament might be agreed to by Parliament, but that is quite a distinct case. In that case Mr. O'Connell had actually been elected when the Catholic Relief Act was passed, and there was a clause in the Act which made its operation prospective, and therefore distinctly, and, I believe, intentionally, excluding Mr. O'Connell from the benefits of the Act.

58. Then he was only prevented from taking advantage of that Act owing to the particular wording of that particular clause, and not owing to anything inherent in the House of Commons?—Yes; the decision was founded upon a literal construction of the words of the recent statute.

59. Mr. WHITBREAD: The case of Mr. O'Connell was this: that he declined to take the oath which was required of Members of Parliament elected at the time that he was elected, and that he requested to be allowed to take another form of oath; he was ordered to withdraw, and the House considered his case; is there anything that you have found in the Journals or in the Debates to indicate that if Mr. O'Connell had been willing to take the oath required of him by the House, the House would have objected to his so taking it?—Certainly not; they put it to him whether he would take the Oath of Supremacy, and upon the face of the Journal, it would seem that if he had taken that oath, he would have been admitted.

60. Mr. BRADLAUGH (through the Committee): After John Archdale had claimed to affirm, did not the House absolutely order him to attend in his place for the purpose of being sworn, and tender the oaths to him?—Mr. Archdale was ordered to attend, and the House being informed that Mr. Archdale attended according to order, his letter to Mr. Speaker was read. That letter is printed at full length among the precedents. "And the several statutes qualifying persons to come into and sit and vote in this House were read, viz., of the 30 Car. II., 1 Will, and Marias, and 7 & 8 Will, and Marias. And then the said Mr. Archdale was called in, and he came into the middle of the House, almost to the table; and Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House, asked him whether he had taken the oaths, or would take the oaths, appointed to qualify himself to be a Member of this House: to which he answered, That in regard to a principle of his religion he had not taken the oaths, nor would take the oaths, or would take another form of oath; he was ordered to withdraw, and the House considered his case; is there anything?

61. Mr. Serjeant SIMON: With reference to what the Honorable Member for Bedford has put to you just now, Mr. O'Connell refused to take the Oath of Supremacy on the ground that it contained matter which he knew to be untrue, and other matter which he believed to be untrue?—Yes, he so stated.
62. Thereupon he withdrew; but is there any precedent among the Journals to show that a Member stating beforehand that what was contained in the oath was untrue, or a matter of unbelief to him, has been allowed to take the oath under such circumstances?—No, this is the only precedent, so far as I know, of that particular character. The others are cases of absolute refusal to take the oath, or a desire to make an affirmation instead of an oath, or to leave out certain words of the Oath.

63. But is there any precedent where, as in the case of Mr. O'Connell, a Member coming to the table of the House, has made a statement such as Mr. O'Connell made, that the oath contains matter which he knows to be untrue, or believes to be untrue, and has been allowed to take the oath afterwards?—There is no case to be found, so far as I know; certainly there is none in any of these precedents.

64. Mr. Secretary Childers: Is the precedent in Mr. O'Connell's case this; that on the 15th May Mr. O'Connell said that he could not take the Oath of Supremacy, and that, nevertheless, on the 19th, he was asked whether he would take the Oath of Supremacy, although he had previously informed the House that he was unable to take it?—Yes, because he had been heard, in the interval, upon his claim to take the new oath, under the recent Catholic Relief Act.

65. But was not that a precedent for a Member who had already stated that he could not take a certain oath, nevertheless being afterwards asked by the House whether he would take it?—It so appears on the face of the precedents.

66. I will put that question again more clearly; is it not the case that, as appears on page 5 of the Paper which you have placed before us, Mr. O'Connell on the 15th May said, that he could not take the Oath of Supremacy?—Yes.

67. And that, nevertheless, on the 19th of May it was ordered that Mr. Speaker do communicate to him the Resolution passed on the same day, and ask him whether he would take the Oath of Supremacy?—It was so.

68. Although the House was aware that Mr. O'Connell had said that he could not take it?—Yes; but as I observed before, in the interval he had been heard upon the question of his right to take the new oath; and that, I think, accounts for the fact that the question was repeated to him as to whether, after the decision of the House had been communicated, he still persisted in refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy.

69. Mr. Watkin Williams: Was not Mr. O'Connell's objection to taking the Oath of Supremacy an objection to the truth of the matter sworn to?—Yes, certainly; and it was an oath which no Roman Catholic could take.

70. It was the truth of the matter which he was asked to pledge his oath to that he objected to, and he did not express any disbelief in the binding character of the oath itself?—No. Every Roman Catholic objected to take the Oath of Supremacy; in fact, the Oath of Supremacy was expressly designed to exclude them from Parliament.

71. Mr. Attorney General: And in consequence of the objection a new form of oath was put in the Catholic Relief Bill?—Certainly, because the Oath of Supremacy was intended to exclude Roman Catholics, and did exclude them, and was known to exclude them.

72. Mr. Watkin Williams: It was not his inability to take the oath, but his inability to pledge himself to the truth of what he was asked to swear to?—Certainly.

73. Mr. Staveley Hill: I gather from you that the House never asked O'Connell to take the oath after his giving the grounds of recusancy?—Yes, that is so.

74. Mr. Serjeant Simon: It appears that the Speaker first asked him whether he would take the Oath of Supremacy, and then he says, No, and gives those reasons?—Yes.

75. Mr. Pemberton: In addition to Mr. O'Connell's having been heard after he had at first declined to take the oath, was there not some further discussion in the House in which other Members took part?—Certainly; those Debates will all be found in Hansard.

76. Sir Gabriel Goldney: His refusal to take the oath in the first instance was accompanied by a claim at the same time to take the new oath?—Clearly.

77. It was a refusal to take the oath accompanied by a claim for a new one; afterwards he was allowed to be heard upon that point, and then it was that the House, having decided that he could not be admitted on the new oath, he was asked if he chose to take the old oath, which he refused to do?—That is a correct statement of the case.

78. Mr. Hopwood: With regard to the point of the Standing Orders as to which Mr. Bradlaugh has asked, as I understand you, under the old practice, as pointed out in Hatsell, and as we know it existed, the occasion of a Member coming to be sworn caused all other business to cease?—Yes.

79. And then as you say, a Standing Order was passed that particular times more appropriate should be allotted for taking those oaths?—Yes.

80. But even though that may be so at the time of taking an oath, no other business can go on?—Clearly not; it is the sole business that is transacted at the moment.
81. No other business can be interposed, and nothing else can be proceeded with but the oath of the Member?—Certainly not; it is the business of the moment, and no other business can interpose.

82. Mr. Gibson: You have been asked by several honorable Members about O'Connell's ease; in your opinion, is there the slightest analogy between the facts and circumstances in O'Connell's case and those of the case now before the Committee?—I see none myself, but I would rather leave such questions for the determination of the Committee. I have stated the case in print, and of course the points of difference are matters of argument.

83. So far as you know, is there any precedent for permitting a Member of the House of Commons to take the Oath after he has stated in the House expressly, or by necessary implication, that it will have no binding effect upon his conscience?—There is no such case on record, so far as I have had the means of ascertaining.

Mr. CHARLES BRADLAUGH, a Member of the House; Examined:

84. Chairman: You were in the room, I think, when Sir Thomas Erskine May gave that part of his evidence as to a matter which was not on the Votes and Proceedings?—Yes, but which took place upon the occasion of my first coming to offer to affirm.

85. Is that accurately and fully stated?—It is accurately and fully stated. I shall have to ask the indulgence of the Committee if in any of the points which I press there seems to be any undue ness in the pressing of them, because, as far as I can see, this is the first occasion on which such a matter has arisen. In the reference which the Committee have to deal with, I claim to be sworn and take my seat by virtue of my due return, a return untainted by illegality of any description, and in pursuance of the Statute of the 5th of Richard II., which puts upon me the duty of coming here to be sworn and do my duty under penalty of fine and imprisonment. I do not know whether the Committee wish that I should read the Statute. It is the second Statute of Richard II.; it is on page 228 of the revised Statutes, Vol. I.; it is a Statute of the year 1382. I submit that although a Member may not sit and vote until he has taken the oaths, he is entitled to all the other privileges of a Member, and is otherwise regarded both by the House and the laws as qualified to serve, until some other disqualification has been shown to exist; and I quote in support of that Sir Thomas Erskine May's book, p. 202, that there is nothing in what I did in asking to affirm which in any way disqualified me from taking the Oath. The evidence that that is so is found in the case of Archdale, on page 3 of the Precedents handed in by Sir Thomas Erskine May, where, after John Archdale had claimed to affirm, he was called into the House, and Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House, asked him if he would take the oaths; that I have never at any time refused to take the Oath of Allegiance provided by Statute to be taken by Members; that all I did was, believing as I then did, that I had the right to affirm, to claim to affirm, and I was then absolutely silent as to the oath; that I did not refuse to take it, nor have I then or since expressed any mental reservation, or stated that the appointed Oath of Allegiance would not be binding upon me; that, on the contrary, I say, and have said, that the essential part of the oath is in the fullest and most complete degree binding upon my honor and conscience, and that the repeating of words of asseveration does not in the slightest degree weaken the binding effect of the Oath of Allegiance upon me. I may say, that if it would be more convenient for any Member of the Committee to ask me any question upon my statement as I go on, it will not interrupt me at all.

86. I think the Committee would rather hear you through.—I submit that according to law the House of Commons has neither the right nor the jurisdiction to refuse to allow the said form of oath to be administered to me, there being no legal disqualification on my part of which the House can or ought to take notice, and there being on my part an express demand to take the Oath, this demand being unaccompanied by, and free from, any reservation or limitation. I submit that there is no case in which the Oath of Allegiance has been refused to any Member respectfully and unreservedly tendering himself to be sworn. I submit that any Member properly presenting himself to be sworn, and not refusing to be sworn, is entitled to be sworn, and to take his seat without interruption, and that the discussion of any disqualification or ineligibility must in such case, according to the practice and precedent of Parliament, take place after the Member has taken his seat; and I quote in support of that John Horne Tooke's case, which came before the House in 1801. It was alleged that John Home Tooke was ineligible because he was an ordained clergyman of the Church of England. There he was allowed to take the oaths first, and after he had taken the oaths Earl Temple rose and said (I am quoting from page 956 of the Parliamentary History, Volume 35), that he observed a gentleman who had just retired from the table after having taken the Oaths whom he conceived to be incapable of having a seat in the House in consequence of his having taken priest's orders, and been inducted into a living. Earl Temple agreed he would wait to see if a petition were presented against him, and if not he should move a resolution upon the subject; and ultimately a resolution was moved that John Horne Tooke was ineligible. The House allowed John Horne Tooke to sit, but declared clergymen for the future to be ineligible for sitting. I rely upon that as showing that the proper course to be pursued, supposing that any Member should think that I am ineligible, is to wait until I have been sworn.
and have taken my seat, and then to challenge it; and that this is clear, because if it were not so it would be possible for the first 41 Members sworn or for a majority of that 41, that is, for 21 Members to hinder, the swearing of all Members coming later to the table without any remedy on the part of the Members aggrieved; and I submit, with great respect for the evidence of Sir Thomas Erskine May, that he has misapprehended the force of the Standing Order that he read to you. Hatsell's Precedents, Volume II., page 90, declares distinctly that when a Member appears to take the oaths within a limited time, all other business is immediately to cease, and not to be resumed until he has been sworn and has subscribed the Roll; and with great submission to Sir Thomas Erskine May, there is no word in the Standing Order which he quoted as altering and changing that practice, which does so alter and change it. All that the Standing Order does is to specify the time and the manner in which the Members might come to the table to be sworn, which had not been hitherto specified; but it does not in any way deal with what was to happen when they did come to the table to be sworn. And if the Committee would permit me respectfully to submit, it would be most dangerous to the House if it were not so. The first batch of Members called over by the Clerk of the House are sworn, and they may then, if the contention raised upon the Standing Order quoted by Sir Thomas Erskine May be correct, prevent every other Member being sworn, if there be more than 40. They may fulfil all the duties of a House of Commons, and do what they please, without any remedy, as the matter stands; every election might be declared null and void, and every one sent back to their constituencies one after another. I submit also that the case of the Attorney General, Sir Francis Bacon, Volume I. of the Commons Journal, page 459, is also a precedent in the same direction. I am obliged to tell the Committee that I cannot quote it with the same reliance that I can put upon Horne Tooke's case, for the notes seem to have been taken, I will not say irregularly, but they do not seem to convey the whole of what took place, and therefore I can only deal with the result. Sir H. Hobart is quoted as being "the only attorney that hath been in this House;" and then there arises a discussion, some of which does not seem to me to be material, as to whether the then Attorney General could sit or not, and I find in the returns that the Attorney General at that date was Sir Francis Bacon, who, three days after this discussion, elected to sit for the University of Cambridge, and although I have not the legal evidence, because the returns are incomplete for that year, as he elected to sit for the University of Cambridge, the probability is that he had also been returned for a county. There was then a Statute of the 46th Edward III., which has only recently been repealed, which made a practising man of the law absolutely ineligible; and it also appears that there was some oath of qualification, of which I have not been able to find the words, which was then taken by a Member coming to the table; and it appears here that the Oath was alleged in the course of the discussion, and two things were said which I press upon the attention of the Committee; one, that the precedents to disable a Member ought to be shown on the side of those who seek to disable (it is not written so lengthily as that; the words are, "The precedents to disable him ought to be showed on the other side"), and the other is, "Their oath, their own consciences to look unto, not we to examine it," which meant, as I submit, that the House did not constitute itself into an Inquisition to look behind a man coming to take the Oath, but that, subject to his being dealt with by law if he had taken it improperly, or subject to a legal disqualification being made clear to the House, they assumed his oath to be properly taken. I submit that even Members absolutely petitioned against and alleged to be disqualified or ineligible by law, are always allowed to be sworn when they come to the table to be sworn and to sit pending the decision of the petition. The only cases which I have found of absolute legal disqualification in which the Member's election was annulled before he had entered the House, are the cases of Mitchell and O'Donovan Rossa (both of whom were away), and the case of John Wilkes, who was physically incapacitated from taking the oath from the act that he was in the custody of the law at the time, and those who held him would not have permitted him to come to the table to be sworn. Those are the only cases even with an allegation of an absolute disqualification in the case of O'Donovan Rossa and Mitchell, and of a disqualification alleged, but not admitted, and not legal, not statutory, in the case of Wilkes, that I have been able to find; and in Wilkes's case the House has solemnly decided that it did wrong there, and I submit that it ought not to do it again. But here the return is not questioned. It is not pretended that there has been a single circumstance of illegality connected with the election, the sole point being, Am I qualified to sit? If I am qualified to sit, I have the duty to take the Oath, and the House has neither the right nor the jurisdiction to refuse the Oath to me, nor to interrupt me in the taking of it. If my qualification or eligibility to sit is to be discussed, the precedent for the proper mode of discussing that qualification is in Home Tooke's case, and rightly so, because then I have the opportunity from my place in the House of defending myself, and of correcting any misstatements that may possibly be urged by Members who may be too anxious that I should not sit, supposing in any other House of Commons it should happen, and it then gives the Member attacked fair play. While I admit entirely that the House has a full and most complete right to expel any sitting Member, and this in its own discretion, and for any reasons in its wisdom sufficient, I submit that it has never done this without first calling upon the Member to be heard in his own defence, and that that cannot possibly happen until the Member is sworn and is sitting. I submit that while the House has the right to annul the election of a person absolutely disqualified by law, it has
never, except in one case, that of John Wilkes, claimed the right to interfere, and in that case it ultimately expunged from its proceedings the whole of its hostile resolutions, as being subversive of the rights of the whole body of electors of this kingdom. I quote on that the Commons Journal, Vol. 38, 3rd of May 1782. I do not think that I should be right in troubling the Committee with the very strong arguments used time after time by Edmund Burke, Thomas Pitt, and others; but I want to point out this, that in addition to the charge on which John Wilkes was expelled from the House (and I am not questioning his original expulsion), there were also charges introduced against John Wilkes for his publications outside the House. That will be found in 1st Cavendish, page 73 and page 129, and they are charges far exceeding anything (if I may judge from the reports which have even been put in) in relation to any supposed publications of my own. None of those charges were ultimately considered by the House to justify the interference of the House with the choice of the constituency. To use the words of Mr. Thomas Pitt, on page 350 of Cavendish, words endorsed by the House itself, "Nothing but a positive law can enable you to circumscribe the electors in their choice of a representative, however, indiscreet they may be in their choice." I consider now on what grounds is it claimed that the House of Commons has the right and jurisdiction, following the words of reference, to refuse to allow me to take and subscribe the Oath? Is it for a disqualification or ineligibility existing prior to my election and continuing down to the time of my election—I mean a disqualification or ineligibility created by Statute or existing at common law? No such disqualification is even pretended. Is it for a disqualification or ineligibility of like legal character arising since my election? No such disqualification is pretended. Is it for conduct not amounting to absolute disqualification legally, but conduct for which the House has in its discretion exercised its rights and jurisdictions by expelling a Member? It must be this, or it is nothing. If there is neither legal disqualification prior to my election, nor legal disqualification subsequent to my election, then there must be such conduct not amounting to absolute legal disqualification as would, were I a sitting Member, justify the House in using its discretion to expel a Member. But if that conduct be prior to the election, then I submit that the constituency is the sole and sovereign judge of the fitness of the candidate, such candidate not being legally disqualified, and that where the chosen and duly returned candidate is ready to perform his duties, this House has neither the right nor the jurisdiction to revoke the decision of the constituency; and that in the only case in which the House did so interfere it afterwards solemnly recorded that its conduct was illegal, as being subversive of the rights of the whole body of the electors of this kingdom. If the complaint against me is for conduct arising since my election, then I submit that even if such matters justify my expulsion as a Member, the point could only be raised after I had been heard in my place against the Resolution, and that the matter could not arise until I have taken the Oath and become entitled to speak, sit, and vote. Manifestly this must be so, as otherwise it would always be in the power of a majority to exclude from coming to take his seat any Member to whom they might have an objection; and although such a thing is, luckily, not probable now, there have been times, even in the history of the House of Commons, when a majority, even of election committees, as I read in the Records of the House, have sought by mere prejudice to exclude Members. It is, therefore, the more necessary that at any rate a Member should have the right to be heard in his own defence. I submit that there is no precedent whatever for preventing a Member from taking his seat and the Oath, on the ground of conduct not amounting to absolute legal disqualification. There is no such precedent to be found at all, and I have searched very carefully indeed. I put the question to Sir Erskine May lest anything should have escaped me, and I say absolutely there is no precedent. Then I submit that it would not be consistent with the dignity of the House to examine any statement made by any Member outside the House, as to any of its procedure, and that in fact the House has firmly refused to allow a Member to be challenged as to whether or not some of his extra-parliamentary utterances were inconsistent with his Oath of Allegiance; and here I should like the Committee to come to a decision, because it would alter and abridge my argument. If the Committee thought (I will put a suppositious case) that, because it would alter the Abridged my argument. If the Committee thought (I will put a suppositious case) that, say there were some document that they thought they had the right to take into consideration here, then while I should object to that, I should like to have the opportunity of addressing the Committee as to that. So far as the evidence has gone, I have not heard of any, except the mere statement in the House, only I judged from a question put by an honorable and learned Member that something was passing in his mind (which, by the way, did not seem to me to be the fact) justifying a question put to Sir Thomas Erskine May as to whether the oath could be administered to a man who had done something either actually or by implication repudiating the effect of that Oath. I have heard nothing in the evidence, so far as it has gone, giving the slightest color or warranty for such a question. If there are any facts to be dealt with by this Committee other than that, then I should like to know the facts, and to argue upon them; but it would be only wasting the time of the Committee to address argument to any point which the Committee would not think it right to consider; and I should be glad if, before going further into my statement, the Committee thought it right to intimate to me their view upon that.

The Committee deliberated.

87. CHAIRMAN: I think the Committee would like to understand from you the kind of objection that you are anticipating before you proceed with your argument; as I understood you, you took this kind of objection: "I
wish to know whether the Committee are going into any proceedings external to the proceedings which took place in the House, or will entertain the consideration of those questions," and that if they did so you would wish to be heard upon that point; I understood you also to say that beyond that general question as to any proceedings which may have taken place as part of the transaction in any other place than the House itself, you wish to know whether the Committee would take such matter into their consideration; am I right in supposing that to be the character of your objection?—Not quite. Practically my question is this: Will this Committee take any facts into consideration other than those of which I have heard evidence given, and those which have been stated by myself in the course of my argument? If so, I should like to know, because I understood the permission of the Committee to be that I should address them at the close of the case before their deliberations, and I should submit with all respect that the Committee would not take one matter of fact into their consideration to influence them in their deliberations which I had not the opportunity of addressing them upon. If they have finished, and if there are no facts except those which I have heard to be dealt with, it enables me to turn out and eliminate a portion of the argument which I have prepared.

The Committee deliberated.

88. CHAIRMAN: The Committee have considered the matter which you have submitted to them, and they request me to inform you that members of the Committee do propose, after your statement is concluded, to ask some questions of you; but I have to inform you, at the same time, that you will-be invited, and are invited, to state any objections that you may entertain to any such questions when put, and that you shall have a full opportunity of addressing the Committee after they have heard your answers to the questions so put?—That will enable me to eliminate a portion of my argument. I wish to submit to the Committee one Observation on the precedent of Daniel O'Connell, and that is that, as a matter of fact, the evidence of Sir Thomas Erskine May shows that he misapprehended that precedent. It was a refusal by Daniel O'Connell to take the Oaths by law required of a member at the date of his election. Between the date of his election and the date of his refusal the law had changed, but it had not changed (so the House interpreted the Statute, or so the Statute ran, I do not know which) at the date of his election. So that I submit that Daniel O'Connell's case is a case of a Member refusing to take the Oath by law required: And I further submit that the Parliamentary Debates will show that the words which appear as being used by Mr. O'Connell on the 19th of May, sufficiently expressed his reason for refusing to take the Oath of Supremacy some days at least before the House asked him again to take it. Then I have only two other matters which I should wish to submit to the Committee.' One is that I have, neither directly nor indirectly, obtruded upon the House, since I have been a Member, any of my utterances or publications upon any subject whatever; that there is no precedent, except in the case of John Wilkes, for any reference on the part of any opposing Member to such publications by any Member prior to the taking of his seat; and that the ultimate decision of the House in John Wilkes's case is directly against the introduction by any Member hostile to me of any such matter as a reason for my not being allowed to take my seat. Finally, I most respectfully submit that I have grave matter of complaint that my privileges as a Member of the House of Commons have been seriously infringed, and that the rights of the electors, my constituents, have been ignored in the attacks made upon me without previous notice to me; attacks to which I had no opportunity of making a dignified reply; attacks which, if the newspaper reports be accurate, were in many instances based upon absolute misapprehension or misquotation of my publications, and in one instance at any rate, based upon the most extreme misrepresentation of my conduct. I thank the Committee for listening to me, and I regret if my want of knowledge of the forms of the House has involved my saying anything in a manner in which the Committee would prefer that I should not have said it.

89. That is all you wish to state at present?—That is all I wish to state at present upon the evidence as taken by the Committee. If fresh evidence should be taken, I should ask the permission of the Committee to have the right of addressing them upon that.

90. The Committee will now proceed to examine you.—Before any question is put to me, will you, Sir, tell me when is the proper time to object to any question which I may think I have the right to object to?

91. When the question is put, before answering it?—

Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL: You will understand that I am not in any sense cross-examining you, but merely to clear up what took place in the House. I am entirely in the hands of the Committee.

92. We know from the Proceedings of the House that you did at the table of the House make a claim, in the first instance, to make affirmation instead of taking the oath?—Yes.

93. And we understand that you did so on the ground that you were a person entitled to make affirmation within the terms of the Evidence Amendment Acts of 1869 and 1870?—That was then my impression of the law, and that was the claim which I made.

94. And I presume, of course, that at the time when you made that claim you founded it upon the belief that you were entitled to make affirmation in the House of Commons?—I made that claim solely upon my belief that the law entitled me to make it.
95. Then as regards your power to give evidence under the Evidence Amendment Acts in courts both civil and criminal, you of course put it before the House of Commons, as a fact, that, you were a person entitled in those courts to make affirmation?—Yes.

96. And I presume that you were acquainted with the terms of those Acts, the subject interesting you?—Quite.

97. Were you aware that if you yourself were called as a witness, it would be necessary before you were allowed to make affirmation in a court, either civil or criminal, under the Acts of 1869 and 1870, that two things should be established: first, that you yourself objected to take the oath, or that your right to take it was objected to by some one else; and then, secondly, that the judge would be required to satisfy himself that the taking of an oath by you would have no binding effect upon your conscience?—No, that is not my interpretation of the Statute, nor do I think it has always been (although I think it has sometimes been) the interpretation of the judge or other presiding officer dealing with it.

98. Would you kindly explain your own view as to the sense in which you read the statute of 1869, which says that the judge must satisfy himself that the oath is not binding upon the conscience of the person wishing to affirm, the words being, "If any person called to give evidence in any court of justice, whether in a civil or criminal proceeding, shall object to take an oath, or shall be objected to as incompetent to take an oath, such person shall, if the presiding judge is satisfied that an oath would have no binding effect on his conscience, make the following promise and declaration"?—My interpretation is that upon certain answers being given by the witness, the judge is bound to take his affirmation, even supposing that the judge himself should not be of opinion that the oath is not binding upon him; and it has been decided so by the Court of Queen's Bench. In the case of ex parte Lennard v. Woolrych, a man tendered his affirmation at the Westminster Police Court, and the magistrate asked him (I am repeating from memory, but repeating perfectly accurately the substance of what appears in the affidavits tiled in the Court of Queen's Bench), "Why do you object?" He said, "I am an Atheist." The magistrate refused to allow him to give evidence upon affirmation, and the court held that upon hearing that answer there was enough under the Act, and that the magistrate was bound to take the man's evidence, and issued a mandamus to compel him.

99. You will not suppose that I am arguing with you, but as I understand that case the witness who tendered himself having said he was an Atheist, the court held that the magistrate was bound to raw the inference from that assertion that the oath was not binding, and therefore to let him make the affirmation?—That is so. Whether the presiding officer did draw the inference or not, the court held that he was bound to.

100. Then I do not think that there is much difference between us; but I assume that when you come to the table of the House of Commons, and asked leave to make affirmation instead of taking the Oath, you were a person, as I understand it, who, if you had gone into a court of justice and made the same request, would have been held by the presiding judge to be one upon whom the oath would have no binding effect?—I did think so when I applied to affirm. I do not think so since the Report of your Committee, for your Committee has reported that the two oaths are entirely different.

101. It is a question for you: do you draw any distinction between the binding effect upon your conscience of the Assertory Oath, as it is called, and the Promissory Oath?—Most certainly I do. The Testimony Oath is not binding upon my conscience, because there is another form which the law has provided which I may take, which is more consonant with my feelings. The Promissory Oath is and will be binding upon my conscience if I take it, because the law, as interpreted by your Committee, says that it is the form which I am to take, and the Statute requires me to take it.

102. Pray do not answer this question unless you like: am I to understand you that the binding effect upon your conscience of the Oath depends upon whether there is an alternative method of taking that which is to you equivalent to the oath?—No, most certainly not. Any form that I went through, any oath that I took, I should regard as binding upon my conscience in the fullest degree. I would go through no form, I would take no oath, unless I meant it to be so binding.

103. Pray object if you do not wish to answer this question: By virtue of what do you regard that assertion which you make within the Oath as binding?—I have not caught your question, if you will pardon me for saying so.

104. By virtue of what portion of what is contained in the Oath do you feel that your conscience is bound; is it by the mere fact that you repeat the words therein contained, or is it by that which is contained in the form of the Oath?—Those words, "I do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors, according to law," are to me, binding in the most full and complete and thorough degree on my conscience.

105. If you read a promise out of any book or paper, and said, "I promise so to do," is there more binding effect in those words that you have read than in the mere ordinary assertion of a promise?—Yes, because this reading is by law, and by the decision of your Committee intended to be the form in which I pledge my
allegiance as a Member.

106. Then if it were a form sanctioned by law, as in the case of an affirmation, is there any more effect upon your mind if you take it in the form of what we call an oath than if you took it simply by words of affirmation or promise?—If the form sanctioned by law ran "I affirm," or "I declare and affirm," or "I solemnly and sincerely declare and affirm that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors, according to law," that would be equally binding upon my conscience.

107. Do you attach any express or particular meaning to the words "I swear"?—The meaning that I attach to them is that they are a pledge upon my conscience to the truth of the declaration which I am making.

108. But a pledge given, may I ask, to whom?—A pledge given to the properly constituted authorities, whomsoever they may be, who are entitled to receive it from me.

109. Do you attribute any more meaning to those words than a pledge to human beings around you?—I attach no more meaning to those words than I do to a pledge to human beings authorised by law to take such a pledge from me under similar solemn circumstances.

110. But the solemn circumstances, I suppose, are the mere mundane circumstances?—The statutory circumstances. I meant "solemn" simply in the sense of being the statutory circumstances; I meant to distinguish between that and mere conversation.

111. I think we understand from your answers that you do not attribute any more weight to the use of the words "I swear," and to the words "So help me God," than you would to an ordinary promise if it were given under the same circumstances as those under which you gave that, promise in the House of Commons?—I conceive myself entitled by law to distinguish, and I beg therefore to object to so much of the question as deals with the words "So help me God," my objection being founded on the case of Miller v. Salomons, in the 17th Jurist, and the case of the Lancaster and Carlisle Railway Company v. Heaton in the 4th Jurist, new series.

112. I presume by that answer you mean that "So help me, God" is no part of the oath or promise, but merely the form in which it is taken?—That is so; it is merely a form of asseveration.

113. Will you confine yourself, then, to the words "I swear"?—I will.

114. Do you attribute any greater weight or any meaning to the words "I swear," and to the fact of kissing the book, beyond the words of ordinary promise?—Not beyond the words of ordinary promise made under statutory obligation.

115. Then what greater weight do you attach to a promise made under statutory obligation than to an ordinary promise?—I would prefer not making any promise that I did not intend to keep; but the law has attached a weight to statutory promises, and a penalty and disgrace on the breaking of them.

116. That is a consequence resulting from human action; you do not attribute any other weight to such a promise beyond what results from such penalties?—I object to that question.

117. I will now go to another point. How lately is that you have claimed a right to affirm in a court of law?—In a superior court or in an inferior court?

118. In any court where you have taken an oath?—Recently in an inferior court, within a few days.

119. How lately prior to your claim in the House of Commons?—Prior to my claim in the House of Commons, about 12 months.

120. You had made a claim on several occasions, I suppose, prior to the period which you have just mentioned?—Yes.

121. What steps, if any, were taken by the judge on such occasions to arrive at the conclusion that the oath would have no binding effect?—On the last occasion, by Mr. Justice Lindley, none. I presume he thought my claim to affirm well founded, and he simply bowed his head, and the clerk administered the affirmation after looking to him.

122. I suppose you made a claim to affirm?—When the clerk brought the Testament to the witness-box I said, "I desire to affirm," and the clerk looked at Mr. Justice Lindley, who just bowed his head (he happened to be the presiding judge), and I did affirm.

123. Had you reason to think that Mr. Justice Lindley was acquainted with any previous applications by you to affirm?—I should think it possible, because the claim to affirm has been the subject of considerable litigation by myself in the courts.

124. Upon any occasion upon which the judge did make inquiry, what was the nature of the inquiry?—The present Lord Justice Brett, whom I remember distinctly challenging me upon it when he was Mr. Justice Brett, said: "Why do you claim; Mr. Bradlaugh?" and I perfectly remember my answer, but I am just thinking whether I am not entitled to say this: that happened seven years ago; I do not intend to imply that there is any change or anything since, but I think I am entitled to say to this Committee that it is hardly within the limits of their reference to inquire into something that happened in a law court between myself and a judge seven years ago.

125. I should not have asked the question, but you have stated in the House of Commons yourself, in order to support your claim to make affirmation, that you have frequently been permitted to affirm?—That is so.
126. And I think you gave the last nine or ten years?—Yes, and Mr. Justice Brett's question came within that time. I hope you will not consider that I am putting the objection unfairly. What I want to put is this: that the conversation which took place on the occasion of my having affirmed (and I repeat that I have affirmed before different judges) being more or less informal, ought not to be the subject of inquiry by this Committee. The fact is of record. Those were all at *Nisi Prius*.

127. It was before a judge who would have to administer an oath?—Quite so.

128. If you state that you really entertain an objection to the question, I do not wish to press it myself personally?—I have no objection to answering, except that I have purposely tried to keep out of this discussion any question of my views; otherwise I am quite in the hands of the Committee, and if the Committee are disposed to press the question I will give the answer, having made my objection.

129. I do not wish to go into the views generally entertained by you, except so far as expressed by you that the Testimony Oath had no binding effect upon your conscience?—My answer applied to the Assertory or Testimony Oath.

130. I am asking you what you stated when a Testimony Oath was being administered to you; but if you desire not to answer the question, so far as I, an individual member of the Committee, am concerned, I do not wish to put it to you?—I take the objection.

131. Mr. Gibson: Can you recall whether within any time since your right to affirm was first recognised in courts of justice, you have taken the Oath?—Never; that is to say, the oath as a witness.

132. Have you ever taken any oath since your right to affirm was first admitted in courts of justice?—It only has been my right to affirm as a witness that has been admitted in a court of justice; I have under cover of that Act, but I think illegally, affirmed as foreman of a special jury, but I have considerable doubt whether the Act covered my affirmation as a jurman.

133. With that knowledge now present to your mind, is it the fact that the oath which you seek to take at the table of the House is, if you are permitted to take it, the first oath that you will have taken since you were permitted to affirm in courts of justice?—It is the first occasion upon which there has been any reason for my taking or not taking the Oath of Allegiance since I have been permitted to affirm.

134. Or any other form of oath?—My memory is not quite clear upon that; I am not sure. There was a case in which I took evidence as a Commissioner from America, and I am not at all sure whether the completion of that Commission was before or after the passing of the Affirmation Act.

135. But since the passing of the Act?—I cannot quite pledge my mind as to that; but except in that case in which I was a Commissioner for taking some evidence in relation to an American process, in which I may have done so, I certainly have not.

136. Then am I to understand that you seek now to take this oath with exactly the same meaning in your mind as you would take the affirmation?—Which affirmation?

137. The affirmation which you originally sought to take at the table of the House, the Promissory Affirmation?—I seek to take the Oath of Allegiance just as I should seek to take the Affirmation of Allegiance.

138. And do you attach in your mind no different meaning to the word "swear" than you would to the word "affirm"?—The law does not.

139. Do you, in your own mind, attach any difference to the sanction?—I object that the question put to me asks me to make a distinction which the law does not make.

140. I do not wish to press anything to which you object; do you desire to tell the Committee that, in your own mind, there is no distinction drawn when you use the word "affirm" and when you use the word "swear"?—To me, on the Statute they have the same meaning; that is, they are a pledge that what I put after those words is binding upon me in the most complete degree.

141. I suppose you are aware of all the ordinary definitions of an oath contained in the law books?—I am afraid that would be saying more than I have any right to say. I am fairly well read, but not sufficiently to say that I know them all.

142. You know a great many of them, I suppose?—I have learnt a few.

143. You said to my honorable and learned friend, the Attorney General, that you regarded the word "swear" as a pledge given to a properly constituted authority, and that that was the meaning you attached to the word "swear"; what do you mean by the "properly constituted authority" that you referred to in that answer?—Whatever may be the authority established by Statute for the purpose of taking such an oath.

144. A human authority?—All authorities established by Statute for the taking of oaths are human authorities Any authority outside a Statute is illegal, and any persons administering such an oath is indictable.

145. You are aware of the meaning of the expression "sanction of an oath "; what do you consider would be the sanction of the Oath if you took it?—I am not sure that I apprehend the meaning that is in your mind when you use the words "sanction of an oath ."

146. I will read the definition which is contained in Mr. Baron Martin's judgment in the case of *Miller v.*
Salomon’s, where it refers to the case of Omichund v. Barker, as reported in the "Law Journal": "The doctrine laid down by the Lord Chancellor (Hardwicke) (Omichund v. Barker), and all the other judges, was that the essence of an oath was an appeal to a Supreme Being in whose existence the person taking the oath believed, and whom he also believed to be a rewarder of truth and an avenger of falsehood, and that the form of taking an oath was a mere outward act, and not essential to the oath which might be administered to all persons according to their own peculiar religious opinions, and in such manner as most affected their consciences." You have listened to that statement?—Yes; and I have also read the judgment of the Court of Error in the following year, in which they say that the essential words of the oath are those without the appeal, and that the words "So help me, God" are words of asseveration, the manner of taking the oath; but the words preceding them are, it appears to me, an essential part of the oath; and in the case of the Lancaster and Carlisle Railway Company v. Heaton, it was held that the oath was completely taken without the addition of that appeal.

147. I am not at all upon the words "So help me, God," which are the words referred to in the last case to which you referred. I am now upon what contains a promise that an oath is being taken when a man uses the word "swear"; do you object to the definition which I have read?—I object to that definition as overruled by the Court of Error in its final decision in error, confirmed by a subsequent decision of Lord Campbell in the Lancaster and Carlisle Railway Company v. Heaton, when it was held that the appeal was not a part of the oath.

148. CHAIRMAN: In both those cases I think the judges in holding that view had reference simply to the words So help me, God"?—Simply to the words "So help me, God.

149. I think we are a little misunderstanding each other?—I hope not; I want to be candid with the Committee.

150. Mr. Gibson: I am not at all on the words which that case went on of "So help me, God," but I am on what must be the essential distinction between an oath and an affirmation; what, I ask you now, do you conceive to be the essential distinction between an oath and an affirmation?—Following the judgment of the Court of Error, repeated in the other judgment which I quoted, I regard the essential words of the oath as beginning with "I swear," and ending with "according to law." I submit that it is no part of my duty to draw any distinction, if distinction exists, between the value of that and the value of an affirmation, because the Statute has declared that they both have the same value.

151. Do you consider that the taking of an oath implies in the person taking it the existence of a belief in God, and that he will reward and punish us according to our deserts?—That depends upon the form of the oath; and since the decision you quoted very many forms of oath have been entirely changed by the Legislature.

152. Do you consider that if you use the word "swear," you appeal to a God?—I consider that I take an oath which is binding upon my honor and conscience.

153. Without any reference to God?—I consider that I take an oath which is binding upon my honor and conscience.

154. And supposing that you break that oath, what would be the consequences which you consider would result to you?—I am not aware that the Statute has provided that I shall declare my opinion upon those consequences.

155. Am I to understand that you decline to answer?—I am objecting that the question is one which would not be put in a court of law, and therefore, much more, should not be put here.

156. In answer to the Attorney General, and in your statement also, you used the words "essential part of the Oath," and the words of the Oath are, "I do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors, according to law;" do you consider that all the words there present to your mind are equally definite and clear meaning?—I consider that the whole of those words are essential: I hold them to be essential, and I submit myself to the construction which the Court has put upon them.

157. Is there any word in the Oath in the Statute which does not convey to your mind any clear and definite meaning?—There is no word in that which does not convey to me a clear and definite meaning.

158. And do you regard the words at the end of it, "So help me, God," as conveying any definite meaning, or merely as a useless addendum to the promise?—I object that this Committee will not ask me my opinion upon those words, because they have been held by the highest court of law in this realm, subject to appeal, to be no necessary part of the Oath.

159. Sir Henry Jackson: If your counsel were here I should put to him this question, which do not answer if you object; I will treat you as if you were your own counsel: I understand your view to be that the Act of 1866 or the Act of 1868, gives you two alternative methods of taking your seat, the one of affirmation and the other of oath, and that it is open to you to take whichever of the two you prefer; you prefer the affirmation, but it having been decided not to be competent for you to make the affirmation, you now propose to take the Oath?—That is exactly my construction.

160. Now I will tell you my doubt, and perhaps you will be good enough to tell me what you say upon it. It
occurs to me that these two alternatives are what lawyers call true alternatives; that is to say, that each excludes the other, and that the Committee having decided (perhaps you will say erroneously) that you cannot affirm, you have by your claim to affirm excluded yourself from the alternative claim to take the Oath; are not the two mutually exclusive?—No; the House of Commons decided that, fortunately for me, and that saves me the trouble of thinking on it for myself. When John Archdale applied to affirm, the House held that he could not affirm, and they ordered him to take the Oath.

161. Was that under the Statute which regulates the present procedure?—No, but it was under the claim of a man who thought that he had alternative courses, and who refused to take the Oath.

162. That is the answer which you give to my doubt?—I am not sure whether I have answered fully.

163. You do not condescend to any argument upon the Statute, but you think that the one alternative is not exclusive of the other?—I thought then, and subject to the Report of the Committee against me, which I presume binds me, I should still think that I have the right to affirm, and if there were any way in which I thought I could legally raise the question, I should try to do so.

164. But on the hypothesis that the decision of the Committee was right, have you anything except the Archdale precedent, from which you would argue that these two Acts of Parliament do not create two mutually exclusive alternatives?—I should simply reply that if that be so, and you told me that I did not come within the one, I must come within the other.

165. Mr. STAVELEY HILL: I wish to ask you one question with reference to what took place before Lord Justice Brett (then Mr. Justice Brett), and, of course, if you think proper, you will take the objection as you did to what the Attorney General asked you: when Mr. Justice Brett admitted you to affirm, what steps did he take with a view to satisfy himself that an oath would not be binding upon your conscience?—He put to me the question, "Why?" and I gave to him three words as an answer, and these three words apparently satisfied him, and he directed the clerk to allow me to affirm. He put no question to me as to whether the oath was binding upon me or not.

166. Have you any objection to tell the Committee what those three words were?—The question put by Mr. Justice Brett was, "Why?" I object to tell the answer, because it would be an inquiry into a man's religious opinions, and Sir George Grey, in introducing the Parliamentary Oaths Act in 1866, under which I claim, said, "We will make no inquiry into any man's religious opinions; let the constituencies be the judges of that."

167. But those three words, whatever they were, satisfied Mr. Justice Brett that an oath would not be binding upon your conscience?—I cannot say that, but they satisfied him sufficiently that he gave the clerk directions to allow me to affirm.

168. When did that take place?—About eight years ago, speaking roughly; it may be six or seven years, but I am not certain about the time.

169. Was it reported in the newspapers, and is it generally known?—I am not sure; there have been cases reported.

170. Mr. PEMBERTON: I wish to ask whether, since you were returned as a Member of this House, and since the Report of the last Committee, you authorised the publication of a letter which appeared in the newspapers of the 21st of May in reference to the proceedings which have taken place on this matter?—I ask that the question may not be put to me, because I say that the House has already decided that they will not put any inquiry to a member as to what happens outside the House to determine what was consistent with the Oath, or not.

171. Of course I do not press the question more than to remind you that it had reference to proceedings which have taken place in this House, and in a Committee of this House?—Many things I have read (I do not know whether they are accurate or inaccurate), speeches made by Members referring to proceedings in this House, and to that Committee in relation to this matter. To put it roughly, I should submit that this Committee should not examine me as to extra-Parliamentary utterances in reply to extra-Parliamentary utterances. For example, one honorable Member, Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, made a speech at Chichester——

172. Lord HENRY LENNOX: Not at Chichester?—The papers said so; they may be very likely wrong, only it shows still more, I submit, the force of the objection that extra-Parliamentary publications in reply to extra-Parliamentary utterances should not be the subject of questions before this Committee.

173. Mr. PEMBERTON: I will only again point out that it was not in reply to an extra-Parliamentary utterance, but had reference to proceedings in this House?—That assumes what would be passing in the mind of the writer and what he had in view in assuming it, and I decline to discuss any subject of that kind.

174. I am to take it that you decline to answer the question?—No, I object to answer it. If the Committee think that I ought to answer it I will answer it. I do not take a legal objection. You quite understand that if the Committee think I ought to answer it, I will answer it at once.

The Committee deliberated.

CHAIRMAN: The Committee have come unanimously to the conclusion that the question put by the honorable Member for East Kent ought to be answered; but, in arriving at that conclusion, I am requested to
inform you what I will now read: "That the Committee think Mr. Bradlaugh should answer the question put to him by Mr. Pemberton, on the ground that it refers to matters written by him directly in relation to the question involved in the order of reference to the Committee, and for the purpose of expressing his views on such questions since the claim was made by him to make the affirmation, and before the appointment of the Committee."

175. Mr. PEMBERTON: I wish to ask whether, since you were returned as a Member of this House, and since the Report of the last Committee, you authorised the publication of a letter which appeared in the newspapers of the 21st May, in reference to the proceedings which have taken place on this matter, such letter being signed in your name?—I think one of the members of the Committee has a copy, which I handed to him; I have not seen the print; and as I sent to all the newspapers a lithographed copy, I prefer, for greater accuracy, to ask him to return it to me. I hold in my hand a copy which I have no doubt is the same.

176. CHAIRMAN: Do you object to that letter being put in?—The moment the Committee decided that I ought to answer that question, I had no reserve in saying that I left myself in the hands of the Committee on it. I shall take the liberty of wishing to address a word or two to the Committee presently upon it. (The letter was handed in.)

177. Mr. WATKIN WILLIAMS: Do you propose to take the Oath in the form given in the Statute of 1868, which I will read to you: "I., A. B., do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors, according to law. So help me, God?"—I do, that being the form in the Statute.

178. If you are permitted to take that oath, do you intend the Committee to understand and believe that it will be binding upon your conscience as an oath?—Yes.

179. In taking such oath, do you consider yourself as appealing to some Supreme Being as a witness that you are speaking the truth?—I submit that having said that I regard the oath as binding upon my conscience, this Committee has neither the right nor the duty to further interrogate my conscience.

180. Sir RICHARD CROSS: You know of course that in taking the oath in the form prescribed by the Statute, and according to the custom of taking oaths, you will have to kiss the Testament: do you attach the smallest weight to the kissing of that book?—I attach the weight attached by the law to the whole of the formula.

181. Do you attach the smallest weight to the kissing of the book; do you think that the kissing of that book adds in the slightest degree to the weight upon your conscience of the words which you have already spoken without kissing the book?—The law has said that the whole of that is to be complete; I have not the right, therefore, to form an opinion, or to formulate an opinion as to how much of that I would leave out had I any choice in the matter.

182. Then do you attach any further importance to the word "swear" in the oath itself, and to the fact of the kissing of the book than if the word "swear" were written "affirm," and no kissing of the book were required?—I have already said that I attach to the complete affirmation the most complete binding effect on my conscience. If I were allowed a preference, I would and still prefer the affirmation. The law says that the oath is the form, and I shall regard that form as in all its respects binding upon my conscience.

183. Do you look upon the kissing of that particular book as adding any more sanction than the kissing of any other book?—I decline to do that which the law has not done; the law has not split up the formula into parts, and expressed an opinion upon each part separately, and I deny the right of the Committee to ask me to do that which the law has not done.

184. I will ask you one other question; do not answer it unless you like?—I will not.

185. Do you think that the fact of the kissing of that book has any relation to an appeal to a Supreme Being, that you will, before Him, perform the oath which you have taken?—The law has not required me, in any case, to express an opinion as to that by itself. As to the whole Oath I have expressed an opinion.

186. As regards the kissing of that book, would you look upon that, so far as your conscience is concerned, as an idle form?—The law has not required me to look upon it by itself, and I dispute the right of the Committee to divide the Oath into parts, and to take one part by itself without the other. I have already answered that the whole of the Oath when taken by me, and if taken by me, will be binding upon my conscience.

187. But still you consider that a certain part of that Oath, which the Statute imposes upon you the necessity to take, is an idle, and empty, and meaningless form?—I have never said so at any time.

188. But do you consider it so?—Most certainly I do not consider the most considerable portion of it an idle and empty form.

189. Some portion of it, I said?—I consider no portion of the essential Oath an idle and empty form.

190. That is to say, that you would take the Oath because the Statute says you must do so in order to take your seat?—That is not so. I take the Oath because the Statute says that I must do so, intending to be bound in my honor and conscience by the oath I take. Every Member takes the Oath because he must do so in order to
take his seat, and he could not take it without it.

191. But you do not think that the forms of the Oath, as settled by law, adds anything to the binding of your conscience further than saying "I solemnly affirm"?—Your question presumes a form of thought which I have not enunciated.

192. Mr. JOHN BRIGHT: Do I understand you aright that you have never said that the oath, as you propose to take it, is less binding upon your conscience than it is supposed to be on the consciences of other men?—I have never said so; and in 1868, when I stood for election, there being then no form of affirmation possible for me, I had gravely considered the question.

193. It is within your knowledge that some men, and not a few men, who do not absolutely refuse to take an oath, still greatly prefer to make an affirmation?—If it would not be impertinent to say it, many Members of the House have told me so since this question has been pending.

194. CHAIRMAN: I think you said, when I informed you that the Committee thought that the letter should be put in, that it was a subject upon which you wished to make an observation?—I wish just to make the slightest observation upon that, and upon one or two points that arose in questions that have been put to me. If the Committee would allow me to think for a moment I believe I can compress it within very slight limits.

195. Sir GABRIEL GOLDFREY: Your statement to Mr. Justice Brett, I understood, you would think over?—No, that my answer did not apply to. If the Committee think that I ought to answer that question in the same way, the question as to the three words, or rather four words, that I answered to Mr. Justice Brett, I am quite in the hands of the Committee, and I should not decline to answer them.

196. Mr. STAVELEY HILL: The reason why I asked you what they were, and where they were to be found if you did not answer the question, was on purpose that one might look for them, because it must be a matter of public notoriety what the words were?—I should think it very possible. I have taken my objection, and if there is even a thought in the Committee that I had better answer the question, I should not object to do so.

197. CHAIRMAN: What are the observations which you wish to offer in consequence of your examination?—As the House will now have before it the statement, I ask the Committee in examining it to take it complete, not to separate one or two words in it and to take those without the countervailing words, and to remember that in this letter I declare that the oath, if I take it, would bind me, and I now repeat that in the most distinct and formal manner; that the Oath of Allegiance, viz.: "I do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors, according to law," will, when I take it, be most fully, completely, and unreservedly binding upon my honor and conscience; and I crave leave to refer to the unanimous judgment of the full Court of the Exchequer Chamber, in the case of Miller v. Salomons, 17th Jurist, page 463, and to the case of the Lancaster and Carlisle Railway Company v. Heaton, 4th Jurist, new series, page 708, for the distinguishment between the words of asseveration and the essential words of an oath. But I also desire to add, and I do this most solemnly and unreservedly, that the taking and subscribing, or repeating of those words of asseveration, will in no degree weaken the binding effect of the oath on my conscience. I should like, finally, simply to submit to the Committee, and especially to the honorable and learned gentleman on the left of the Chairman, that there has not been from the beginning to the end of this matter, any declaration, either distinct or implied, that the Oath if taken by me would be less binding upon me than upon him; and I do submit to this Committee that this House has never sought to inquire or to distinguish in any fashion as to the religious views of its Members, except so far as any of them have found themselves obliged by their conscience to refuse to comply with some form that the House has put before them. On the contrary, in the Lords' protest on the discussion of the Promissory Oaths Municipal Bill, Lord Holland and other Lords put it in the most distinct fashion that no sort of inquisition and no sort of inquiry ought to be tolerated involving any examination of a man's theological views. Lord Holland added, in words better than I can command: "That there is no tribunal which he knows competent to make that examination, and that the purely secular and political duties called upon to be performed were not such as to entitle that examination to be made." I thank the Committee for having listened to me, and I submit myself to their decision.

198. CHAIRMAN: You mentioned some precedents which you thought might usefully be added to the list of precedents which we have already had: could you conveniently add those cases?—Yes, I will do so.

Monday, 7th June 1880.
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- Mr. John Bright.
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Mr. Charles Bradlaugh, a member of the House; further Examined.

199. CHAIRMAN: There was some reference, I think, made to you by Mr. Whitbread, with regard to which you desire to make some observations?—There was a point urged by Mr. Whitbread upon the first Committee. I do not know whether I should be in order in referring to it. I thought it had been sufficiently covered by what I had said, until I reflected upon it, and then I thought it had not. I wish to submit to this Committee that it ought not to consider that I claimed to affirm because I regarded the oath as not binding upon my conscience, under the spirit of the Evidence Further Amendment Act, 1869, for that Statute runs: "If any one shall object to take an oath, or be objected to as incompetent to take an oath;" and that it is quite possible (perhaps wrongly, and undoubtedly wrongly, as the Committee have so decided) that I might claim to affirm, objecting to take the oath, and that the Committee have not on the evidence here either the right or the duty to assume anything more as against me in dealing with it now. That is all I wish to put before the Committee.

Appendix.

Appendix No. 1.

Precedents Relative to Parliamentary Oaths.

Precedent of a MEMBER disabled for having sat in the House without taking the Oath.

Sir John Leedes hath been in the House and not taken the Oath.
Sir John Leedes not to come into the House till further Order.
Sir E. Coke: That by the law Sir J. Leedes is disabled to serve this Parliament, and therefore ought to be discharged, and a new Writ.
Mr. Pawlett, accordant.
Sir J. Strangways: Can pretend no ignorance, for a Member of the House last Parliament.
Mr. Crew, for Sir J. Leedes: No question but he is in-capable. 2. He is to be punished.
Resolved, Sir J. Leedes incapable of being a Member of this House, as if never returned.
Mr. Hackwyll: To have him removed; a Writ for a new choice; and to punish him, by sending him to the Tower.
Sir G. Moore: To have no question made, but where it is questioned.
Mr. Secretary: The fault great, especially because of last Parliament. To order, he shall be discharged now, and to serve no more this Parliament.
Sir J. Leedes, brought to the Bar, confesseth he was of the House last meeting in Parliament; and that he hath sit this Parliament in the House, and hath not taken his Oath.
Mr. T. Fanshaw: That he must be punished as one that hath come into the House, not being chosen.
Sir E. SANDES: To pay the Serjeant his fees, and no further punishment; because, but negligence, no presumption, and is willing to take the Oath.
Mr. CHIDLEY: To have an order to disable him for this Parliament.
A Warrant for a new Writ in his room.

Precendent of a MEMBER Admitted to sit without taking the OATHS of ALLEGIANCE and SUPREMACY.

Ordered, That WILLIAM AYRES, Esquire, being legally elected and returned a Member of this House, his election being returned and remitted of Record, shall be admitted to sit in this House, without taking the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance.

Ordered, That an Ordinance be brought in by Mr. Lisle, to-morrow morning, for repealing that clause in the Act of ** That no person be admitted to sit as a Member of this House, before he hath taken the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy.

Ordered, That all and every the Sheriffs of the respective counties in England and Wales do henceforth execute their several places and offices of Sheriffs of their several and respective counties, according to the duty of their said office, without taking the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy.

Precendent of a MEMBER Discharged for declining to take the OATHS.

The House being informed, that Sir HENRY MOUNSON attended, according to the Order on Saturday last; 
Resolved, That he be called in, and tendered the Oaths and Declaration directed to be taken, made, repeated, and subscribed by the Members of the House.

He was called in accordingly; and came up to the table: And Mr. Speaker acquainted him, That the House had taken notice that he had been about the town a considerable time; but yet did not attend the service of the House: And that he had directions to tender him the Oaths and the Declarations.

Whereupon, Sir Henry Mounson said: That he was sorry that for some reasons he could not comply to qualify himself to sit in the House: But that those reasons would no way incline him to disturb the Government; and that he submitted himself to the House.

And then withdrew.

Resolved, That Sir Henry Mounson be discharged from being a Member of the House.

New Writ Ordered.

Precendent of a MEMBER Discharged for declining to take the OATHS.

The House being informed, that the Lord FANSHAW attended at the door, according to the order of Saturday last.

Resolved, That he be called in, and tendered the Oaths and Declaration directed to be taken, made, repeated, and subscribed by the Members of the House.

He was called in accordingly; and came up to the table: And Mr. Speaker acquainted him, That the House had taken notice that he had been about the town a considerable time; but yet did not attend the Service of the House; and that he had direction to tender him the Oaths and Declaration.

Whereupon the Lord Fanshaw said, that it was true, he had been about town a great while indeed; but had been in the country, if his health would have permitted him; but that he had been in a strict course of physick, and was in the same condition still of physick and diet; but, however, that since he was absent there was an Act of Parliament passed for taking the Oaths; and he was not qualified to sit in the House, in regard he was not satisfied to take the Oaths; and therefore he could not appear.

And then withdrew.

Resolved, That the Lord Fanshaw be discharged from being a Member of the House.

And there being a Petition in, touching the Election, the granting a new Writ was respited.

Precendent of a MEMBER Committed to the TOWER for declining to take the OATHS.

The House being acquainted, that Mr. CHOLMLY attended according to their order of Tuesday last;

He was called in, and came up to the table: And Mr Speaker, by the direction of the House, acquainted him to this effect, viz., That the House had taken notice of his being absent from their service a considerable time, and that now he was come he was to tender him, and accordingly did tender him, the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy appointed to be taken by the Members of the House, according to an Act of this present Parliament.

To which Mr. Cholmly replied, That as to his absence, both when he was in the country and since he came to town, he had been infirm and lame, and had been under the doctor's hands, and could not as yet recover himself. And that he had endeavored to qualify himself to be a sitting Member of the House, by taking the
Oaths, as the House expects, but that he could not as yet do it: And therefore humbly submitted himself to the House; and that he did it not out of any wilful humor.

Upon which he was commanded to withdraw.

And being withdrawn accordingly;

Resolved, That Francis Cholmly, Esquire, a Member of this House, for his contempt in refusing to take the Oaths, *, *, be committed Prisoner to the Tower of London.

Ordered, That the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House do take into his custody the said Mr. Cholmly, and convey him to the Tower: And that Mr. Speaker do issue his Warrant for that purpose.

**Precedent of a MEMBER, being a QUAKER, refusing to take the OATH.**

House called over,

And the name of John Archdale, Esquire, a burgess for the borough of Chipping Wycomb, in the county of Bucks, being called over a second time:

Mr. Speaker acquainted the House that Mr. Archdale had been with him this morning, and delivered him a letter sealed, which Mr. Speaker presented to the House.

And the same was opened and read, and is as followeth, viz.:—

"London, the 3rd of the 11th month, called January 1698—9.

Sir.

Upon the call of the House it will appear that I am duly chosen and returned to serve in Parliament for the borough of Chipping Wycomb, in the county of Bucks; and, therefore, I request of thee to acquaint the honorable House of Commons the reason I have not as yet appeared, which is, that the burgesses being voluntarily inclined to elect me, I did not oppose their inclinations, believing that my declarations of fidelity, etc., might, in this case, as in others, where the law requires an oath, be accepted, I am, therefore, ready to execute my trust if the House think fit to admit of me thereupon; which I do humbly submit to their wisdom and justice; and shall acquiesce with what they will be pleased to determine therein: This being all at present, I remain,

"Thy real and obliged friend,

"JOHN ARCHDALE."

Day appointed for considering the contents of the said letter.

Mr. Archdale ordered to attend.

The House being informed, that Mr. Archdale attended according to order;

His letter to Mr. Speaker was again read;

And the several statutes qualifying persons to come into and sit and vote in this House were read, viz., of the 30 Car. If., I Will, and Mariae, and 7 and 8 Will, and Mariae.

And then the said Mr. Archdale was called in,

And he came into the middle of the House, almost to the table;

And Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House, asked him whether he had taken the Oaths or would take the Oaths, appointed to qualify himself to be a member of this House; To which he answered, That in regard to a principle of his religion he had not taken the Oaths, nor could take them.

And then he withdrew.

A new Writ ordered.

**Precedent of a MEMBER expelled for absconding, and not taking the OATHS.**

The House was called over according to order.

And the names of such as made default to appear were taken down.

Ordered, That the names of such as made default be now called over.

And they were called over accordingly.

And several of them appeared, and others were excused upon account of their being ill, some in the country, some in town; and others upon account of their being in the country upon extraordinary occasions; and some as being upon the road.

Upon calling over the names of * * LEWIS PRICE, Esquire, * * they were not excused.

Several Members sent for.

Ordered, That Lewis Price, Esquire, be sent for, in custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House. The Serjeant-at-Arms being called upon to give the House an account of what he had done in relation to Lewis Pryse, Esquire, who was, the 8th of August last, ordered to be sent for in custody, for not attending the Service of the House; he acquainted the House, That the messenger he sent to bring up Mr. Pryse, had been at
his house at Gargathen, but that he was not there; nor could the messenger have any intelligence where he was.

Ordered, That Lewis Pryse, Esquire, do surrender himself into the custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House, by this day month at the farthest, upon pain of occurring the farther displeasure of this House, and of being proceeded against with the utmost severity.

The order of the 2nd of February last being read requiring Lewis Pryse, Esquire, to surrender himself into the custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House by that day month at farthest;

The Serjeant was called upon to know whether he had heard from the said Mr. Pryse, and he acquainted the House, That he had not heard from him.

Mr. Speaker acquainted the House, that he had received a letter from the said Mr. Pryse, and he delivered the same to the Clerk to be read; and the same was read accordingly, and is as follows, viz.:

"Sir,
'Tis with pleasure that I embrace every opportunity of returning you my acknowledgments for the good offices you have done me, as often as the case of my unavoidable absence has come under debate in the House. The repeated experience I have had of your friendship in this point, encourages me to hope for the continuance of them, which I shall not offer to desire longer than the reasonableness of my case shall appear to deserve them.

I beg leave once more to represent it to you; and through your assistance to the honorable House; whose displeasure as it is a very sensible affliction to me, I should be glad by any means in my power to remove. That as it is impracticable for me to attend by the time appointed, because of a very severe fit of the gout which I am now afflicted with, and thereby give satisfaction to the House in the method they have insisted on; I hope they will accept of such as is in my power, and give me a favorable hearing when I represent to them, that I was chose knight of the shire of Cardigan when I was at 100 miles distant from it, and had been absent thence for ten months before the time of my election; which I was so far from seeking, that I never asked a vote for it, and was chose even against my inclinations.

I know not how far a man is obliged to stand to the choice a county makes of him. Sure I am that I have reason to complain of a force that has administered the occasion of my disobliging the honorable House, by an absence caused by infirmities, under which I labored at the time of my choice, and which have continued upon me ever since with the greatest severity, and with little or no intermission.

In these circumstances I would fain hope that the honorable House will rather blame the country's choice than him who has been unwillingly forced into a post, and lies under the misfortune (for I flatter myself 'twill not be thought a crime) of not being able to attend the business of it; and will therefore lay aside their displeasure, and remit the sentence ordered against me.

And I am the rather encouraged to hope this, because Mr. Prynne, in his comment on the fourth book of Sir Edward Coke's Institutes, shows, from various records, that incurable distempers have been constantly allowed by the House for a just excuse of non-attendance; and upon debates in such cases, no other punishment has been inflicted than excusing the service of the Member, and ordering a new writ for electing a person duly qualified, and capable of attending the business of the House. This being the course of Parliamentary proceedings in such cases as mine, which I have now truly represented to you, and can produce hundreds of witnesses to confirm, I hope that the unhappy incapacity I am under of attending the service of the House, will be thought to deserve no severer treatment than has been usual in the like cases; and that my ready submission to the honorable House's pleasure in this point, will be a means to restore me to their favorable opinion, and engage you to promote the request of

"Your most obliged and obedient humble servant,
"LE PRYSE.

"Aberllefenny,
18th February, 1715.

"I know not how far the House in their last order about me, might be influenced by any report of the messenger who came down to my house; but to prevent misrepresentation I think it proper to assure you, that within three days after a very dangerous fit of the gout suffered me to come downstairs, I came from thence hither to my father-in-law's, eighteen miles in my way to London. But the motion of even so small a journey brought another fit upon me immediately, with which I have been laid up here ever since, and not having been yet so much as able to return to my own house."

Then the journal of the * day of May, 1689, in the case of Mr. Cholmondley was read.
(House interrupted—Conference.)
The House resumed the consideration of the matter relating to Mr. Pryse.

Resolved. That Lewis Pryse, Esquire, a Member of this House, having been sent for in custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House, the 8th day of August last, for not attending the service of this House, and having never qualified himself as a Member of this House, by taking the oaths at the table, be forthwith brought up in custody.

The Messenger gives the House an account of what he had done pursuant to the order of the House.

Resolved, That Lewis Pryse, Esquire, a Member of this House, having been sent for in custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms attending this House, the 8th day of August last, for not attending the service of this House, and having never qualified himself as a Member of this House, by taking the Oaths at the table; and having been on the 2nd of February last summoned to surrender himself into custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms, upon pain of being proceeded against with the utmost severity, and he having absconded, and peremptorily refused to surrender himself into custody, be, for the same contempt, expelled this House.

Precedent of a MEMBER refusing to take the OATH of SUPREMACY.

Daniel O'Connell, Esq., professing the Roman Catholic religion, returned Knight of the Shire for the County of Clare, being introduced in the usual manner, for the purpose of taking his seat, produced at the table a certificate of his having been sworn before two of the deputies appointed by the Lord Steward, whereupon the clerk tendered to him the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration; upon which Mr. O'Connell stated, that he was ready to take the Oaths of Allegiance and Abjuration, but that he could not take the Oath of Supremacy, and claimed the privilege of being allowed to take the Oath set forth in the Act passed in the present Session of Parliament "for the Relief of his Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects;" whereupon the Clerk having stated the matter to Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker informed Mr. O'Connell that, according to his interpretation of the law, it was incumbent on Mr. O'Connell to take the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration, and that the provisions of the new Act applied only to Members returned after the commencement of the said Act, except in so far as regarded the repeal of the Declaration against transubstantiation; and that Mr. O'Connell must withdraw unless he were prepared to take the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration. Whereupon Mr. O'Connell withdrew.

Motion, That Mr. O'Connell be called back and heard at the table. Debate arising.

A Member stated that he was requested by Mr. O'Connell to desire that he might be heard. Debate adjourned.

Resolved, That Mr. O'Connell, the Member for Clare, be heard at the Bar, by himself, his counsel or agents, in respect of his claim to sit and vote in Parliament without taking the Oath of Supremacy.

Mr. O'Connell was called in, and heard accordingly: And being withdrawn;

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this House, that Mr. O'Connell having been returned a Member of this House before the commencement of the Act passed in this Session of Parliament "for the Relief of his Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects," is not entitled to sit or vote in this House unless he first take the Oath of Supremacy.

Ordered, That Mr. O'Connell do attend the House this day, and that Mr. Speaker do then communicate to him the said resolution, and ask him whether he will take the Oath of Supremacy.

And the House being informed that Mr. O'Connell attended at the door, he was called to the Bar, and Mr. Speaker communicated to him the resolution of the House of yesterday, and the order thereupon, as followeth:

Resolved. That it is the opinion of this House, that Mr. O'Connell having been returned a Member of this House before the commencement of the Act passed in this Session of Parliament, "for the Relief of his Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects," is not entitled to sit or vote in this House unless he first take the Oath of Supremacy.

Ordered, That Mr. O'Connell do attend the House this day, and that Mr. Speaker do then communicate to him the said resolution, and ask him whether he will take the Oath of Supremacy.

And then Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the said order, asked Mr. O'Connell whether he would take the said Oath of Supremacy? Whereupon Mr. O'Connell requested to see the said Oath, which being shown to him accordingly, Mr. O'Connell stated that the said Oath contained one proposition which he knew to be false, and another proposition which he believed to be untrue; and that he therefore refused to take the said Oath of Supremacy.

And then Mr. O'Connell was directed to withdraw; and he withdrew accordingly.

Ordered, That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Ireland to make out (subject to the provisions of an Act passed in this Session of Parliament, intituled, "An Act to amend certain Acts of the Parliament of Ireland relative to the election of Members to serve in Parliament, and to regulate the qualification of persons to vote at the election of Knights of the Shire of Ireland") a new writ for the electing of a Knight of the Shire to serve in this present Parliament for the County of Clare, in the room of Daniel
O'Connell, Esq., who, having been returned a Member of this House before the commencement of an Act passed in this Session of Parliament "for the Relief of his Majesty's Roman Catholic Subjects," has refused to qualify himself to sit and vote as a Member of this House, by taking the Oath of Supremacy.

**Precedent of a MEMBER being a QUAKER, claiming to make an AFFIRMATION.**

Several Members attended at the table to take the Oaths; and Joseph Pease, Esquire, returned for the Southern Division of the County of Durham, having stated that, being one of the people called Quakers, he claimed the privilege of making an Affirmation, instead of taking the Oaths; whereupon he was desired by Mr. Speaker to retire until the sense of the House could be taken upon his claim; and he retired accordingly.

*Ordered*, That a Select Committee be appointed to search the Journals of the House, and to report to the House such precedents, and such Acts or parts of Acts of Parliament as relate to the right of the people called Quakers to take their seats in Parliament, and to the privilege conferred upon them to make their solemn Affirmation in Courts of Justice, and other places where by law an Oath is allowed, authorised, or required to be taken.

Report:—

Resolved, That it appears to this House, that Joseph Pease is entitled to take his seat upon making his solemn Affirmation and Declaration to the effect of the Oaths directed to be taken at the table of this House.

The Counsel and Agents in the case of the Coleraine Election, being returned to the bar, the Clerk appointed to attend the said Committee delivered into the House a reduced List; and the same was called over, and is as follows:—

* * * * *

And the Members of the Committee being as usual, come to the Table to be sworn, and Joseph Pease, Esquire, a Quaker, being one of the said Members, Mr. Speaker submitted to the House whether Mr. Pease was capable of serving on the said Election Committee without having been sworn.

* * * * *

And the House being unanimously of opinion, That Mr. Pease was capable of serving on the said Committee;

The rest of the Committee were sworn, and Mr. Pease made his solemn Affirmation, as follows:

* * * * *

**Precedent of a MEMBER omitting the words in the OATH of ABJURATION "On the true Faith of a Christian."**

The Baron **LIONEL NATHAN DE ROTHSCHILD**, returned as one of the members for the City of London, came to the table to be sworn; and being asked by the Clerk what Oath he wished to take, the Protestant or the Roman Catholic Oath, he replied, "I desire to be sworn upon the Old Testament."

Whereupon the Clerk having stated the matter to Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker directed Baron Rothschild to withdraw. [Debate on Question relative to the matter adjourned.]

*Ordered*, That Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, one of the Members for the City of London, having demanded to be sworn on the Old Testament, be called to the table, and that Mr. Speaker do ask him why he has demanded to be sworn in that form.

Whereupon Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, having come to the Table, was asked by Mr. Speaker—

"Baron de Rothschild, you have demanded to be sworn on the Old Testament, and I am directed by the House to ask you why you have demanded to be sworn in that form?"

To which Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild replied:

"Because that is the form of swearing that I declare to be most binding on my conscience."

And then Mr. Speaker directed him to withdraw.

*Ordered*, That Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, one of the Members for the City of London, having presented himself at the table of the House, and having previously to taking the Oaths, requested to be sworn on the Old Testament (being the form which he has declared at the table to be most binding on his conscience), the Clerk be directed to swear him on the Old Testament accordingly.

The Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, having come to the table, Mr. Speaker acquainted him that the House had made the following Order:

"That Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, one of the Members for the City of London, having presented himself at the table of the House, and having previously to taking the Oaths, requested to be sworn on the Old Testament (being the form which he has declared at the table to be most binding on his conscience), the Clerk be directed to swear him on the Old Testament accordingly."

Whereupon the Clerk handed to him the Old Testament, and tendered him the Oaths; and he accordingly
took the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, repeating the same after the Clerk; the Clerk then proceeded to
administer the Oath of Abjuration, which the Baron de Rothschild repeated after the Clerk so far as the words
"upon the true faith of a Christian," but upon the Clerk reading those words, the Baron de Rothschild said, "I
omit those words as not binding on my conscience;" he then concluded with the words "So help me, God" (the
Clerk not having read those words to him), and kissed the said Testament:—Whereupon he was directed to
withdraw.

Question for a new writ negatived.

Resolved, That the Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild is not entitled to vote in this House, or to sit in this
House during any debate, until he shall take the Oath of Abjuration in the form appointed by law.

Resolved, That this House will, at the earliest opportunity in the next Session of Parliament, take into its
serious con- sideration the form of the Oath of Abjuration, with a view to relieve her Majesty's subjects
professing the Jewish religion.

[The House refuses to hear Petitioners by Counsel in favour of a resolution admitting Baron Lionel de
Rothschild.]

Bill to provide for the relief of her Majesty's subjects professing the Jewish Religion. Brought from the
Lords, 13th July. Royal assent, 23rd July, 1858.

[Oaths Bill Passed: By the Lords with Amendments; Lords' Amendments disagreed to; Lords insist, and
assign reasons.]

Resolved, That this House does not consider it necessary to examine the reasons offered by the Lords for
insisting upon the exclusion of Jews from Parliament, as by a Bill of the present Session, intituled, "An Act to
provide for the relief of her Majesty's subjects professing the Jewish Religion," their Lordships have provided
means for the admission of persons professing the Jewish Religion to seats a the Legislature.

Resolved, That this House doth not insist upon its disagreement with the Lords in their Amendments to the
said Bill.

Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, returned as one of the Members for the City of London, came to the
table to be sworn; and stated that, being a person professing the Jewish religion, he entertained a conscientious
objection to take the Oath which, by an Act passed in the present Session, has been substituted for the Oaths of
Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration, in the form therein required. Whereupon the Clerk reported the matter
to Mr. Speaker, who desired Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild to withdraw, and he withdrew accordingly.

Resolved, That it appears to this House that Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, a person professing the
Jewish religion, being otherwise entitled to sit and vote in this House, is prevented from so sitting and voting by
his conscientious objection to take the oath which, by an Act passed in the present Session of Parliament, has
been substituted for the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration, in the form therein required.

Resolved, That any person professing the Jewish religion may henceforth, in taking the oath prescribed in
an Act of the present Session of Parliament to entitle him to sit and vote in this House, omit the words "and I
make this declaration upon the true faith of a Christian."

Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild having again come to the table, desired to be sworn on the Old
Testament, as being binding on his conscience.

Whereupon the Clerk reported the matter to Mr. Speaker, who then desired the Clerk to swear him upon the
Old Testament.

Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild was sworn "accordingly, and subscribed the Oath at the table.
[See case of Baron Mayer Amschel de Rothschild, 15th Feb., 1859, infra.]

Parliament dissolved, 23rd April, 1859; met, 31st May, 1859.

Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, Member for the City of London, came to the table to be sworn, and
stated that being a person professing the Jewish religion, he had a conscientious objection to take the oath in the
form required by the Act 22 Vict. c. 48. The Clerk having reported the circumstance to Mr. Speaker, Baron
Lionel Nathan de Rothschild was directed to withdraw, and he withdrew accordingly.

Resolved, That it appears to this House that Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, a person professing the
Jewish religion, being otherwise entitled to sit and vote in this House, is prevented from so sitting and voting by
his conscientious objection to take the oath which, by an Act passed in the 22nd year of her Majesty has been
substituted for the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration in the form therein required.

Resolved, That any person professing the Jewish religion may henceforth, in taking the oath prescribed in an
Act passed in the twenty-second year of her Majesty to entitle him to sit and vote in this House, omit the words "and I
make this declaration upon the true faith of a Christian."

Whereupon Baron Lionel Nathan de Rothschild, Alderman David Salomons, and Baron Mayer Amschel de
Rothschild, being Members professing the Jewish religion, having come to the table, were sworn upon the Old
Testa- ment, and took the oath, omitting the words "and I make this declaration upon the true faith of a
Christian," and subscribed the same.

**Precedent of a MEMBER omitting the words in the OATH OF ABJURATION, "on the true faith of a Christian."

DAVID SALOMONS, Esq., returned as one of the Members for the borough of Greenwich, came to the table to be sworn; and being tendered the New Testament by the Clerk, stated that he desired to be sworn on the Old Testament: Whereupon the Clerk reported the matter to Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker asked him why he desired to be sworn on the Old Testament; he answered, because he considered it binding on his conscience; Mr. Speaker then desired the Clerk to swear him upon the Old Testament; the Clerk handed to him the Old Testament, and tendered him the oaths; and he took the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, repeating the same after the Clerk. The Clerk then proceeded to administer the Oath of Abjuration, which Mr. Salomons read as far as the words "upon the true faith of a Christian," which he omitted, concluding with the words "So help me, God. And the Clerk having reported to Mr. Speaker that Mr. Salomons had omitted to repeat the words "upon the true faith of a Christian," Mr. Speaker desired Mr. Salomons to withdraw. He thereupon retired from the table and sat down upon one of the lower benches, upon which Mr. Speaker informed him that, not having taken the Oath of Abjuration in the form prescribed by the Act of Parliament, and in the form in which the House had upon a former occasion expressed its opinion that it ought to be taken, he could not be allowed to remain in the House, but must withdraw. And he withdrew accordingly.

Motion for new writ withdrawn.

The House resumed the further proceedings.

Mr. Alderman Salomons entered the House, and took his seat within the Bar: Whereupon Mr. Speaker said that he saw that a Member had taken his seat without having taken the Oaths required by law; and that he must therefore desire that the honorable Member do withdraw.

Mr. Alderman Salomons continued in the seat within the Bar.

Ordered (after Debate), That Mr. Alderman Salomons do now withdraw.

Whereupon Mr. Speaker stated that the honorable Member for Greenwich had heard the decision of the House, and hoped that the honorable Member was prepared to obey it.

Mr. Alderman Salomons continuing to sit in his seat, Mr. Speaker directed the Serjeant-at-Arms to remove him below the Bar.

Whereupon Mr. Serjeant-at-Arms having placed his hand on Mr. Alderman Salomons, he was conducted below the Bar.

[The House refuses to hear Petitioners by Counsel at the Bar of the House in defence of their right to elect their own Representative.]

Resolved (after Debate), That David Salomons, Esq., is not entitled to vote in this House, or to sit in this House, during any debate, until he shall take the Oath of Abjuration in the form appointed by law.

**Precedent of a MEMBER stating that he had a conscientious objection to take the OATH.**

Baron MAYER AMSCHEL DE ROTHCHILD, returned for the town and port of Hythe, came to the table to be sworn, and stated that, being a person professing the Jewish religion, he entertained a conscientious objection to take the oath, which by an Act passed in the last Session has been substituted for the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration, in the form therein required. Whereupon the Clerk reported the matter to Mr. Speaker, who desired Baron Mayer Amschel de Rothschild to withdraw; and he withdrew accordingly.

Resolved, That it appears to this House that Baron Mayer Amschel de Rothschild, a person professing the Jewish religion, being otherwise entitled to sit and vote in this House, is prevented from so sitting and voting by his conscientious objection to take the oath, which by an Act passed in the last Session of Parliament has been substituted for the Oaths of Allegiance, Supremacy, and Abjuration in the form therein required.

Resolved, That any person professing the Jewish religion may henceforth, in taking the oath prescribed in an Act of the last Session of Parliament to entitle him to sit and vote in this House, omit the words "and I make this declaration upon the true faith of a Christian."

Baron Mayer Amschel de Rothschild, being again come to the table, desired to be sworn on the Old Testament as binding on his conscience.

Whereupon the Clerk reported the matter to Mr. Speaker, who then desired the Clerk to swear him upon the Old Testament.

Baron Mayer Amschel de Rothschild was sworn accordingly, and subscribed the oath at the table.
Appendix No. 2.

PAPER handed in by Mr. Bradlaugh, 2nd June, 1880.

Precedents Relating to Parliamentary Oaths.

Case of Attorney General Sir FRANCIS BACON, Commons Journals, Vol. 1, page 459, 11th April, 1614, continued from page 456, 8th April.

ELIGIBILITY of the Attorney General to sit in Parliament. By 46 Edward III., 1372, no practising barrister could be Knight of the Shire.

Page 459.—"The precedents to disable him ought to be showed on the other side."
Page 460.—"Their Oath their own consciences to look unto, not we to examine it."

At that date each Member had to make Oath that he was duly qualified.
1. Question whether he shall for this Parliament remain of the House or not:—Resolved, He shall.
2. Question.—Whether any Attorney General shall after this Parliament serve as a Member of this House:—Resolved, No.

Case of JOHN WILKES, Esquire, Commons Journal, 38, page 977, 3rd May, 1782.

The House was moved, that the entry in the Journal of the House, of the 17th day of February, 1769, of the Resolution, "That John Wilkes, Esquire, having been in this Session of Parliament expelled this House, was and is incapable of being elected a Member to serve in this present Parliament," might be read, and the same being read accordingly;

A motion was made, and the question being put, That the said resolution be expunged from the Journals of this House, as being subversive of the rights of the whole body of electors of this Kingdom.

The House divided.
The Yeas went forth.
Tellers for the Yeas, Sir Philip Jennings Clarke and Mr. Byng, 115.
Tellers for the Noes, Mr. John St. John and Sir William Augustus Cunynghame, 47,
So it was resolved in the affirmative.

And the same was expunged by the Clerk at the table, accordingly.

Ordered, That all Declarations, Orders, and Resolutions of this House, respecting the election of John Wilkes, Esquire, for the county of Middlesex, as a void election, the true and legal election of Henry Lawes Luttrell, Esquire, into Parliament for the said county, and the incapacity of John Wilkes, Esquire, to be elected a Member to serve in the said Parliament, be expunged from the Journals of this House as being subversive of the rights of the whole body of electors of this Kingdom.

By Cavendish's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. I., page 73, 24th November, 1768, it appears that inter alia were used to justify the original and subsequently expunged Resolutions—first. "the copy of the record of the proceedings, on an information in the Court of King's Bench, against John Wilkes, Esquire, for blasphemy"—page 123; "three obscene and impious libels"; "an impious libel with intent to blaspheme the Almighty God."

Case of Mr. JOHN HORNE TOOKE, Parliamentary History, Vol. 35, page 956, 16th February, 1801.

Mr. John Horne Tooke took the Oaths and his seat for Old Sarum. He was introduced by Sir Francis Burdett and Mr. Wilson. This being done, Earl Temple rose and said, he had observed a gentleman who had just retired from the table, after having taken the Oaths, whom he conceived to be incapable of a seat in that House, in consequence of his having taken priest's orders and been inducted into a living. He would wait the allotted time of fourteen days to see whether there was any petition presented against his return; if not he should then move that the return for Old Sarum be taken into consideration.

Page 1323, 10th March, 1801.—Earl Temple moved that Mr. Boucher, Deputy Registrar of Salisbury, be called in to prove that Mr. Horne Tooke, being a priest in orders, was not eligible to a seat in that House. After debate, in which Mr. John Horne Tooke spoke—Amendment and Division—Motion agreed to (page 1342),—Select Committee appointed (page 1343). Two reports given, pages 1343 to 1349, were made, giving all the cases of "any of the clergy" returned to Parliament.

4th May, 1801.—Earl Temple moved (pages 1349 to 1374), "That Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the clerk of the Crown in Great Britain, to make out a new writ for the election of a burgess to serve in this present
Parliament for the Borough of Old Sarum, in the county of Wilts, in the room of the Rev. John Horne Tooke, who being at the time of his election in priest's orders, was and is incapable of sitting in this House." A debate took place in which Mr. John Horne Tooke spoke (pp. 1350 to 1402), division, and the motion negatived.

Jurist, Vol. 17, Page 463.—Exchequer Chamber; Error from the Court of Exchequer: Coram, Lord Campbell, Chief Justice, and Coleridge, Cresswell, Wightman, Williams, and Crompton, J.

One judgment by Lord Chief Justice Campbell for the whole Court.

Lord Campbell (page 464).—The words "so help me, God," are words of asseveration, and of the manner of taking the oath; but the words preceding them are, it appears to me, an essential part of the oath.

Fisher's Digest, Vol. 3, page 6179.—By a private Act, no person appointed to act as tithe valuer shall be capable of acting until he shall have taken and subscribed an oath in the words following: "I, A. B., do swear that I will faithfully, etc., execute, etc.; so help me, God." Held, that the oath had nevertheless been properly administered according to the Statute, for the words omitted were not part of the oath, but only an indication of the manner of administering it. Lancaster and Carlisle Railway Company v. Heaton, 8 El. & Bl., 952; 4 Jur., N. S., 707; 27 L. J., Q. B., 195."

Appendix No. 3.

Paper handed in by Mr. BRADLAUGH, 2nd June, 1880.

Statement on the OATH QUESTION by Mr. BRADLAUGH.

20, Circus Road, St. John's Wood, London, N.W., 20th May, 1880.

When elected as one of the Burgesses to represent Northampton in the House of Commons, I believed that I had the legal right to make affirmation of allegiance in lieu of taking the oath, as provided by section 4 of the Parliamentary Oaths Act, 1866. While I considered that I had this legal right, it was then clearly my moral duty to make the affirmation. The oath, although to me including words of idle and meaningless character, was, and is, regarded by a large number of my fellow countrymen as an appeal to Deity to take cognizance of their swearing. It would have been an act of hypocrisy to voluntarily take this form if any other had been open to me, or to take it without protest, as though it meant in my mouth any such appeal. I, therefore, quietly and privately notified the Clerk of the House of my desire to affirm. His view of the law and practice differing from my own, and no similar case having theretofore arisen, it became necessary that I should tender myself to affirm in a more formal manner, and this I did at a season deemed convenient by those in charge of the business of the House. In tendering my affirmation, I was careful when called on by the Speaker to state my objection, to do nothing more than put in the fewest possible words my contention that the Parliamentary Oaths Act, 1866, gave the right to affirm in Parliament to every person for the time being by law permitted to make an affirmation in lieu of taking the oath, and that I was such a person, and therefore claimed to affirm. The Speaker neither refusing, nor accepting my affirmation, referred the matter to the House, which appointed a Select Committee to report whether persons entitled to affirm under the Evidence Amendment Acts, 1869 and 1870, were, under Section 4 of the Parliamentary Oaths Act, 1866, also entitled to affirm as Members of Parliament. This Committee, by the casting-vote of its Chairman, has decided that I am not entitled to affirm. Two courses are open to me, one of appeal to the House against the decision of the Committee; the other, of present compliance with the ceremony, while doing my best to prevent the further maintenance of a form which many other Members of the House think as objectionable as I do, but which habit, and the fear of exciting prejudice, has induced them to submit to. To appeal to the House against the decision of the Committee would be ungracious, and would certainly involve great delay of public business. I was present at the deliberations of the Committee, and while naturally I cannot be expected to bow submissively to the statements and arguments of my opponents, I am bound to say that they were calmly and fairly urged. I think them unreasonable; but the fact that they included a legal argument from an earnest Liberal deprives them even of a purely party character. If I appealed to the House against the Committee, I, of course, might rely on the fact that the Attorney General, the Solicitor General, Sir Henry Jackson, Q.C., Watkin Williams, Q.C., and Mr. Serjeant Simon are reported in the Times to have interpreted the law as I do; and I might add that the Right Honorable John Bright and Mr. Whitbread are in the same journal arrayed in favor of allowing me to affirm. But even then the decision of the House may endorse that of the Committee, and should it be in my favor it could only, judging from what has already taken place, be after a bitter party debate, in which the Government specially and the Liberals generally would be sought to be burdened with my anti-theological views, and with promoting my return to Parliament. As a matter of fact, the Liberals of England have never in any way promoted my return to Parliament. The much-attacked action of Mr. Adam had relation only to the second seat, and in no way related to the one for which I was fighting. In 1868, the only action of Mr. Gladstone and of Mr. Bright was to write letters in favor of my competitors; and since 1868 I do not believe that either of these gentlemen has directly or indirectly interfered in any way in connection with my Parliamentary candidature. The majority of the electors of
Northampton had determined to return me before the recent union in that borough, and while pleased to aid their fellow Liberals in winning the two seats, my constituents would have at any rate returned me had no union taken place. My duty to my constituents is to fulfil the mandate they have given me, and if to do this I have to submit to a form less solemn to me than the affirmation I would have reverently made, so much the worse for those who force me to repeat words which I have scores of times declared are to me sounds conveying no clear and definite meaning. I am sorry for the earnest believers who see words sacred to them used as a meaningless addendum to a promise, but I cannot permit their less sincere co-religionists to use an idle form in order to prevent me from doing my duty to those who have chosen me to speak for them in Parliament. I shall, taking the oath, regard myself as bound, not by the letter of its words, but by the spirit which the affirmation would have conveyed had I been permitted to use it. So soon as I am able, I shall take such steps as may be consistent with Parliamentary business to put an end to the present doubtful and unfortunate state of the law and practice on oaths and affirmations. Only four cases have arisen of refusal to take the oath except, of course, those cases purely political in their character; two of those cases are those of the Quakers John Archdale and Joseph Pease. The religion of these men forbade them to swear at all, and they nobly refused. The sect to which they belonged was outlawed, insulted and imprisoned; they were firm, and one of that sect sat on the very committee, a member of her Majesty's Privy Council, and a member of the actual Cabinet. I thank him gratefully that, valuing right so highly, he cast his vote so nobly for one for whom I am afraid he has but scant sympathy. No such religious scruple prevents me from taking the oath as prevented John Archdale and Joseph Pease. In the case of Baron Rothschild and Alderman Salomons the words "upon the true faith of a Christian" were the obstacle. To-day the oath contains no such words. The Committee report that I may not affirm, and protesting against a decision which seems to me alike against the letter of the law and the spirit of modern legislation, I comply with the forms of the House.

CHARLES BRADLAUGH.

Mr. Bradlaugh's Speeches.

MR. BRADLAUGH's First Speech at the Bar of the House of Commons, delivered June 23rd, 1880.

SIR,—I have to ask the indulgence of every member of this House while, in a position unexampled in the history of this House, I try to give one or two reasons why the resolution which you have read to me should not be enforced. If it were not unbecoming I should appeal to the traditions of the House against the House itself, and I should point out that in none of its records, so far as my poor reading goes, is there any case in which this House has judged one of its members in his absence, and taken away from that member the constitutional right he has (hear, hear). There have been members against whom absolute legal disqualification has been urged. No such legal disqualification is ventured to be urged by any member of this House against myself. But even those members have been heard in their places; those members have been listened to before the decision was taken against them; and I ask that this House to myself shall not be less just than it has always been to every one of its members (hear, hear). Do you tell me I am unfit to sit amongst you? (hear, hear, and Order, order.) The more reason, then, that this House should show the generosity which judges show to a criminal, and allow every word he has to say to be heard. But I stand here, Sir, as no criminal. I stand here as the chosen of a constituency of this country, with my duty to that constituency to do. I stand here, Sir—if it will not be considered impertinent to put it so—with the most profound respect for this House, of which I yet hope and mean to form a part, and on whose traditions I should not wish to cast one shadow of reproach. I stand here returned duly; no petition against my return; no impeachment of that return. I stand here returned duly, ready to fulfil every form that this House requires, ready to fulfil every form that the law permits this House to require, ready to do every duty that the law makes incumbent upon me. I will not in this presence argue whether this House has or has not the right to set its decision against the law, because I should imagine that even the rashest of those who spoke against me would hardly be prepared to put in the mouth of one whom they consider too advanced in politics an argument so dangerous as that might become. I speak within the limits of the law, asking for no favor from this House for myself or for my constituents, but asking the merest justice which has always been accorded to a member of the House (hear, hear, and Order.) I have to ask indulgence lest the memory of some hard words which have been spoken in my absence should seem to give to what I say a tone of defiance, which it is far from my wish should be there at all; and I am the more eased because although there were words spoken which I had always been taught English gentlemen never said in the absence of an antagonist without notice to him, yet there were also generous and brave words said for one who is at present, I am afraid, a source of trouble and discomfort and hindrance to business. I measure the generous words against the others, and I will only make one appeal through you, Sir, which is, that if the reports be correct that the introduction of other names came
with mine in the heat of passion and the warmth of debate, the gentleman who used those words, if such there were, will remember that he was wanting in chivalry, because, while I can answer for myself, and am able to answer for myself, nothing justified the introduction of any other name beside my own to make a prejudice against me (cheers and cries of Question and Order.) I fear lest the strength of this House, judicially exercised as I understand it to be—with infrequency of judicial exercise—that the strength of this House makes it forget our relative positions. At present I am pleading at its bar for justice. By right it is there I should plead. [The hon. member pointed to the seats.] It is that right I claim in the name of those who sent me here. No legal disqualification before my election, or it might have been made the ground of petition. No legal disqualification since my election—not even pretended. It is said: "You might have taken the oath as other members did." I could not help when I read that, Sir, trying to put myself in the place of each member who said it. I imagined a member of some form of faith who found in the oath words which seemed to him to clash with his faith, but still words which he thought he might utter, but which he would prefer not to utter if there were any other form which the law provided him, and I asked myself whether each of those members would not then have taken the form which was most consonant with his honor and his conscience. If I have not misread, some hon. members seem to think that I have neither honor nor conscience. Is there not some proof to the contrary in the fact that I did not go through the form, believing that there was another right open to me? (hear, hear, and Order.) Is that not some proof that I have honor and conscience? Of the gentlemen who are now about to measure themselves against the rights of the constituencies of England I ask what justification had they for that measurement? They have said that I thrust my opinions on the House. I hold here, Sir, the evidence of Sir Thomas Erskine May, and I can find no word of any opinion of mine thrust upon the House at all. I have read—it may be that the reports misrepresent—that the cry of "Atheist" has been raised from that side. [The hon. member pointed to the Opposition side.] No word of all mine before the committee put in any terms those theological or anti-theological opinions in evidence before the House. I am no more ashamed of my own opinions, which I did not choose, opinions into which I have grown, than any member of this House is ashamed of his; and much as I value the right to sit here, and much as I believe that the justice of this House will accord it to me before the struggle is finished, I would rather relinquish it for ever than it should be thought that by any shadow of hypocrisy I had tried to gain a feigned entrance here by pretending to be what I am not (cheers, and cries of Order.) On the report of the committee as it stands, on the evidence before the House, what is the objection to either my affirming or taking the oath? It is said I have no legal right to affirm. I will suppose that, to be so. It is the first time that the House has made itself a court of law from which there may be no appeal, and deprived a citizen of his constitutional right of appeal to a court of law to make out what the statute means in dealing with him. There is no case in which this House has overridden everything, and put one of its members where he had no chance of battling for his right at all. Take the oath. It is possible that some of the lawyers, who have disagreed among themselves even upon that (the Opposition) side of the House, may be right, and that I may be wrong in the construction I have put upon the oath, but no such objection can come. There is no precedent—there is, I submit respectfully, no right—in this House to stand between me and the oath which the law provides for me to take, which the statute, under penalty even upon members of this House themselves if they put me out from my just return, gives me the right to take. What kind of a conflict is provoked here if this resolution be enforced? Not a grave conflict in a court of law, where the judges exclude passion, where they only deal with facts and evidence. I do not mean that these gentlemen do not deal with facts; but, if I am any judge of my own life's story, there have been many things which I can hardly reckon in the category of facts put against myself. I don't mean that they are not right, for hon. members may know more of myself than I do myself; but, judging myself as I know myself, some of the members who have attacked me so glibly during the last few days must have been extraordinarily misinformed, or must have exceedingly misapprehended the matters they alleged. It has been said that I have paraded and flaunted some obnoxious opinions. I appeal to your justice, sir, and to that of the members of this House, to say whether my manner has not been as respectful as that of man could be—whether in each case I have not withdrawn when you told me. If I now come here with even the appearance of self-assertion, it is because I would not be a recreant and a coward to the constituency that sent me to represent them; and I mean to be as members have been in the best history of this assembly. I ask the House, in dealing with my rights, to remember how they are acting. It is perfectly true that by a majority they may decide against me now. What are you to do then? Are you going to declare the seat vacant? First, I tell you that you have not the right. The moment I am there—[the hon. member pointed inside the House]—I admit the right of the House, of its own good will and pleasure, to expel me. As yet I am not under your jurisdiction. As yet I am under the protection of the law. A return sent me to this House, and I ask you, sir, as the guardian of the liberties of this House, to give effect to that return. The law says you should, and that this House should. And naturally so; because, if it were not so, any time a majority of members might exclude anyone they pleased. What has been alleged against me? Politics? Are views on politics urged as a reason why a member should not sit here? Pamphlets have been read—I won't say with accuracy, because I will
not libel any of the hon. members who read them; but, surely, if they are grounds for disqualification they are grounds for indictment to be proved against me in a proper fashion. There is no case in all the records of this House in which you have ransacked what a man has written and said in his past life and then challenged him with it here. My theology? It would be impertinent in me, after the utterances of men so widely disagreeing from me that have been made on the side of religious liberty during the past two nights—it would be impertinent in me to add one word save this. It is said that you may deal with me because I am isolated. I could not help hearing the ring of that word in the lobby as I sat outside last night. But is that a reason, that, because I stand alone the House are to do against me what they would not do if I had 100,000 men at my back? (cries of Oh). That is a bad argument which provokes a reply inconsistent with the dignity of this House and which I should be sorry to give. I have not yet used—I hope no passion may tempt me to be using—any words that would seem to savor of even a desire to enter into conflict with this House. I have always taught, preached, and believed the supremacy of Parliament, and it is not because for a moment the judgment of one Chamber of Parliament should be hostile to me that I am going to deny the ideas I have always held; but I submit that one Chamber of Parliament—even its grandest Chamber, as I have always held this to be—had no right to override the law. The law gives me the right to sign that roll, to take and subscribe the oath, and to take my seat there [pointing to the benches]. I admit that the moment I am in the House, without any reason but your own good will, you can send me away. That is your right. You have full control over your members, but you cannot send me away until I have been heard in my place, not a supplicant as I am now, but with the rightful audience that each member has always had. There is one phase of my appeal which I am loth indeed to make. I presume you will declare the seat vacant. What do you send me back to Northampton to say? I said before, and I trust I may say again, that this assembly was one in which any man might well be proud to sit—prouder I that I have not some of your traditions and am not of your families, but am of the people, the people that sent me here to speak for them. Do you mean that I am to go back to Northampton as to a court, to appeal against you? that I am to ask the constituency to array themselves against this House? I hope not. If it is to be, it must be. If this House arrays itself against an isolated man—its huge power against one citizen—if it must be, then the battle must be too. But it is not with the constituency of Northampton alone—hon, members need not mistake—that you will come into conflict if this appeal is to go forward, if the House of Commons is to override the statute law to get rid of even the vilest of members. Had you alleged against me even more than against one man whose name was mentioned in this House last night, I should still have held that the House cannot supersede the rights of the people. But not as much is alleged against me as was alleged against that man, in whose case the House itself said that its conduct had been subversive of the rights of the people. I beg you, for your own sakes, don't put yourselves in that position. I have no desire to wrestle with you for justice. I admit that I have used hard words in my short life, giving men the right in return to say hard things of me; but is it not better that I should have the right to say them to your faces? If they are within the law, let the law deal with me fairly and properly; but if they are without the law, not unfairly, as I submit you are doing now. You have the power to send me back, but in appealing to Northampton I must appeal to a tribunal higher than yours—not to courts of law, for I hope the days of conflict between the assembly which makes the law and the tribunals which administer it are passed. It must be a bad day for England and for Great Britain, if we are to be brought again to the time when the judges and those who make the law for the judges are in rash strife as to what they mean. But there is a court to which I shall appeal—the court of public opinion, which will have to express itself. You say it is against me. Possibly; but if it be so, is it against me rightly or wrongly? I am ready to admit, if you please, for the sake of argument, that every opinion I hold is wrong and deserves punishment. Let the law punish it. If you say the law cannot, then you admit that you have no right, and I appeal to public Opinion against the iniquity of a decision which overrides the law and denies me justice. I beg your pardon, Sir, and that of the House too, if in this warmth there seems to lack respect for its dignity; and as I shall have, if your decision be against me, to come to that table when your decision is given, I beg you, before the step is taken in which we may both lose our dignity—mine is not much, but yours is that of the Commons of England—I beg you, before the gauntlet is fatally thrown—I beg you, not in any sort of menace, not in any sort of boast, but as one man against six hundred, to give me that justice which on the other side of this hall the judges would give me were I pleading there before them (loud cheers and cries of Order, amid which Mr. Bradlaugh again bowed and retired).

Mr. Bradlaugh's Second Speech at the Bar of the House of Commons, delivered April 28th, 1881.

Mr. Speaker,—I have again to ask the indulgence of the House while I submit to it a few words in favor of my claim to do that which the law requires me to do. Perhaps the House will pardon me if I supply an omission, I feel unin- tentionally made, on the part of the hon. member for Chatham in some words which have just fallen from him. I understood him to say that he would use a formal statement made by me to the Committee against
what the Chancellor of the Duchy had said I had said. I am sure the hon. and learned member for Chatham, who has evidently read the proceedings of the Committee with care, would, if he had thought it fair, have stated to the House that the statement only came from me after an objection made by me—a positive objection on the ground that it related to matters outside this House, and that the House in the course of its history had never inquired into such matters; but I can hardly understand what the member for Chatham meant when he said that he contrasted what I did say with what the Chancellor of the Duchy said I said, for it is not a matter of memory, it is on the proceedings of this House, that being examined formally before the Committee, I stated: “That the essential part of the oath is in the fullest and most complete degree binding upon my honor and conscience, and that the repeating of the words of asseveration does not in the slightest degree weaken the binding of the allegiance on me.” I say now I would not go through any form—much as I value the right to sit in this House, much as I desire and believe that this House will accord me that right—that I did not mean to be binding upon me without mental reservation, without equivocation. I would go through no form unless it were fully and completely and thoroughly binding upon me as to what it expressed or promised. Mine has been no easy position for the last twelve months. I have been elected by the free votes of a free constituency. My return is untainted. There is no charge of bribery (cheers), no charge of corruption, nor of inducing men to come drunken to the polling booth. I come here with a pure untainted return—not won by accident. For thirteen long years have I fought for this right—through five contested elections, including this. It is now proposed to prevent me from fulfilling the duty my constituents have placed upon me. You have force—on my side is the law. The hon. and learned member for Plymouth spoke the truth when he said he did not ask the House to treat the matter as a question of law, but the constituencies ask me to treat it as a question of law. I, for them, ask you to treat it as a question of law. I could understand the feeling that seems to have been manifested were I some great and powerful personage. I could understand it had I a huge influence behind me. I am only one of the people, and you propose to teach them that on a mere technical question you will put a barrier in the way of my doing my duty which you have never put in the way of anyone else. The question is, has my return on the 9th of April, 1881, anything whatever to impeach it? There is no legal disqualification involved. If there were it could be raised by petition. The hon. member for Plymouth says the dignity of this House is in question. Do you mean that I can injure the dignity of this House? This House which has stood unrivalled for centuries? This House supreme among the assemblies of the world? This House, which represents the traditions of liberty? I should not have so libelled you. How is the dignity of this House to be hurt? If what happened before the 9th of April is less than a legal disqualification, it is a matter for the judgment of the constituency and not for you. The constituency has judged me; it has elected me. I stand here with no legal disqualification upon me. The right of the constituency to return me is an unimpeachable right. I know some gentlemen make light of constituencies; yet without the constituencies you are nothing. It is from them you derive your whole and sole authority. The hon. and learned member for Plymouth treats lightly the legal question. It is dangerous to make light of the law—dangerous because if you are only going to rely on your strength of force to override the law, you give a bad lesson to men whose morality you impeach as to what should be their duty if emergence ever came (hear, hear). Always outside the House I have advocated strenuous obedience to the law, and it is under that law that I claim my right. It is said by the right hon. baronet who interposes between me and my duty that this House has passed some resolution. First, I submit that that resolution does not affect the return of the 9th April. The conditions are entirely different, there is nothing since the date of that return. I submit next that if it did affect it the resolution was illegal from the beginning. In the words of George Grenville, spoken in this House in 1769, I passed some resolution. First, I submit that that resolution does not affect the return of the 9th April. The conditions are entirely different, there is nothing since the date of that return. I submit next that if it did affect it the resolution was illegal from the beginning. In the words of George Grenville, spoken in this House in 1769, I say if your resolution goes in the teeth of the law—if against the statute—your resolution is null and void. No word have I uttered outside these walls which has been lacking in respect to the House. I believe the House will do me justice, and I ask it to look at what it is I claim. I claim to do what the law says I must. Frankly, I would rather have affirmed. When I came to the table of the House I deemed that I had a legal right to do it. The courts have decided against me, and I am bound by their decision. I have the legal right to do what I propose to do. No resolution of yours can take away that legal right. You may act illegally and hinder me, and unfortunately I have no appeal against you. "Unfortunately" perhaps I should not say. Perhaps it is better that the Chamber which makes the law should never be in conflict with the courts which administer the laws that the Chamber makes. I think the word "unfortunately" was not the word I ought to have used in this argument. But the force that you invoke against the law to-day may to-morrow be used against you, and the use will be justified by your example. It is a fact that I have no remedy if you rely on your force. I can only be driven into a contest, wearying even to a strong man well supported, ruinous and killing to one man standing by himself—a contest in which if I succeed it will be injurious to you as well as to me. Injurious to me because I can only win by lessening your repute which I desire to maintain. The only court I have the power of appealing to is the court of public opinion, which I have no doubt in the end will do me justice. The hon. member for Plymouth said I had the manliness on a former occasion to make an avowal of opinions to this House. I did nothing of the kind. I have never, directly or indirectly, said one word about my opinions, and this House has no right to inquire
what opinions I may hold outside its walls, the only right is that which the statute gives you; my opinions there is no right to inquire into. I shelter myself under the laws of my country. This is a political assembly, met to decide on the policy of the nation, and not on the religious opinions of the citizens (cheers). While I had the honor of occupying a seat in the House when questions were raised which touched upon religious matters, I abstained from uttering one word. I did not desire to say one word which might hurt the feelings of even the most tender (hear). But it is said, why not have taken the oath quietly? I did not take it then because I thought I had the right to do something else, and I have paid the penalty. I have been plunged in litigation fostered by men who had not the courage to put themselves forward (loud cheers below the gangway). I, a penniless man, should have been ruined if it had not been that the men in workshop, pit, and factory had enabled me to fight this battle (interruption). I am sorry that hon. members cannot have patience with one pleading as I plead here. It is no light stake, even if you put it on the lowest personal grounds, to risk the ambition of a life on such an issue. It is a right ambition to desire to take part in the councils of the nation, if you bring no store of wisdom with you, and can only learn from the great intellects that we have (hear, hear). What will you inquire into? The right hon. baronet would inquire into my opinions. Will you inquire into my conduct, or is it only my opinions you will try here? The hon. member for Plymouth frankly puts it opinions. If opinions, why not conduct? Why not examine into members' conduct when they come to the table, and see if there be no members in whose way you can put a barrier? (Hear, hear.) Are members, whose conduct may be obnoxious, to vote my exclusion because to them my opinions are obnoxious? As to any obnoxious views supposed to be held by me, there is no duty imposed upon me to say a word. The right hon. baronet has said there has been no word of recantation. You have no right to ask me for any recantation. Since the 9th April you have no right to ask me for anything. If you have a legal disqualification, petition, lay it before the the Judges. When you ask me to make a statement, you are guilty of impertinence to me, of treason to the traditions of this House, and of impeachment of the liberties of the people. My difficulty is that those who have made the most bitter attacks upon me only made them when I was not here to deal with them. One hon. and gallant member recently told his constituents that this would be made a party question, but that the Conservative members had not the courage to speak out against me. I should have thought, from reading "Hansard," not that they wanted courage, but that they had cultivated a reticence that was more just. I wish to say a word or two on the attempt which has been made to put on the Government of the day complicity in my views. The Liberal party has never aided me in any way to this House. (Oh, from the Opposition.) Never. I have fought by myself. I have fought by my own hand. I have been hindered in every way that it was possible to hinder me, and it is only by the help of the people, by the pence of toilers in mine and factory, that I am here to-day, after these five struggles right through thirteen years. I have won my way with them, for I have won their hearts, and now I come to you. Will you send me back from here? Then how? You have the right, but it is the right of force, and not of law. When I am once seated on these benches, then I am under your jurisdiction. At present I am under the protection of the writ from those who sent me here. I do not want to quote what has happened before, but if there be one lesson which the House has recorded more solemnly than another, it is that there should be no interference with the judgment of a constituency in sending a man to this House against whom there is no statutory disqualification. Let me appeal to the generosity of the House as well as to its strength. It has traditions of liberty on both sides. I do not complain that members on that (the Conservative) side try to keep me out. They act according to their lights, and think my poor services may be injurious to them. (Cries of No.) Then why not let me in? (Cheers.) It must be either a political or a religious question. I must apologise to the House for trespassing upon its patience. I apologise because I know how generous in its listening it has been from the time of my first speech in it till now. But I ask you now, do not plunge with me into a struggle I would shun. The law gives me no remedy if the House decides against me. Do not mock at the constituencies. If you place yourselves above the law, you leave me no course save lawless agitation instead of reasonable pleading. It is easy to begin such a strife, but none knows how it would end. I have no court, no tribunal to appeal to; you have the strength of your votes at the moment. You think I am an obnoxious man, and that I have no one on my side. If that be so, then the more reason that this House, grand in the strength of its centuries of liberty, should have now that generosity in dealing with one who to-morrow may be forced into a struggle for public opinion against it (cheers).

Mr. Bradlaugh's Third Speech at the Bar of the House of Commons, delivered February 7th, 1882.

Sir,—In addressing the House for the third time from this position, I feel the exceeding difficulty of dealing fairly with myself without dealing unfairly with the House. If I were to follow the hon. member who has just sat down into his errors of law, of history, and of memory, into his reckless misconceptions as to what are the views I hold and write about, I should only be giving pain to numbers of members hero, and departing from that mandate with which my constituents have trusted me. It is—I say it with all respect—not true that I
done anything more with reference to the succession than maintain the light of Parliament, meaning by
Parliament both Houses, to control it; and any member who pretends that I done anything else, either does it,
not having read what I have written, or heard what I have said, or having forgotten entirely what I have written
or said, and being extremely careless in representing my views to the House. I regret that the hon. member
should have imported into the discussion some fact supposed to have occurred in a police-court since I stood
here before. I can only give the House my positive assurance that the hon. member is perfectly inaccurate in his
representation of what took place. It is exceedingly painful to bandy words in this way. The hon. member was
good enough to say he did not hear—he could not well have heard, for the magistrate did not refuse my
affirmation at all. I happened to have been before Sir J. Ingham before, and he knew me, and knew the
particular form of affirmation, and when the clerk read it to me no discussion took place on the subject. I hope
the House will forgive me for contradicting such a small thing, but small things are sometimes much used.
They have been used to work my ruin since I stood here before, and I regret that the shame of reticence did not
at least keep it from this House, that the hon. member thought it his duty, by a common informer, to attempt to
drive me into the Bankruptcy Court, and outside this House has boasted that the question would be solved in
that way. It may be a brave boast, it may be consonant with piety from the hon. member's point of view, but I
believe that every other gentleman's sense of piety would revolt against the notion of driving a single man into
bankruptcy, and then canvassing for subscriptions—(hear, hear)—for the bold and vigorous, and patriotic and
noble conduct," as the advertisement said, which consisted in hurrying in a cab to find the common informer to
issue a writ against me. I dismiss that, however. I ask the House to pardon me for having wasted its time on this
poor thing. I do not hope, I dare not think, that any word I may say here will win one vote; and I would have let
this go silently against me, were it not that I owe a duty to the constituency that has twice entrusted me with its
suffrages, a duty to every constituency right through the land in time to come—(hear, hear)—whose
representative may be challenged as Northampton's has been. (Hear, hear, and No.) Some gentlemen say "No,
but where is the challenge to stop? (Hear.) It is not simply theology, it is politics too (hear, hear). It is not
simply theology that is brought before the House, but the wild imaginings of some member who, with the
nightmare of panic upon him, and a wild imagining of the French Revolution clothed in terrors of which I know
nothing, comes here to tell you of mighty Russia successful, and of the unfortunate United States with its
Presidents assassinated because of religious and political opinions. Panic of that kind is not evidence as to my
opinions. If this House intends to try me for my opinions, let it do it reasonably, and at least have the evidence
before It. I would show you how unfair it is to trust to memory of words. The hon. member was good enough to
tell the House that I had declared to a Committee of the House that certain words were meaningless. I hold in
my hand the report of the Committee and the minutes of evidence, and no such words exist in any declaration
of mine. (Hear, hear. Mr. Newdegate shook his head.) The hon. member does not believe me. I cannot make
more than facts. I cannot make the comprehension which should distinguish when prejudice has determined
that nothing shall be right that is put. The only way in which it can be pretended that anything of the kind in
reference to the oath can be brought in is by taking my letter of the 20th of May, written outside the House,
which does not contain a specific declaration the hon. member has put into it, which letter I protested ought not
to be brought before the Committee at all, which I never volunteered to the Committee—(Opposition
laughter)—which I objected to the Committee having before them. (Oh, and laughter from the Opposition.) The
gentlemen who laugh, laugh because the laugh is the only answer that could be given. No reason can be given
in reply, no facts can be quoted; and I ask hon. members who laugh to remember that I am pleading as though a
quasi-criminal at this bar, and that I have a right to an audience from them, and I appeal to the House at least to
give me a silent hearing. Judges do that. If you are unfit to be judges, then do not judge (hear, hear). It shows, at
least, the difficulty of dealing with a question like this, when those who are to judge have come to a judgment
already, not upon any facts, but upon what they think ought to be the facts. I ask the House to deal
gently with me, even if you have differences with me, even if you think my opinions so obnoxious, even if you think
that the politics with which you identify me in your minds are dangerous to you (oh, oh). If I am not dangerous,
why not let me speak there? (pointing to the seat he occupied last Session.) If there is no danger, why strain the
law? If there is no danger, why disobey the law? It is put by the hon. gentleman who spoke last that there are
certain words of the oath which the courts of law have declared essential. The courts of law have declared the
exact opposite. So far as a decision has been given, the very report of the Committee shows that the highest
court of judicature in this realm has decided the words are not essential to the oath at all. I ask the House to deal
with me with some semblance and show of legality and fairness, and first I say that they ought not to go behind
my election of the 9th of April, 1881, and that the House ought to reject the resolution moved by the right hon.
gentleman, because it deals with matters which antedate my election, and because the House has nothing to do
with me before the 9th of April, 1881. That is the return of which the Clerk at the table has the certificate. That
is my only authority for being here. If I did aught before that rendered me unworthy to sit here, why did the
House let me sit here from the 2nd of July to the 29th of March? If what I did entitles the House not to receive me, why has not the House had the courage of its opinions and vacated the seat? Either the seat is mine in law, and in law I claim it from you, or I am unworthy to hold it, and then why not vacate the seat and let the constituency express its opinion again? But my return is unimpeached, it is unimpeachable, and there has been no petition against me. The hon. member who went into back alleys for common informers could not find a petitioner to present a petition against it. If I speak with temper—(Opposition laughter)—the House, I trust, will pardon me. I have read within the last few days words spoken, not by members of no consequence, but by members occupying high position in this House, which make me wonder if this is the House of Commons to which I aspired so much. I have read that one right hon. member, the member for Whitehaven—(laughter from the Ministerial side)—was prompted to say to his constituents that I was kicked down stairs last Session, and that he hoped I should be again. If it were true that I was kicked downstairs I would ask members of the House of Commons on whom the shame, on whom the disgrace, on whom the stigma? I dare not apply this, but history will when I have mouldered, and you too, and our passions are quite gone. But it is not quite true that I was kicked downstairs, and it is a dangerous thing to say that I was, for it means that hon. members who should rely on law rely on force. It is a dangerous provocation to conflict to throw to the people. If I had been as wicked in my thought as some members are reported to have been in their speech, this quarrel, not of my provoking, would assume a future to make us all ashamed. I beg this House to believe, and I trust, Sir, that you at least will believe me, that I have tried as much as man might to keep the dignity of this House. I submitted last Session, and the Session before, to have had things said against me without one word of reply, because having had your good counsel, I felt it might provoke discussion upon matters which this House would willingly not have speech upon, and that I had far better rest under some slight stigma than occupy the House with my personality. I appeal to the recollection of every member of the House whether from the moment of my entering into it I did not utterly disregard everything that took place prior to my coming into it, and direct myself to the business for which my constituents sent me here. The most extraordinary statements are made as to my views, statements as inaccurate as those which have fallen, no doubt unconsciously, from the hon. member who has last addressed the House. One noble lord in a great London gathering convoked against me, a gathering which was not as successful as some that have taken place in my favor, denounced me as a Socialist. I do not happen to be one. I happen to think that Socialists are the most unwise and illogical people you can happen to meet. But the noble lord knew that I ought to be something (laughter). I am a red rag to a wild Conservative bull, and it must rush at me and call me Socialist. I ask this House to be more fair and just. If I am to be tried, at least let me be tried for the opinions I hold and the views I express. Why, there are members who have soiled their tongues with words about social relations and marriage for which I have no proper reply in this House, as unfortunately the forms of the House do not permit me to use the only fitting answer, and perhaps it is as well. But I ask the House, Do not let this be the kind of weapon with which a return is met. Deal with me as the law directs, and in no other way. It is said "You have brought this upon yourself" (hear, hear). One baronet who has spoken of me with a kindness more than I deserve, in the very borough which I represent said I had brought it upon myself, because when I originally came to the House I flaunted and most ostentatiously put my opinion upon the House (hear, hear). Well, not one word of that is true. Not a shadow of it is true. I hold in my hand the sworn evidence of Sir Erskine May. I do not ask gentlemen to take my word, for it is clear they will not, but that of their own officer. And when the right hon. baronet said I claimed under the statute, and drew an inference from it, he knows that my claim contained no such words until the clerk at the table of the House challenged me as to the law under which I claimed. I do not quarrel with him, but I submit that the Clerk of the House had no right to put that question to me. I submit that the House had nothing whatever to do with it—that it certainly is no ostentatious flaunting by me. I submit, that at any rate, that it is prior to the 9th of April, 1881, and the House had no right to revive it against me. I ask the House to try and deal with me with some show of fairness. They will find when I was before the Committee, instead of overlooking my opinions, I said I had never directly or indirectly obtruded upon the House any of my utterances or publications upon any subject whatever, and when pressed by one of the members sitting on that (the Opposition) side of the House as to certain opinions I was supposed to hold, by asking me particular words I was supposed to have used in a judicial proceeding, I said that if the Committee wished I would answer, but that I objected to answer, because I had carefully refrained from saying any word which would bring my opinions before the House. I ask, therefore, the House whether it is not monstrously unfair to say that I have obtruded any opinions here when I have expressly, carefully, and thoroughly kept them from the House? But it is said by the right hon. baronet that it would be a profanation to allow me to take the oath, and that the House would be no party to such a profanation (Opposition cheers). Does the House mean that it is a party to each oath taken? (hear.) There was a time when most clearly it was not so a party. There was a time when the oath was not even taken in the presence of members at all. But does the House mean it is a party now? Was it a party the Session before last? Was it a party when Mr. Hall walked up to that table, cheered by members on the other
plenty of witnesses to the scene. I saw one hon. member climb on to a pedestal to see how fourteen men could
be seized by force while saying it. My memory may not serve me well on that, but I think it does. There were
came saying at the very door of the House that I was ready to obey its lawful orders, and I thought I was then
dealt with the pressing business of the nation. I thought that had been recognised by this House. I thought I only
sometimes does, or things happened without my consciousness. I thought I had stood aside until Parliament had
heard). I ask the House for a moment to carry its mind to the 3rd of August last. I do that because cither I do not
the constitutional right was attempted, it was always attempted in the person of some obnoxious man (hear,
the greatest statesmen who sat in this House more than a hundred years ago, that whenever an infringement of
admit I am unworthy, but it is not my fault that I have this fight to make. I remind you of the words of one of
knowing their superiority to me, say how unworthy I am that this question should be fought in my person. I
advocates, and I have felt acutely the judgment properly passed upon me by many members of this House, who,
shouting "No" won't decide the law, even with the united wisdom of the members of this House who shout it. I
leaving me with the full legal responsibility and no kind of legal authority, I submit is not generous. Well, will
any form of words, however often repeated, would convey any kind of conviction to some minds. I presume that this
myself so harshly judged, so unfairly dealt with, that one feels a difficulty in understanding whether any form
I would take no pledge that I did not mean to be binding, I would use that form of words. But I have found
infringe them now. If I knew any kind of word which might convince members whom I desire to convince that
and laughter from the Opposition)—at the ballot-box, where it has a right to express it, may not only say
Withdraw," from the Opposition.) If members will allow me to finish my sentence—-(Cries of "Withdraw.")
These (Mr. Bradlaugh pointing to the Opposition benches) are my judges. Members of this House who are
ignorant of what is honor and conscience——(Renewed cries from the Opposition of "Withdraw.")
I am asked to the word "swear." I say : "I consider when I take an oath it is binding upon my honor and upon my conscience"; and with reference to the words of asseveration to which the hon.
member for North Warwickshire referred, he would at least have been more generous towards myself, if
generosity be possible with him, if he had said: "I desire to add—and I do this most solemnly and
unreservedly—that the taking, and sub-scribing, and repeating these words of asseveration will in no degree
weaken the binding effect of the oath upon my conscience." I say here, Sir, before you, with all the solemnity
man can command, that I know the words of the oath the statute requires me to take, that I am ready to take that
oath according to law, and that I will not take an oath without intending it to be binding upon me, and that if I
do take the oath it will be binding upon my honor and conscience. (Conservative cries of "Oh! oh!") Members of the House who are ignorant of what is honor and conscience——(Loud cries of "Order," "Oh, oh," and
"Withdraw," from the Opposition.) If members will allow me to finish my sentence—-(Cries of "Withdraw.")
Members of this House who are ignorant of what is——(Renewed cries from the Opposition of "Withdraw.")
These (Mr. Bradlaugh pointing to the Opposition benches) are my judges. Members of this House who are
ignorant of what is the honor and conscience of the man who stands before them—-(Oh," and laughter from the
Opposition)—have a right to shout "Withdraw:" but they must beware lest a greater voice outside—("Oh, oh,"
and laughter from the Opposition)—at the ballot-box, where it has a right to express it, may not only say
"withdraw," but make withdraw all those who infringe the constitutional rights of the nation, as they seek to
infringe them now. If I knew any kind of word which might convince members whom I desire to convince that
I would take no pledge that I did not mean to be binding, I would use that form of words. But I have found
myself so harshly judged, so unfairly dealt with, that one feels a difficulty in understanding whether any form
of words, however often repeated, would convey any kind of conviction to some minds. I presume that this
House will repeat its vote of April 26th. What then? Will it have the courage of its opinions, and vacate my
seat? (Hear, hear.) If it does not, this House leaves me in an unfair position before the law. I am bound to come to
this table, and will come to this table, as long as the mandate of my constituents sends me here, unless the
House vacates the seat. If my seat be vacated, it is my duty to bow to the House, and appeal to my constituents
again; and then the verdict rests with them. But to take away part of the right, and deal with it in this fashion,
again; and then the verdict rests with them. But to take away part of the right, and deal with it in this fashion,
unreservedly—that the taking, and sub-scribing, and repeating these words of asseveration will in no degree
weaken the binding effect of the oath upon my conscience." I say here, Sir, before you, with all the solemnity
unreservedly—that the taking, and sub-scribing, and repeating these words of asseveration will in no degree
weaken the binding effect of the oath upon my conscience." I say here, Sir, before you, with all the solemnity

side who knew his seat was won by deliberate bribery? (loud Opposition cries of Order.) Bribery sought to be
concealed by the most corrupt perjury. Did the House join in it? (renewed cries of Order.) If the House did not
join in it, why did you cheer so that the words of the oath were drowned? But was the House a party when John
Stuart Mill sat in this House? (hear, no.) A member who is, I think, now within the walls of the House—the
hon. member for Greenwich—in addressing his constituents, said that Mr. Bradlaugh's opinions were hardly
more objectionable than those of some other members of the House. If the hon. member knew that, then he was
a party to the profanation of the oath: but perhaps they were on his own side, and he did not feel the profanation
so acutely (hear, hear, and laughter). But it is said, "Our real objection is that you have declared that the oath is
not binding upon you" (hear, hear, from Mr. Alderman Fowler). That is exactly the opposite of what I did
declare. The hon. member whose voice I hear now, I unfortunately heard on the 3rd of August; and heard so
that I shall never forget it. (Mr. Bradlaugh here looked towards Alderman Fowler and paused.) The hon.
member admits that is the point—that I have declared the oath is not binding upon my conscience; but,
unfortunately, all the print goes the other way. I am asked by the Committee who sat as to whether the oath is
binding, and on page 15 I reply : "Any form that I went through, any oath that I took, I shall regard as binding
upon my conscience in the fullest degree, and I would go through no form and take no oath unless I meant it to
be so binding." Again, I am asked as to the word "swear." I say : "I consider when I take an oath it is binding
upon my honor and upon my conscience"; and with reference to the words of asseveration to which the hon.
member for North Warwickshire referred, he would at least have been more generous towards myself, if
generosity be possible with him, if he had said: "I desire to add—and I do this most solemnly and
unreservedly—that the taking, and sub-scribing, and repeating these words of asseveration will in no degree
weaken the binding effect of the oath upon my conscience." I say here, Sir, before you, with all the solemnity
man can command, that I know the words of the oath the statute requires me to take, that I am ready to take that
oath according to law, and that I will not take an oath without intending it to be binding upon me, and that if I
do take the oath it will be binding upon my honor and conscience. (Conservative cries of "Oh! oh!") Members of the House who are ignorant of what is honor and conscience——(Loud cries of "Order," "Oh, oh," and
"Withdraw," from the Opposition.) If members will allow me to finish my sentence—-(Cries of "Withdraw.")
Members of this House who are ignorant of what is——(Renewed cries from the Opposition of "Withdraw.")
These (Mr. Bradlaugh pointing to the Opposition benches) are my judges. Members of this House who are
ignorant of what is the honor and conscience of the man who stands before them—-(Oh," and laughter from the
Opposition)—have a right to shout "Withdraw:" but they must beware lest a greater voice outside—("Oh, oh,"
and laughter from the Opposition)—at the ballot-box, where it has a right to express it, may not only say
"withdraw," but make withdraw all those who infringe the constitutional rights of the nation, as they seek to
infringe them now. If I knew any kind of word which might convince members whom I desire to convince that
I would take no pledge that I did not mean to be binding, I would use that form of words. But I have found
myself so harshly judged, so unfairly dealt with, that one feels a difficulty in understanding whether any form
of words, however often repeated, would convey any kind of conviction to some minds. I presume that this
House will repeat its vote of April 26th. What then? Will it have the courage of its opinions, and vacate my
seat? (Hear, hear.) If it does not, this House leaves me in an unfair position before the law. I am bound to come to
this table, and will come to this table, as long as the mandate of my constituents sends me here, unless the
House vacates the seat. If my seat be vacated, it is my duty to bow to the House, and appeal to my constituents
again; and then the verdict rests with them. But to take away part of the right, and deal with it in this fashion,
leaving me with the full legal responsibility and no kind of legal authority, I submit is not generous. Well, will
this House repeat its vote of 9th May? Will it substitute force for law? At present the law is on my side (No, no,
and hear, hear). If not, let me sit and sue me (hear, hear). If not, try by petition. If not, bring an action. But
shouting "No" won't decide the law, even with the united wisdom of the members of this House who shout it. I
know that no man is a good advocate for a great principle unless he himself be worthy of the principle he
advocates, and I have felt acutely the judgment properly passed upon me by many members of this House, who,
knowing their superiority to me, say how unworthy I am that this question should be fought in my person. I
admit I am unworthy, but it is not my fault that I have this fight to make. I remind you of the words of one of
the greatest statesmen who sat in this House more than a hundred years ago, that whenever an infringement of
the constitutional right was attempted, it was always attempted in the person of some obnoxious man (hear,
hear). I ask the House for a moment to carry its mind to the 3rd of August last. I do that because either I do not
understand what took place then, or my memory has failed me, as the memory of other hon. members
sometimes does, or things happened without my consciousness. I thought I had stood aside until Parliament had
dealt with the pressing business of the nation. I thought that had been recognised by this House. I thought I only
came saying at the very door of the House that I was ready to obey its lawful orders, and I thought I was then
seized by force while saying it. My memory may not serve me well on that, but I think it does. There were
plenty of witnesses to the scene. I saw one hon. member climb on to a pedestal to see how fourteen men could
struggle with one. It was hardly generous, hardly brave, hardly worthy of the great House of Commons, that
those sending out to the whole world lessons of freedom, liberty, and law, should so infringe and so stamp them
under foot. I had no remedy in any court, or I would have taken it. With all respect to you, Sir, and the officers
of this House, if there had been any possibility of trying at law against the mighty privilege of this House, I
would have appealed to that possibility. Let me now, before I finish, ask the ear of the House for one moment.
It is said it is the oath an I not the man; but others, more frank, say it is the man and not the oath. Is it the oath
and not the man? I am ready to stand aside, say for four or five weeks, without coming to that table, if the
House within that time, or within such time as its great needs might demand, would discuss whether an
Affirmation Bill should pass or not. I want to obey the law, and I tell you how I might meet the House still
further, if the House will pardon me for seeming to advise it. Hon. members have said that would be a
Bradlaugh Relief Bill (hear, hear). Bradlaugh is more proud than you are (hear, hear). Let the Bill pass without
applying to elections that have taken place previously, and I will undertake not to claim my seat, and when the
Bill has passed I will apply for the Chiltern Hundreds (cheers.) I have no fear. If I am not fit for my
constituents, they shall dismiss me, but you never shall. The grave alone shall make me yield (hear, hear, and
"Oh").
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How The British House of Commons Treated Charles Bradlaugh, M.P.

The House of Commons in the first instance refused to allow Mr. Bradlaugh what he, in common with
others well qualified to form an opinion (I allude particularly to the Law Officers of the Crown), believed to be
his simple right. But we will waive that point and simply state, that the House refused to allow him the
privilege of affirming. It then refused him his undoubted legal right of taking the oath, and sent him to prison
for refusing to forego such right. It then brought him back again and allowed him to do what it had previously
said he should not do, namely, affirm. It then, through one of its honorable (?) members, in conjunction with a
common informer, actually prosecuted him for such affirmation, or, in other words, it prosecuted him for not
doing the very thing it would not allow him to do, that is, for not taking the oath before voting, which oath, as I
have said, it would not allow him to take. The legal tribunal before which the case was taken by the common
informer then imposed a heavy fine upon him; that is, imposed a fine upon him for doing the only thing the
House of Commons would allow him to do. Oh, most intolerable and unlawful muddle! But the legal tribunal
did more, it actually established the fact, or rather re-established the fact, that he had a full legal right to take the
oath, which after being duly elected for the second time, he claimed to take. Once more the House refused, and
stood between a constituency and its legal representative, between a citizen and his citizenship, no legal bar
being even pretended to exist as against him. But it did not send him to prison this time, although he insisted
most firmly upon fulfilling the trust and obligation the electors of Northampton had imposed upon him.

The House by this time had become dreadfully-muddled; it also had lost heart, and cried out hopelessly to
Mr. Gladstone to do something. He did eventually come to the rescue, and announced the intention of the
Government of bringing in a Bill which would enable Mr. Bradlaugh to take his seat in the House. He was
careful to explain that the Bill would be more in the shape and perhaps be regarded more in the light of, a relief for
the House than for the junior member for Northampton. This point was prominent in more than one of the
speeches he made upon the subject, and I regard it as important, because it shows that he considered the House
was in the dilemma and Mr. Bradlaugh was in the right. "The Lord moves in a mysterious way His wonders to
perform." And so does the House of Commons. However, upon this understanding and upon the promises given
by the conscientious defenders of the "sanctity of the oath," that they would fairly consider any such Bill, Mr.
Bradlaugh gave his word of honor that he would wait, which word he patiently and honorably kept. But how
did the bigots keep their word? These pious Tories and sham Liberals, these political latter-day saints, who
presumptuously pretend to monopolise all the Parliamentary "honor and conscience"—how did they keep their
word? Why by a series of shuffles and moves which would be a disgrace to an ordinary debating society. By
tactics deliberately adopted, and in violation of their pledged word, by which they prevented the Government
from bringing in their promised measure; not only that, but they, in a like dishonorable manner, successfully
blocked a Bill which the senior member for Northampton endeavored to introduce. It was not till Mr. Bradlaugh found his patient waiting to be worse than useless; that the promises given had all been broken; that Mr. Gladstone could not, or would not, bring in his promised measure; and that his friend's and colleague's Bill was finally blocked, that his patience gave way, and he resolved at all hazards to do his duty to his constituency. What happened at the portals of the House and in Palace Yard, when he again went to give effect to the legal trust imposed upon him by his constituents, will ever remain a disgrace to those whose bigotry and duplicity forced it on. It will be a black mark in the modern history of the English Parliament. I have no desire to enlarge upon that shameful scene, nor add one iota to its degrading detail; but I will ask my countrymen if they do not consider it a monstrous usurpation of their political rights that a man, one of their chosen representatives, properly and duly elected to serve them in Parliament, should be met at the threshold of that House and there seized upon by lackeys, porters, and minor officials, and ruthlessly assaulted and maltreated, so much so that both his arms were severely ruptured. At the beginning of the next Session he took the oath and his seat, in spite of the House, but in compliance with the law. For this awful piece of sacrilege he was expelled from the House, cast out like a second Lucifer, but with this essential difference, that while he was innocent of rebellion those who cast him out were guilty of it. But in casting him out of the House they cast him once more into the arms of his constituents, who again returned him as their representative at the head of the poll.

This action of the House is not only a shameful usurpation, but it strikes at the very fundamental principle of the Constitution, which principle says that we govern ourselves through those whom we freely and duly elect to represent us in the Parliament House; and I ask you to always remember that no one, not even Mr. Newdegate himself, has ventured to assert that there is any legal disqualification against Charles Bradlaugh. I will not ask you to remember, although I cannot forbear speaking of it, that some of the hon. members actually had the indecency to gloat over the above scene, and to jibe and jeer as he sat in an exhausted state from the treatment he had received at the hands of the House of Commons' lackeys, who had been put in motion by those who pretend they reverence the oath, and who worship in that faith which tells them: "If a man strikes thee on one cheek, turn to him the other." There is just one bright spot, so far as the House itself is concerned, that stands out clearly in that black day's business. It is the rebuke administered to the House by John Bright, in which he piously protested against the shameful proceedings which had just taken place. Mr. Bradlaugh has since endeavored to his utmost to obtain a legal decision upon the action of the House, but with no success.

There appears now to exist no legal tribunal which dares to measure its authority against the House of Commons. The decision recently given by Mr. Justice Field simply amounts to this: that the House of Commons is the sole arbiter of its own actions; it may do absolutely as it pleases. This, I think, is new to most of us. I think the majority of us have been in the habit of regarding the Commons as one only of the three estates of the realm, viz., the Queen, Lords, and Commons, and that it might not of its own will, or by the caprice of a majority, ignore the written law of the land. And I believe such to be the case, the decision of Mr. Justice Field notwithstanding. But if he be right, if the will of a chance majority of the House is above and superior to all law, why then it may reject or receive whomsoever it pleases, and the principle of Parliamentary representation becomes a farce. A dangerous doctrine, this. The hodge-podge and curious combination which forms a majority upon this particular occasion may not always exist. It is just within the range of possibility that the Radicals may one day have a majority in the House. What if they should then hold fast to the doctrine that they "could do no wrong"? But, apart from that, what a mockery and a delusion the whole system of electing those we believe best able to serve us becomes, if a chance majority may meet the person so elected at the bar of the House and say: We will not have you; we admit you are duly and lawfully elected; you are also qualified to serve; but we do not like your principles! How shall the House of Commons represent the wishes and feelings of the country, if a properly-elected member may be met at the door and pushed out, because he is disliked or feared by some—a majority, if you like—of those within? But Mr. Justice Field says such is the law. Such should not be the law; and, if it be, the sooner it is altered the better.

The House of Commons can do no wrong? It is the sole judge of its own acts, and when we speak of the House it is important to bear in mind, that we speak virtually of the majority of that House upon any given question. Why, then, let the Liberals, when in a majority, forcibly eject the Tories, and vice versa; and do not complain. If the Radicals should one day obtain a majority and eject both, the House of Commons can do no wrong. Why, then, let us poor electors humbly bow our heads, and receive its decrees without question. It may do the most wicked, the most unjust, and the most arbitrary act which it is possible for a self-seeking majority to do, and who shall gainsay it? Is this really the law? If so, what may it not do? Where will you draw the line? It would be a sorry thing, indeed, if the Constitution was built upon such a foundation. Both the Lords and the Commons are, doubtless, competent to make rules and regulations for the management of their respective Houses; but it is only common sense to suppose such rules and regulations must not violate the rights of constituencies, and the established laws of the land. If it were otherwise, what is to prevent them from committing any outrage they may please under the sanction of a rule or order?
The Commons and the Lords may in conjunction with each other by due and proper process, amend, alter, and abolish laws. They may also in like manner make new ones; but neither the one nor the other is competent to ignore and render nugatory the existing law of the realm. This law says that Charles Bradlaugh is entitled to take his seat as member for Northampton. But the House—not the wisdom, learning, dignity, and the statesmanship of the House—but the bigotry, the intolerance, and the ignorance of the House, which unfortunately form the majority on this question, say he shall not take his seat, and Mr. Justice Field says, Amen! But what will the people say? Will they submit to this wrong tamely? Well, if they do, they will deserve all that may follow. Are they prepared to go backwards, crablike, to the days of the odious religious tests? Is the House of Commons to be a representative assembly, or a species of modern Inquisition? I warn Sir Stafford Northcote that he is stirring up dangerous elements, which it would be better for him and his class to let slumber. How dare he meet the properly-chosen representative of a large constituency at the bar of the House, and say, You shall not enter? He is solicitous for the sanctity of the oath, forsooth. Hypocrisy, pretence. He is solicitous for the safety of the perpetual pensions, and other interests which he fears Mr. Bradlaugh will attack, and attack them he assuredly will, either in the House or out of it. I think this covering over of the real motives which actuate this "pious majority," with what I shall call the "sanctity of the oath" cloak, is one of the worst features of the case. I do not wish to say one word here in disparagement of religion. I know there are a vast number of estimable persons who profess it in some shape or form. But when you have a number of educated men prosecuting purely selfish aims and interests, likewise seeking to rob their fellow-man of his social and political existence, outraging law and decency under the guise and in the name of religion, the thing becomes despicable. Another bad feature of the business is the indecent anxiety shown by members of the various sects who have seats in the House, to vie with each other in the virulence of their attacks upon a man who simply claims for himself the same right, of judgment upon religious matters as they themselves claim; from the Catholic and Jew down to those who could not well define their faith at all, the cry was the same, forgetting as they did that it was by the efforts of such men as he that it was made possible for many of them to sit in that House, which they now degrade by their action. I think the Jew and the Catholic in particular, if they could not have found it compatible with their conscience to raise their voices in favor of that liberty they themselves enjoy, might at least have had the decency to remain silent. I also think the action adopted by what is called the "Irish National Party" deserves especial reprobation. Mr. Bradlaugh, whilst he sat in the House, regularly upon almost all Irish occasions, spoke and voted with them, and on behalf of Ireland, conspicuously against coercion—upon one occasion, at least, when Mr. Parnell was not at his post, but was possibly in Paris having an eye to his friend Egan, and the enormous sums of money with which he was entrusted, and which would have been a boon to the luckless peasants and farmers who were evicted through taking his advice, but who got so little of it. Of course, I do not know that Mr. Parnell was doing this, his whereabouts at that time was something of a mystery; but I do know he was absent from the House at a very critical time, and that Mr. Bradlaugh led what was really a "forlorn hope," thereby risking the good-will of those with whom it might have been politic on his part to stand well. In return for this, and the steady and constant support given, not because it was the Irish party, but because he believed they were on this in the right—in return for this they, Judas-like, turn and vote against him to a man. It is worthy of note that during the period Mr. Bradlaugh sat in Parliament by the generous (?) forbearance of the House, but at his own risk, and with an enormous penalty hanging over his head for every vote he gave, he bore himself with singular moderation and ability, so much so as to elicit statements to that effect from those high in authority; his enemies not venturing to gainsay the fact. Indeed they were particularly dumb whilst he sat facing them, with the right of reply. Parliament is to meet in a very short time; in the meanwhile there is being arranged, and there will assemble, such a throng of people as could not be got together at the present moment by another man in the kingdom, save Mr. Gladstone himself. And mark, this vast number of people who will assemble, unless forcibly prevented, will not be composed of the ordinary roughs who are often got together by various means for political purposes, but will be composed chiefly of representative men—delegates and others—who will have travelled from all parts of the kingdom at much loss and sacrifice to give their support to a man who represents a principle which is dear to all of us; I mean the principle that we govern ourselves through those whom we legally and lawfully choose to represent us in Parliament. The country will wait with some anxiety to see what action the Government will take; let us hope it will be a firm one. It is a lamentable spectacle to see a Government stand helplessly by whilst the law and constitution is being outraged; and it is even worse when that Government is a Liberal one, and actually admits the wrong which is being done. This dreary and uncharitable business has just a small silver lining, it can hardly be called a bright side; but still it is cheering to know that such men as Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright, men whose intellect and sense of justice, of right and wrong, are inferior to none, and who are as jealous of the honor of the House as any men within its walls, and whose Christianity is of a higher type than that which finds a resting place in the minds of most of the hon. members—indeed, it would be an insult to those gentlemen to compare their Christianity for one moment with the kind of stuff which finds a mouthpiece in that famous
statesman, Sir Henry Tyler, or that other Christian champion, my Lord Randolph Churchill, not to mention the Cardinal's "henchman," Philip Callan, or that other would-be leader of Christian thought, Frank Hugh O'Donnell—it is, I say, cheering to know that such men as Gladstone and Bright raised their voices for the man against whom nearly all men's hands were turned, the man whom bigotry and fanaticism were endeavoring to strike down. In doing so they honored themselves and helped to redeem the character of the House, because they gave their great influence to the man in whose person the sacred principle of liberty of conscience was assailed. There is just one other consideration, or rather question, connected with this matter: it is not of such a cheering character as the last, but nevertheless it is worth some little considera- tion. The question I allude to is—will the honorable member, Mr. Newdegate, and the common informer, who are prosecuting Mr. Bradlaugh, be mean enough (supposing they have the opportunity) to put into their own pockets the money which they hope to extract from Mr. Bradlaugh's? I ask, will they be mean enough to keep what might be called the "bloodmoney," but what I will call the price for endeavoring to hunt down and ruin a brave and honorable man; or will they give it to the missionaries to help them to teach the poor "heathen" something of that "charity to all men" with which they are themselves so overburdened? Whatever they may or may not do with the money they hope to obtain, one thing is certain: the United Kingdom will have to thank Charles Bradlaugh for breaking down, once and for all, the last of the abominable religious tests in the British House of Commons.

The United Kingdom will have to thank Charles Bradlaugh for breaking down, once and for all, the last of the abominable religious tests in the British House of Commons. Such was the closing part of my last sentence pending the opening of Parliament, and I begin again with the same sentence now that Parliament is open; for, lo-and-behold, the Government has announced its intention of again bringing in an Affirmation Bill. Well, this looks like winning for Mr. Bradlaugh, but we must not be too sanguine; we may be sure that the measure will meet with a most determined opposition from the Tories, the saints, and the sham Liberals; indeed, one of the most rabid (Sir R. Cross) has already given notice that he will oppose it "tooth and nail." Unhappy gentleman, no doubt he is very "Cross" with the Government for attempting to do right in this matter; of course he will oppose it to his uttermost, and so he would any good and useful measure, providing he and his class were not going to be directly benefited thereby. No doubt he is a very good man, so is Baron de Worms, the German Jew, who sits and makes laws for the Christians whose God he believes to have been an impostor. I dare say these two honorable gentlemen are so pure that if they were buried and dug up again, after a given time, lilies would be found to have sprouted from their persons. However that may be, it is quite possible that they and their wretched army, from Sir Stafford Northcote and my Lord Randolph Churchill, down to Philip Callan and Frank Hugh O'Donnell, may succeed again in frustrating the intentions of the Government, and should the Bill get through the Commons, what fate may await it in the Lords? It appears that it is only intended to apply to the Commons; the Lords must say amen to it, a very bitter pill for most of them to swallow; but swallow it they must, sooner or later. In the meantime, let the country support the Government in its new determination to shield the principles of liberty of conscience and freedom of election. Let the people in all parts, and by every possible means, give them their cordial, their loyal, and lawful support; let them show the Government that they understand the great difficulties it has to encounter in a case like this, and that they appreciate the efforts it is about to make, and that they are determined to sustain it in a peaceable law-abiding constitutional manner; by holding meetings and sending petitions and resolutions of confidence. If the Government be thus supported their hands will be strengthened, and they will be better able to disregard all such vile attacks as that contained in the Post of Feb. 16th, in which it lies in the following fashion:—"To the eternal disgrace of the executive of a civilised country the advisers of the Crown have yielded to brutal and vulgar menace." It is, indeed, very difficult to please these newspapers of the thoroughgoing Tory type. If Mr. Bradlaugh remains comparatively quiet, does not call together large numbers of his countrymen, they twit him with a want of earnestness, say the country is not with him, point to the absence of enthusiasm, imposing demonstrations, etc. But if he address his fellow countrymen, if he asks them to come together and say what are their sentiments upon this matter—in short, if he does the things they weakly boast he cannot do, he is still wrong; he at once becomes the leader of a "mob of roughs," and the embodiment of "vulgar menace," and many other choice terms culled from the vocabulary of the worshippers at the shrine of the "sanctity of the oath." Now, I put this question to the Post (indeed it is very like talking to a post), and to all the pretenders and hybrids of every description, who croak in the tune, or I should say in discord with it. If a vast number of sober, sincere, earnest representative men, from all parts of the country, assembled to support, not only a duly-elected member of the House of Commons, but the very executive itself, in their endeavors to have the law respected and fulfilled, I ask if this, in the language of the Post, constitutes a "brutal menace"? What do ignoring the rights of a constituency, maltreating and insulting, in the precincts of the House itself, a fellow-member, and ignoring the law of the land in the name of religion constitute? Answer, Morning Post, is this not a vulgar menace? Answer, ye curious brood of contradictory and godless oath-takers, do you not think it is more vulgar for a number of law-makers to gather on the steps of the House to break the laws, than for a throng, if you like, of electors to meet and petition that
the law may be obeyed? Whatever you may think, one thing seems quite certain, and that is that your ordinary English elector is the most docile, good-tempered, burden-bearing creature it is possible to conceive. If it were otherwise such things could not be done, but it will not be possible to do them for ever. The people are gaining in power slowly but surely. Let us hope, when they possess what they are patiently toiling for, that they will not abuse it, like those who have had it thrust upon them. I believe they will not; I believe—nay, I am sure—that if the much-dreaded and most-abused Charles Bradlaugh himself had a large majority and followers in the House, he would be more generous, more liberal, tolerant, and just than the motley crew of bigots who are now vainly endeavoring to hunt him down and ruin him by pains and penalties.
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The Latest Constitutional Struggle.

1880.

April 2nd.—After twelve years' fight and three repulses, Mr. Charles Bradlaugh is elected member of Parliament for Northampton. The polling was as follows:—

The Weekly Dispatch said: Mr. Bradlaugh's achievement of the position he has been aiming at so long and so zealously is a notable sign of the times. Whatever his critics may think of him, he will enter Parliament as the representative of a vastly larger constituency than the whole electorate or the whole population of Northampton.

The Birmingham Daily Mail: Mr. Bradlaugh holds extreme views on some subjects, but he will none the less be a useful man in Parliament, his unflinching courage in the exposure of abuses being unquestionable.

The Standard: Mr. Bradlaugh, now that he has got to the House of Commons, is not likely to efface himself in speechless obscurity.

The Southampton Times: The most signal and portentous triumph is that which has been achieved by Mr. Bradlaugh. His election shows what the unity of the Liberal party must have been.

The Christian World: His contributions to the discussions of the House may not be without value.

During the election Mr. Samuel Morley telegraphed to Mr. Labouchere as follows: I strongly urge necessity of united effort in all sections of Liberal party, and the sinking of minor and personal questions, with many of which I deeply sympathise, in order to prevent the return, in so pronounced a constituency as Northampton, of even one Conservative.

April 15th.—Mr. S. Morley, speaking at Bristol, said, respecting his telegram to Northampton: He made no reference to candidates, nor did the friend who wrote the telegram go into detail, but he advised union. Those who had known him all his life would believe that he viewed with the intensest repugnance the supposed opinions, both social and religious, of one of the candidates. Afterwards, writing to the Record, Mr. Morley said he deeply regretted his telegram.

The Weekly Dispatch, commenting on Mr. Morley's conduct, said: Let the bigots who have taken him to task for his temporary aberration from the path of pharisaism make what they can of his pitiful excuse. Other people can only regret that a man so useful in many ways, both as a politician and a philanthropist, should show himself so narrow-minded.

The Edinburgh Evening News: In their disappointment, the defeated party have eagerly caught at the election of Mr. Bradlaugh as supplying the most pungent taunt that can be thrown at their victorious opponents.

The Sheffield Telegraph: Bradlaugh is an M.P. . . . . . . . . . . the bellowing blasphemer of Northampton.

Mr. Bradlaugh announces that he considers he is legally entitled to avail himself of the Freethinkers' affirmation, and that there is some reason to hope that other members will join him in that course.
April 17th.—*Sheffield Independent's* "London Correspondent" says: Tenets which constitute the religious faith of Mr. Bradlaugh are understood to constitute an insuperable difficulty in the way of his being sworn a member of "the faithful Commons."

April 29th.—Parliament opens.

May 3rd.—At the table of the House Mr. Bradlaugh handed in a written paper to the Clerk of the House; on this were written the words: "To the Right Honorable the Speaker of the House of Commons. I, the undersigned Charles Bradlaugh, beg respectfully to claim to be allowed to affirm, as a person for the time being by law permitted to make a solemn affirmation or declaration instead of taking an oath. Charles Bradlaugh." Asked if he desired to state anything to the House, Mr. Bradlaugh said: I have to submit that the Parliamentary Oaths Act, 1866, gives the right to affirm to every person for the time being permitted by law to make affirmation. I am such a person; and under the Evidence Amendment Act, 1869, and the Evidence Amendment Act, 1870, I have repeatedly, for nine years past, affirmed in the highest courts of jurisdiction in this realm. I am ready to make the declaration or affirmation of allegiance.

At the request of the Speaker Mr. Bradlaugh then withdrew, in order that the House might consider the claim, and Lord F. Cavendish, urging that it would be manifestly inconvenient that when any hon. member had applied to take his seat in the House, any unnecessary delay should intervene, moved the appointment of a committee of inquiry which should lay before the House the material on which the House itself should found its decision. Sir Stafford Northcote seconded. Several other members spoke, and Mr. Beresford Hope said that the grievance of one man was very little compared with a great principle; at present the House of Commons was only a half-hatched chicken. The committee was then agreed to.

May 11th.—Appointment of committee carried by 171 votes against 74, after a two hours' debate.

May 20th.—The committee report: "that in the opinion of the committee, persons entitled under the provisions of 'the Evidence Amendment Act, 1869,' and 'the Evidence Amendment Act, 1870,' to make a solemn declaration instead of an oath in courts of justice, cannot be admitted to make an affirmation or declaration instead of an oath in the House of Commons, in pursuance of the Acts 29 and 80 Vict., c. 19, and 31 and 32 Vict., c. 72."

The draft report, proposed by the Attorney-General, was to the effect that "persons so admitted," etc., *may be* admitted, etc. This was lost by the casting vote of the chairman (Mr. Walpole), the other members of the committee voting as follows. Ayes: Mr. Whitbread, Mr. John Bright, Mr. Massey, Mr. Sergeant Simon, Sir Henry Jackson, Mr. Attorney-General, Mr. Solicitor-General, Mr. Watkin Williams. Noes: Sir John Holker, Lord Henry Lennox, Mr. Staveley Hill, Mr. Grantham, Mr. Pemberton, Mr. Hopwood, Mr. Beresford Hope, Mr. Henry Chaplin.

Mr. Bradlaugh makes a public statement of his position with regard to the oath. He considered he had a legal right to choose between the alternatives of making an affirmation or taking the oath, and he felt it clearly his moral duty, in that case, to make an affirmation. The oath included words which, to him, were meaningless, and it would have been an act of hypocrisy to voluntarily take this form if any other had been open to him. He should, taking the oath, regard himself as bound not by the letter of its words, but by the spirit which the affirmation would have conveyed, had he been allowed to make it, and as soon as he might be able he should take steps to put an end to the present doubtful and unfortunate state of the law and practice on oaths and affirmations.

May 21st.—Amid a tumult of cries from the Conservative benches Mr. Bradlaugh goes to the table for the purpose of being sworn. Sir H. D. Wolff objecting, the Speaker requested Mr. Bradlaugh to withdraw. He (the Speaker) was bound to say he knew of no instance in which a member who had offered to take the oath in the usual form was not allowed by the House to do so. Sir H. D. Wolff then moved that Mr. Bradlaugh should not be allowed to take the oath, alleging against Mr. Bradlaugh his repute as an Atheist, and his authorship of "The Impeachment of the House of Brunswick." Mr. Alderman Fowler seconded the motion, stating that he held in his hand a petition praying the House not to alter the law and the custom of the realm for the purpose of admitting an Atheist to Parliament. Mr. Gladstone, in the course of replying, said: "it was not in consequence of any regulation enforced by the authority of this House—of a single branch of the legislature, however complete that authority may be over the members of this House, that the hon. member for Northampton presents himself to take the oath at the table. He presents himself in pursuance of a statutory obligation to take the oath in order that he may fulfil the duty with which, as we are given to understand, in a regular and formal manner, his constituents have entrusted him. That statutory obligation implied a statutory right." He moved that it be referred to a select committee to consider and report for the information of the House whether the House has any right to prevent a duly-elected member, who is willing to take the oath, from doing so. A long debate ensued, characterised by the fierceness with which Mr. Bradlaugh's admission to Parliament was opposed. Mr. John Bright, however, asked if the House were entitled thus to obstruct what he called the right of a member to take his seat on account of his religious belief, because it happened that his belief or no belief had been openly...
professed, what reason was there that any member of the House should not be questioned as to his beliefs, and if the answer were not satisfactory that the House should not be at liberty to object to his taking his seat? After two or three adjournments of the debate the Premier's amendment was virtually withdrawn, and a motion by the Attorney-General was carried to the effect that a committee should be appointed to report whether it was competent to the House to prevent Mr. Bradlaugh, by resolution, from taking the oath.

May 28th.—Committee nominated—twenty-three members.

Mr. Labouchere gives notice to ask leave to bring in a Bill to amend the law of Parliamentary Oaths, to provide that any member may, if he desire, make a solemn affirmation in lieu of taking the oath.

June 2nd.—Mr. Bradlaugh gives evidence before Select Committee, in the course of which he said: "I have never at any time refused to take the oath of allegiance provided by statute to be taken by members; all I did was, believing as I then did that I had the right to affirm, to claim to affirm, and I was then absolutely silent as to the oath; that I did not refuse to take it, nor have I then or since expressed any mental reservation, or stated that the appointed oath of allegiance would not be binding upon me; that, on the contrary, I say, and have said, that the essential part of the oath is in the fullest and most complete degree binding upon my honor and conscience, and that the repeating of words of asseveration does not in the slightest degree weaken the binding effect of the oath of allegiance upon me." [It had been persistently represented that Mr. Bradlaugh had refused to take the oath.] "Any form that I went through, any oath that I took, I should regard as binding upon my conscience in the fullest degree."

June 16th.—The committee report that the compliance by Mr. Bradlaugh with the form used when an oath is taken would not be the taking of the oath within the true meaning of the statutes; that if a member make and subscribe the affirmation in place of taking the oath it is possible by means of an action in the High Court of Justice, to test his legal right to do so; and that the committee recommend that should Mr. Bradlaugh again seek to make and subscribe the affirmation he be not prevented from so doing. (Majority in favor of his being allowed to affirm—four.)

June 21st.—Mr. Labouchere moved in the House of Commons that Mr. Bradlaugh be admitted to make an affirmation instead of taking the oath, seconded by Mr. M'Laren. Sir H. Giffard moved a resolution seeking to debar Mr. Bradlaugh from both oath and affirmation. Alderman Fowler seconded, a man who did not believe in a God was not likely to be a man of high moral character. The majority of the people were opposed to an Atheist being admitted to Parliament. Many other members spoke. General Burnaby said the making of the affirmation by Mr. Bradlaugh would pollute the oath. Mr. Palmer said Mr. Bradlaugh had a legal right with which the House had no power to interfere. The Attorney-General said he had come to the conclusion that Mr. Bradlaugh could not take the oath, chiefly on the consideration that he was a person entitled to an affirmation instead of taking the oath. Sir Henry Tyler, with execrable taste, dragged in the name of a lady with whom Mr. Bradlaugh is associated in business. At last, by a majority of 45—the numbers voting being 275 and 230—another triumph against liberty was scored.

The Christian World regretted that some Nonconformists helped to swell the Tory majority.

The Jewish World held it as a reproach to Judaism, that members of their community should have gone over to the party which once strove to detain them in bondage.

In 1851, Mr. Newdegate protested against the idea "that they should have sitting in the House, an individual who regarded our redeemer as an impostor," and yet Baron de Worms voted with Mr. Newdegate for the exclusion of a man with whose tenets he disagreed.

The Whitehall Review headed an article "God v. Bradlaugh," and said the majority had "protected God from insult."

June 23rd.—Mr. Bradlaugh again claimed at the table of the House of Commons to take the oath, and the Speaker having informed him of the resolution passed the previous evening, requested his withdrawal. Mr. Bradlaugh thereupon asked to be heard, and after some debate the demand was complied with.
Mr. Bradlaugh spoke from the bar of the House, asking no favor, but claiming his right, and warning hon. members against a conflict with public opinion.

Mr. Labouchere moved, and Mr. Macdonald seconded, the rescindment of the resolution of the 22nd, which was lost on division.

Mr. Bradlaugh was then recalled and requested to withdraw from the House. Standing by the table, he said: "I respectfully refuse to obey the order of the House, because the order is against the law." The raging of the bigots and Tories recommenced. Mr. Gladstone declined to help them out of the pit into which they had leapt: "Those who were responsible for the decision might carry it out as they chose." After a sharp discussion Mr. Bradlaugh was, on the motion of Sir Stafford Northcote, "committed to the Clock Tower." In the division the numbers were 274 for and 7 against, the Radicals having left the House.

June 24th.—On the motion of Sir Stafford Northcote, Mr. Bradlaugh is released from custody, "not upon apology, or reparation, or promise not to repeat his offence, but with the full knowledge and clear recollection of his announcement that the offence would be repeated toties quoties till his object was effected."

June 25th.—Mr. Labouchere gives notice of motion to rescind the resolution of the 22nd, and Government agreed to give an early day for the discussion of the same.

June 28th.—Baron de Ferrieres announced his intention to move that the seat for Northampton be declared vacant, and that a Bill be brought in providing for the substitution of an affirmation for the oath at the option of members. Mr. Wyndham (Conservative) asked Mr. Gladstone whether the Government would bring in a Bill to remove all doubts as to the legal right of members to make a solemn affirmation. Mr. Gladstone said the Government did not propose to do so, and gave notice for Thursday (1st July) to move as a standing order that members-elect be allowed, subject to any liability by statute, to affirm at their choice. Mr. Labouchere then said he would not proceed with his motion. On another motion, however, by the same member, leave was given to bring in a Bill for the amendment of the Parliamentary Oaths and Affirmations, which was read a first time.

July 1st.—After a futile attempt made by Mr. Gorst to show that Mr. Gladstone's resolution was a disorderly one, the Premier, in moving it said, in the course of an extremely fair speech, that the allegation of members that Mr. Bradlaugh had thrust his opinions upon the House was untrue. His (Mr. Bradlaugh's) reference to the Acts under which he claimed to affirm had only been named in answer to a question from the clerk of the House. Sir Erskine May, in his evidence before the recent committee, stated that Mr. Bradlaugh simply claimed to affirm.

Sir Stafford Northcote admitted that when Mr. Bradlaugh was called upon to affirm he was not disrespectful, but firm. He opposed the resolution as humiliating to the House. Several members protested against any course for facilitating the admission of Mr. Bradlaugh. General Burnaby stated that in order to obtain "authoritative" opinions on the matter he had obtained letters or telegrams from the Moravian body, the Bishop of London, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Ossory, the Bishop of Ratho, the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Galway, and the Bishop of Argyle and the Isles, and the Secretary of the Pope of Rome, all of whom expressed themselves in the strongest terms against the admission of an Atheist into Parliament. Mr. Spurgeon, who was unfortunately from home, had expressed his opinion strongly adverse to it, and the Chief Rabbi—(loud laughter)—although refusing to interfere with political questions, felt very deeply on the subject. (Laughter, and cries of "the Sultan," and "Shah.")

When the House divided the numbers were 303 for, and 249 against.

July 2nd.—Mr. Bradlaugh takes the affirmation of allegiance, and his seat.

During the struggle several hundreds of indignation meetings were held in London and the provinces, and petitions, letters, telegrams, etc., in immense numbers, poured in upon the Government and the House, in favor of Mr. Bradlaugh's rights.

July 2nd.—Mr. Bradlaugh gives his first vote, and was there-upon served with a writ to recover against him a penalty of £500 for having voted and sat without having made and subscribed the oath, the plaintiff being one Henry Lewis Clarke, who, as subsequently appeared, was merely the tool of the actual common informer, Charles Newdigate Newdegate, M.P. This writ was ready so quickly that, if not issued actually before Mr. Bradlaugh had taken his seat, it must have been prepared beforehand.

July 8th.—Mr. Norwood asks the first Lord of the Treasury whether, considering the Government declined to introduce a bill to amend the Oaths Act, it would instruct the law officers of the Crown to defend the junior member for Northampton against the suit of the common informer. Mr. Callan asked whether the Government would remit the penalty. Mr. Gladstone said no application had been received for remission of the penalties, and that his reply to Mr. Norwood must be in the negative.

July 14th.—Read first time in the House of Commons, a bill "to incapacitate from sitting in Parliament any person who has by deliberate public speaking, or by published writing, systematically avowed his disbelief in the existence of a supreme being." It was prepared and introduced by Sir Eardley Wilmot, Mr. Alderman Fowler and Mr. Hicks. Owing to an informality the Bill could not come on for second reading.
The Rev. Canon Abney, of Derby, speaks of Mr. Bradlaugh as "the apostle of filth, impurity, and blasphemy."

July 16th.—Parliament indemnifies Lord Byron against an action, he having sat and voted without being sworn.

July 20th.—Sir Eardley Wilmot gives notice of moving that it is repugnant to the constitution for an Atheist to become a member of "this Honorable House." He afterwards postponed his motion.

At a meeting of the Dumfries Town Council, a member said: "If the law courts should decide that it was legal for an Atheist to sit in the House of Commons, he should feel it is duty to give notice of petition to Parliament to have the law altered; he would not allow Mr. Bradlaugh to go into a hundred acre field beside cattle, let alone the House of Commons."

The Rev. Chas. Voysey writes, that he feels disgraced by the people of Northampton electing Mr. Bradlaugh, and declares that "most of the speeches in the Bradlaugh case in favor of his exclusion, strike me as singularly good, wholesome and creditable." He repeats the myth of Mr. Bradlaugh forcing his objections to the oath upon the House.

July 21st.—Sir John Hay, M.P., speaking about Mr. Bradlaugh at New Galloway, made a most infamous, cowardly, and uncalled for attack on Mrs. Besant. The Scotsman refused to print the remarks, as "the language was so coarse that it could hardly have dropped from a Yahoo."


Aug. 24th.—Mr. Bradlaugh gives notice that early next session he will call attention to perpetual pensions.

Sept. 7th.—Parliament prorogued. Hansard credits Mr. Bradlaugh with about twenty speeches during the Session. (Mr. Newdegate told the Licensed Victuallers that Mr. Bradlaugh "had made one speech, and proved himself a second or third-rate speaker.")

1881.

Jan. 6th.—Parliament reopens. Mr. Bradlaugh renews his notice as to perpetual pensions. Great interest in the question throughout the kingdom.

Jan. 24th.—Mr. Bradlaugh makes a speech in the House of Commons against Coercion in Ireland.

Jan. 31st.—Mr. Newdegate, speaking in the House, described Northampton as an "oasis in the Midland Counties."

Feb. 4th.—Mr. Bradlaugh makes a speech against the second reading of the Coercion Bill, and concluded by moving that it be read that day six months.

Feb. 15th.—Date of motion for inquiry into perpetual pensions fixed for March 15th. (When the day arrived Mr. Bradlaugh, on an appeal from Mr. Gladstone, allowed the motion to be postponed, in order to allow supply to be taken. 848 petitions had been presented to the House, with 251,332 signatures in favor of the motion.)

Feb. 17th.—Mr. Dawson, M.P. for Carlow, said that Irish members were much indebted to Mr. Bradlaugh for what he had done on the Coercion Bill.

Feb. 25th.—Mr. Bradlaugh made final speech against third reading of the Coercion Bill.

March 7th.—The case of Clarke v. Bradlaugh heard by Mr. Justice Mathew.

March 10th.—Mr. Bradlaugh brought before the House the case of the imprisoned Maoris.

March 11th.—Judgment in the case given, which was for the plaintiff, that he was entitled to recover the penalty, subject to appeal. Mr. Bradlaugh gave notice of appeal.

Mr. Gorst gave notice to move that Mr. Speaker issue his warrant for new writ for the borough of Nottingham.]

March 14th.—Upon Mr. Bradlaugh rising to present petitions against perpetual pensions, signed by over 7,000 persons, Mr. Gorst rose to order, on the ground that the seat for Northampton was vacant. After discussion the Speaker called upon Mr. Bradlaugh to proceed with the presentation of his petitions.

March 15th.—At request of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Bradlaugh postponed his motion for enquiry into perpetual pensions.

March 23rd.—Mr. Bradlaugh moved the Court of Appeal to expedite the hearing of his appeal, and also to expedite the trial of the issues in fact. The Court gave the appeal priority over other cases.

March 28th.—Mr. Bradlaugh made his last speech in the House against flogging in the Army.

March 30th.—Appeal heard.

March 31st.—Judgment given against the defendant. Plaintiff not yet entitled to execution, but seat vacated, Mr. Bradlaugh undertaking not to appeal so far as the affirmation was concerned.

Mr. Bradlaugh again seeks the suffrages of the electors of Northampton.
April 6th.—The Tories serve notice on the Mayor not to accept Mr. Bradlaugh's nomination, which the Mayor disregarded. Mr. Edward Corbett nominated by Tories.

April 9th.—Mr. Bradlaugh re-elected by 3,437 votes to Corbett 3,305.

April 26th.—Mr. Bradlaugh, accompanied by Mr. Labouchere and Mr. Burt, came to the table of the House, and, "the book" having been handed to him, was about to take the oath when Sir Stafford Northcote interposing, he was requested to withdraw, in order that the House might consider the new conditions under which the oath was proposed to be taken. Mr. Bradlaugh withdrew to the bar of the House, and Sir Stafford Northcote moved that he be not allowed to go through the form of taking the oath. Mr. Davey moved and Mr. Labouchere seconded an amendment to the effect that where a person who had been duly elected presented himself at the table to take the oath he ought not to be prevented from doing so by anything extraneous to the transaction. Other members spoke, and Mr. Bright regretted "the almost violent temper with which some hon. gentlemen came to the consideration of the question."

Mr. Bradlaugh, speaking at the bar, claimed that his return was untainted, that it had not been brought about by the Liberal party, but by the help of the people, by the pence of toilers in mine and factory. He begged the House not to plunge into a struggle with him, which he would shun. Strife was easy to begin, but none knew where it would end. There was no legal disqualification upon him, and they had no right to impose a disqualification which was less than legal.

Mr. Gladstone made a lengthy and fine speech in favor of Mr. Bradlaugh, the text of which was Mr. Bradlaugh's own words given above as to imposition of a new disqualification; on a division, however, the bigots again had it.

Mr. Bradlaugh again stepped to the table, and demanded the administration of the oath, refusing to obey the Speaker's order to withdraw. Sir Stafford Northcote asked the Prime Minister whether he proposed to offer the House any counsel. Mr. Gladstone said he should leave it to the majority to carry out the effects of their vote. Eventually the Speaker called upon the Sergeant-at-Arms to remove Mr. Bradlaugh, who during the debate had been standing at the table. Mr. Bradlaugh with-drawing with the Sergeant three times to the bar, as often returned to the table. After further passages at arms between Mr. Gladstone and Sir Stafford Northcote, the House adjourned.

April 27th.—Mr. Bradlaugh again found at the table of the House claiming to be allowed to take the oath. At the bidding of the Speaker the Sergeant-at-Arms again caused Mr. Bradlaugh to withdraw to the bar, where he remained during the discussion which followed.

Mr. Labouchere asked the Prime Minister whether he would give him reasonable facilities to introduce his Affirmation Bill, if so Mr. Bradlaugh would not interfere with the resolution passed last night.

Mr. Gladstone said the giving facility for that purpose, meant the postponement of very serious and very urgent business, and he had no assurance as to the disposition of the House. He could not see his way to consent if it was to be an opposed Bill. After further discussion, however, Mr. Gladstone said it might be possible to test the feeling of the House by one or more morning sittings.

April 29th.—Mr. Gladstone announces the intention of the Government of bringing in a bill amending the Parliamentary Oaths Act.

May 2nd.—The Attorney-General moved that the House re-solve itself into committee with a view of his asking leave to introduce the Bill. Debate on motion adjourned to the 5th with the view of fixing the time on the 6th, when the discussion should be resumed.

Mr. MacIver gave notice to ask the Prime Minister whether he was prepared to reconsider his decision of last session, and will introduce "a short measure" for the partial disfranchisement of Northampton. (The question was never put.)

May 6th.—Further obstruction of the Bigots.

May 10th.—After 1.15 a.m. the Government proposed a morning sitting for that day (Tuesday), to discuss the introduction of their Bill. Further obstruction, wrath, and bitterness, and the Government abandoned the intention to hold a morning sitting.

At the afternoon sitting a resolution was arrived at, which authorised the Sergeant-at-Arms to prevent Mr. Bradlaugh from entering the House.

Lord Selborne (Lord Chancellor) in reply to a letter relative to Mr. Bradlaugh and the oath, says equal justice is due to Christian and infidel; he saw no possibility of refusing to afford by legislation to all who scruple to take the oath, the same option in Parliament as they have in courts of law, to make an affirmation.

May 25th.—Mr. Newdegate formally blocked the Bill, of which Mr. Labouchere gave notice, for indemnifying Mr. Bradlaugh against penalties for having sat and voted on affirmation.

June 19th and 20th.—The common informer's action tried at nisi prius before Mr. Justice Grove. Verdict against Mr. Bradlaugh for penalty and costs.—Rule nisi for new trial afterwards, granted by Justices Grove and Lindley; this rule was made absolute by Justices Denman and Hawkins, but was set aside by Lords Justices
Brett, Cotton and Holker.

Mr. Bradlaugh appeals to the country. The country answers.

Aug. 3rd.—Mr. Bradlaugh, acting on his right to enter the House of Commons, is seized at the door of the House by fourteen men, police and ushers (Inspector Denning said ten), and roughly hustled out into Palace Yard, Mr. Bradlaugh protesting against such treatment as illegal. "In the passage leading out to the yard Mr. Bradlaugh's coat was torn down on the right side; his waistcoat was also pulled open, and otherwise his toilet was much disarranged. The members flocked down the stairs on the heels of the struggling party, but no pause was made until Mr. Bradlaugh was placed outside the precincts and in Palace Yard."—Times. Alderman Fowler was heard to call, "Kick him out." This he afterwards denied, but there is evidence that he did so. (Mr. Bradlaugh suffered the rupture of the small muscles of both his arms, and erysipelas ensued).

Many thousands of people went up to the House with petitions, urging the House to do justice to Northampton and Mr. Bradlaugh.

In the House Mr. Labouchere moved a resolution condemning, as an interference with the privilege of members, the action of the authorities in expelling Mr. Bradlaugh from the lobby. This was rejected by 191 votes against 7, and a motion of Sir Henry Holland, declaring the approval of the House of the course taken by the Speaker, was agreed to without controversy.

At a crowded meeting at the Hall of Science the same evening Mr. Bradlaugh stated that he had told Inspector Denning in Palace Yard that he could come back with force enough to gain admittance, but that he had no right to risk the lives and liberties of his supporters.

Aug. 4th.—The Times declares, in an article favorable on the whole to Mr. Bradlaugh's claims, that the House of Commons was yesterday the real sufferer in dignity, authority, and repute. It says: "the question contains within itself the baleful germ of a grave constitutional contest between the House of Commons and any constituency in the land;" and "such a conflict can but have one conclusion, as all history shows."

The Daily News, in a similar article, concludes thus: "Sooner or later it will be generally acknowledged that Mr. Bradlaugh's exclusion was one of the most high-handed acts of which any legislative body has ever been guilty."

The following unique paragraph from The Rock is worth preserving in its original form: "The question now is whether the Christian people of this realm will quietly allow clamorous groups of infidels, Radicals, and seditionists, by organised clamor, bluster, and menace, to overawe the legislature, and by exhibitions of violence—not at all unlikely, if permitted to develop into outrage and riot—to cause an organic and vital change to be made in our Constitution and laws, in order that brazen-faced Atheism might display itself within the walls of the British Parliament."

Mr. E. D. Girdlestone writes: "If the present Cabinet does not secure your admission to the House in some way or other, I can only wish they may soon be turned out of office. I don't know what more I can do than say, 'Go on! and go in!'"

Aug. 5th.—Mr. Bradlaugh's application at Westminster Police Court for summons against Inspector, for having assaulted him at the House of Commons on the 3rd inst., refused.

Mr. Bradlaugh confined to the House with severe erysipelas in both arms, resulting from the injuries inflicted. Attended by Drs. Ramskill and Palfrey. The latter, on August 12th, ordered his immediate removal from town, to prevent yet more dangerous complications.

Aug. 13th.—Mr. Bradlaugh went to Worthing to recruit his health. Outside the station there, weary and exhausted, both arms in a sling, he was rudely stared at by a clergyman, who, having satisfied himself as to Mr. Bradlaugh's identity, walked away saying loudly: "There's Bradlaugh; I hope they'll make it warm for him yet."

The Northern Star (a Tory paper) suggested that Mr. Bradlaugh was malingering—"simply carrying on the showman business."

Aug. 24th.—Sir Henry Tyler, in the House of Commons, attempts to discredit the South Kensington department for allowing science and art classes at the Hall of Science. Mr. Mundella gives those classes great credit.

Aug. 27th.—Parliament prorogued.

Further appeal to England.

1882.

Jan. 9th.—The Earl of Derby, in a speech at the Liverpool Reform Club, says: "For my part I utterly disbelieve in the value of political oaths. . . . I should hope that if Mr. Bradlaugh again offers to take the oath, as he did last year, there will be no further attempt to prevent him."

Feb. 7th.—Reopening of Parliament. Mr. Bradlaugh again attended at the table to take the oath, and Sir Erskine May, the clerk of the House, was about to administer the same when Sir Stafford Northcote,
interposing, moved that Mr. Bradlaugh be not allowed to go through the form. Sir W. Harcourt, in moving the previous question, said the Government held the view that the House had no right to interpose between a duly-elected member and the oath.

Mr. Bradlaugh, addressing the House from the bar for the third time, begged the House to deal with him with some semblance and show of legality and fairness. He concluded: "I want to obey the law and I tell you how I might meet the House still further, if the House will pardon me for seeming to advise it. Hon. members had said that an Affirmation Bill would be a Bradlaugh Relief Bill. Bradlaugh is more proud than you are. Let the Bill pass without applying to elections that have taken place previously, and I will undertake not to claim my seat, and when the Bill has passed I will apply for the Chiltern Hundreds. I have no fear. If I am not fit for my constituents they shall dismiss me, but you never shall. The grave alone shall make me yield."

When a division was taken there were for the previous question 228, against 286. Mr. Samuel Morley voted with the majority against the Government. Sir Stafford Northcote's motion was then agreed to without a division.

Feb. 8th.—Mr. Labouchere, in committee of the whole House, proposed for leave to bring in a Bill to amend the law of Parliamentary Oaths and Affirmations. The Bill was afterwards formally blocked by Mr. Molloy.

Feb. 17th.—Mr. Labouchere asked the Attorney-General whether the resolution of Feb. 7th had not vacated the seat. Sir Henry James answered that it had not.

Feb. 18th.—Mr. Gladstone writes Mr. Bradlaugh that the Government have no measure to propose with respect to his seat.

Feb. 21st—Mr. Bradlaugh of himself takes and subscribes the oath, and takes his seat.

Feb. 22nd.—Mr Bradlaugh expelled the House of Commons.

Mar. 2nd—Re-elected for Northampton. For Bradlaugh, 3,796; for Corbett, 3,688.

Mar. 6th.—On the motion of Sir Stafford Northcote, the House reaffirms its motion of the 7th Feb., Mr. Gladstone supporting an amendment moved by Mr. Marjoribanks, by which the House would have declared the desirability of legislation, for the purpose of giving members an option between oath and affirmation.

Mar. 7th.—Lord Redesdale introduces in the House of Lords a Bill, requiring every peer and every member of the House of Commons before taking the oath or making the affirmation, to declare and affirm his belief in Almighty God. The Bill, introduced "from a sense of what was due to Almighty God," was afterwards withdrawn "in deference to Lord Salisbury."

To this date, 317 petitions with 62,168 signatures had been presented against Mr. Bradlaugh being allowed to take his seat; while in favor of the same 1,051, with 250,833 signatures, had been presented.

Mr. Labouchere's Affirmation Bill blocked by Earl Percy.

1883

Jan. 11th.—Mr. Justice Field gave judgment that the privileges of the House of Commons prevented Mr. Bradlaugh from obtaining any redress for the assault upon him on August 3rd., 1881.

Feb. 15th.—Great demonstration in Trafalgar Square; from eighty to one hundred thousand people present. (Evening Standard says 30,000; Daily News, 50,000 an hour before the meeting.) Mr. Adams, chairman; Rev. W. Sharman, Jos. Arch, and Mr. Bradlaugh, speakers.

Opening of Parliament. (Mr. Gladstone at Cannes.) Government give notice for to-morrow for leave to introduce bill to amend the Oaths Act, 1866. Sir R Cross gives notice of opposition on second reading of same. Mr. Bradlaugh consents, with the approval of his constituents, expressed on the 13th inst., to await the fate of the measure.

Feb. 16th.—Sharp succession of frantic speeches in the House of Commons by Mr. Newdegate, Alderman Fowler, Mr. Warton, Mr. Henry Chaplin, Mr. Onslow, Mr. Grantham, Mr. Beresford Hope, Lord H. Lennox, Lord C. Hamilton, Mr. A. Balfour, Mr. Ashmead Bartlett, and Mr. A. O'Connor. Divisions: from two to three to one for Government. The Marquis of Hartington consents to adjourn the motion for Bill until Monday at twelve.

Feb. 18th.—The Observer says that when Conservatives ask Liberals whether they really mean to alter the law for the purpose of admitting Mr. Bradlaugh, it is fair for Liberals in turn to ask Conservatives whether they really mean to maintain an admitted abuse and injustice for the mere purpose of excluding Mr. Bradlaugh.

Feb. 19th.—First reading of Bill carried on division by 184 votes to 53; second reading formally fixed for that night week.

Feb. 20th.—Daily News says Bill will be carried by large majorities, and will be regarded by the House and the country as the appropriate settlement of an unfortunate controversy.

The Times says the leaders of the opposition will not succeed in finally preventing the Bill from becoming
law. Its real concern is that Mr. Bradlaugh has been substantially in the right; that he has been unjustly excluded from taking the seat which belongs to him.

The *morning Advertiser* thinks the Government may yet find it difficult to persuade the House to adopt the Bill.

The *Morning Post* justifies the irregular opposition to the first reading of the Bill, and thinks notice of the measure should have been given in the Queen's Speech. No measure had created more excitement or raised more indignation in the country, which desired to see it rejected by a decisive majority.

March 5th.—Appeal case Bradlaugh v. Clarke part heard before the House of Lords.
March 6th.—Case concluded; judgment deferred.
March 9th.—Action for maintenance—Bradlaugh v. Newdegate—tried before Lord Coleridge and a special jury. Henry Lewis Clarke, the common informer, swore that he had not the means to pay the costs, and would not have brought the action if he had not been indemnified by Mr. Newdegate. Case adjourned for argument of legal points.
March 17th.—Maintenance action argued; four counsel appearing for Mr. Newdegate. Lord Coleridge reserved judgment.
March 20th.—The Solicitors to the Treasury compelled Mr. Bradlaugh to pay the costs of the House of Commons in the action against the deputy Sergeant-at-Arms.

Price Sixpence.

The True Story

of

My Parliamentary Straggle.

by

Charles Bradlaugh.

Containing the whole of Mr. Bradlaugh's evidence before the Select Committee; his letter to the *Times*, May 20th, 1880; and his three Speeches at the bar of the House of Commons.

London : FREEought Publishing Company, 63, Fleet Street, E.C.

**A Christian View of the "Bradlaugh" Case.**

**Ought to be read by every Christian.**

A man has not only the right to express his thoughts, but it is his duty to do so—he writes :—"It is my right and my duty to take my seat, I shall try to exercise my right and to perform my duty.—C.B.

Gratitude is her due to the brave Church of England Clergyman, Rev. STEWARD D. HEADLAM, who has brought upon himself much censure and assailment for having persisted in holding the "right of electors."

Notwithstanding most influential presure to the contrary.—*N.R.C.B.*, January, 1883.

His simple words were weighty with a eloquence which not only swayed the hearts, but the judgment of his hearers. And few men left a audience under greater weight of obligation for truths spoken and principles enunciated.

Published By J. Dunne Woolloomooloo, Sydney 112 Bourke Street

The following Freethought Books and Pamphlets are for Sale in George-street Markets every Saturday from 1 till 10 o'clock p.m., and at 112 Bourke-street, Woolcomooloo.

**The Rev. S. D. Headlam, B.A., on a Christian View of the "Bradlaugh Case."**

Ought to be read by every Christian.

**The Rev. STEWARD D. HEADLAM, said :—**

**THERE is certainly one remark of the chairman's that I entirely endorse, and it is the wish that I could have met a good large number of the clergy of Northampton to discuss this subject with them. (Hear, hear.) I feel very strongly indeed that I am entirely within my rights and duties as a priest of the Church of England in taking the line I do. (Cheers.) I do not come before you as I might do, merely as citizen to have my say on what I believe to be a great constitutional question; but I come before you also as a clergyman to have my say in what I believe to be a great religious question. (Hear, hear.) I would ask you in a friendly way first of all to understand that I am not in the habit of giving lectures in large halls like this, and I don't think anyone would have induced me to come down here had it not been first of all for the great admiration I feel for the great social and political work which has been done by Mr. Bradlaugh—(loud cheers)—and secondly, for the very strong feeling which I have that you here in Northampton have a most important work in hand at present to see that Mr. Bradlaugh and you get your rights in the House of Commons. (Cheers.) Now, the title I have chosen for my
lecture is—"A Christian view of the Bradlaugh case." And I think I have a right to bring before you a Christian view of this case, because you know how very many, the large majority of Mr. Bradlaugh's opponents throughout the country, oppose him in the name of Christianity. (Applause.) There are very many good friends of mine, and I daresay many good friends of yours, who deprecate the connecting religion and politics in any way whatever. They often say that a clergyman is better in his parish, and ought not to interfere with politics either on one side or the other. I do not so read the life and character of Jesus Christ or of Jesus Christ's apostles. As far as I understand the life and character of Jesus Christ he was far more of a secularist than many religious people seem to think. I would like to call your attention to the fact that almost all those works which are reported as having been done by Jesus Christ in the four Gospels are works for what we should now-a-days call the secular welfare of mankind, that those miracles of His, though we may not understand how they were worked, but, taking them as we find them, were works done for health against disease, for life against premature death, works done to see that people were properly fed, works done to see that nature was subdued to human good. All those kinds of ideas are brought before you when you think of those works of Jesus Christ. Once more, when you think of those words of Jesus Christ's, which we call parables, when you read the New Testament you will find they were parables of the kingdom of heaven. You will find, and I will ask you to think of this very carefully, that when Jesus Christ spoke of the kingdom of heaven, he did not speak about a life in the clouds, to which people were to go, and which they were to enjoy after death, but he spoke about a righteous society which he said he was to establish upon earth. (Cheers.) I would ask any of you—perhaps there may be some secularists here who have revolted against the religious teaching they were given in their childhood, or in the Sunday-school and who have not candidly examined the subject since their first revolt—I would ask them to read the four gospels through once more and see whether I am right. I say that Jesus did not teach anything about a good time coming merely—he taught that and something else, he spoke of the time when righteousness should prevail in this world, in this world, and tyranny and bigotry be got rid of. (Loud cheers.) Then, again, think how Jesus Christ associated with those who were looked upon as outcasts of society. Think how it was rather those who were considered by the religious world to be heretics that he found himself in friendship with. Think how he boldly rebuked the vices, not so much of the poor and degraded, but the vices of the clergy of the time, for that was really what the scribes and Pharisees were, and how he rebuked the vices of the great social leaders of the time. (Hear, hear.) When I hear revolutionists denounced as enemies of their country, I remember the words which Christ used of the king of the time: "Go, tell that fox" That was the language the gentle Jesus used of the king of his country whom he believed to be a wrong-doer. That is one of many instances I could give you if I were to go into detail. Consider this, and that Christian clergymen are bound to take Jesus Christ as their example, and then you will surely conclude that we are bound to do all we possibly can to help to make this world better—(cheers)—to work to leave this world better than we found it, and get a real kingdom of heaven, a real righteous society, established here upon earth. And when one remembers—I don't know Northampton personally, but I have no doubt it is true of Northampton as of London—when one remembers the great amount of indifference there is amongst the vast majority of people who care nothing for Secularism or religion, who perhaps have hardly time to care for anything else but getting their daily bread, and very little of that—when one thinks of the enormous amount of indifference amongst the people—on account of their own foolish ignorance, or on account of very different circumstances in which they find themselves—I feel, for one, that I am bound to work heart and soul with any man—no matter what he calls himself, Roman Catholic, English Catholic, Dissenter, or Secularist—who is trying to make the world better and to get rid of the evil in the world. (Loud cheers.) Then I would ask you further to bear in mind that according to Christian teaching, Christ not only taught as I have said, but he founded a society to keep on doing the work he began to do, and that that society is the Christian Church; and that therefore the Christian Church, with all its organisations, ought not to be troubling itself with about ten thousand and one doctrines, but ought to be doing all it possibly can as an organised society to ameliorate the condition of the people of the country in which it finds itself. (Cheers.) I see you are going to have a Mission, a Christian Mission, a Church Mission, in this town very soon, headed by the Bishop of the Diocese. A very good thing indeed, but I hope you will use your energy to get the work of that Mission turned not only to converting individual souls from wrong-doing, a very good piece of work indeed, but also to converting public opinion to righteousness with reference to great political matters. (Cheers.) It is just as important that a town should be righteous in its social and political dealings, or that a nation should be righteous in its social and political dealings, as that Tom or Jane should be helped to be made better people by the action of the Christian Church. (Cheers.) And the Christian Church has just as much work to do, I maintain—and more work—with reference to these great social and political matters than with regard to these individual matters. (Cheers.) Having said so much to show the position which I take as a Christian, I should like to give you certain reasons for my very cordial approval of your action, the action of you electors of Northampton, with reference to Mr. Bradlaugh. I have had the pleasure of knowing Mr. Bradlaugh, for some, I suppose, six, seven, or eight years, and I have found him throughout the time I have
known him an earnest Radical Reformer. (Cheers.) He has not been as so many others have been, on the side either of aristocracy, or of the plutocracy, but so far as I have studied his life and his career he has been an earnest reformer on all matters which concern the welfare of the people. (Cheers.) Therefore, as a Christian, I am bound not to consider whether he says he is an Atheist, or whether somebody else says he is an Atheist, but to consider whether, on the whole, the work he does is for the good of humanity, good for the people of England, and for the people of Northampton. (Cheers) I have convinced myself—very strongly as I disagree with him on many religious matters, on almost all religious matters, and on some social matters—I have convinced myself from absolute experience that he is a man willing to work for the well-being of the great body of the people, for the greatest happiness of the greatest number. (Loud cheers.) Then there is a second reason. It is perhaps rather a reason of expediency, and it is a reason I should have urged more strongly if I had had the advantage of meeting the clergy or opposition in this Hall, than I shall urge it on you—and it is that for good or for evil Mr. Bradlaugh has a very large and enthusiastic following, and that it is most dangerous to the well being of the country when a man has a large and enthusiastic following that that man should be kept outside the pale of the constitution. (Hear, hear.) We have always been glad in England that our great reforms and revolutions have as far as possible been carried by moral force and without bloodshed. Jesus Christ, my Lord and Master, was a moral force revolutionary. He had sympathy with those who were physical force revolutionists. Still he would not endorse their action for one moment, though he had sympathy with their aspirations. But I say to the Conservatives, and those weak- kneed Liberals who have been on the same side with them—(Cheers.) I say to them that it is a very dangerous thing every point of view to keep one who represents such a large and enthusiastic following as Mr. Bradlaugh does outside the pale of the constitution. (Cheers.) I recommend that thought to them for their most earnest consideration. Then I have a third reason why, as a Christian, I endorse your action with reference to Mr. Bradlaugh. I know that here in Northampton the fight, as far as possible, is fought out not on Atheistic grounds, but simply on political grounds. (Cheers.) But still you must allow me to say, as a clergyman, that I honor Mr. Bradlaugh very much indeed because he is an outspoken Atheist. I don't like the word myself, and I hardly ever use it about anybody. But there are many people who hold the same opinion about matters of religion as Mr. Bradlaugh does, but they have kept it dark. (Hear, hear) I have heard people quote this sentence, I believe it was said of the Mill—John Stuart Mill and his brother James Mill—"There is no God, but it is a family secret; you must not let he people know anything about it You must only let the philosophers and the half-crown magazines say anything about it. These questions of Atheism or Theism, these questions of Christianity, must not be brought down to the people; it will make them discontented." I honor Mr. Bradlaugh because, feeling what he did feel—of course I differ from him in what he does feel—he spoke out plainly what he thought was the falseness of certain teachings that had been going on for a long time; and because he was therefore a more honest and a more healthy opponent than a person who keeps his opinions dark. I have had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Bradlaugh two or three times in controversy. I have now every Sunday evening after service discussions at which some of the London Secularists attend and take part. I have had my say for twenty minutes or half-an-hour, and they have had their say quite as plainly as to what they think. And I am sure all of us who attend these lectures are very much the better, because we have each spoken out our feelings and our opinions; and we know our grounds for belief or bisbelief. It is this matter of the outspokenness of Mr. Bradlaugh in matters of religion which seems to me another claim on my admiration for him. (Cheers) Then, again also with reference to another matter which, I believe, did not come very strongly before you at the election, but I must claim my right to speak of, and that is with regard to some of Mr. Bradlaugh's social teachings. Mr. Bradlaugh is what is called a Malthusian, I am not by any means a Malthusian, but I am, as strongly as I can be, a Socialist; and I believe the Malthusian theory is not the theory which will eventually be adopted. (Hear, hear) I believe, since Mr. Henry George's book on "Progress and Poverty" has been circulated far and wide, the Malthusian theory has to a very great extent been destroyed. But why I honor Mr. Bradlaugh here again for is that whilst all the great economists, Mr. John Stuart Mill, and Mr. Fawcett, whom we mention with all reverence now he is on his sick bed—while all have been Malthusians, they again have kept it dark, and have not carried out to a legitimate extent their Malthusian programme. Mr. Bradlaugh, his friend Mrs. Besant, Dr. Drysdale, and others, have had the courage, in face of the greatest difficulties, and in spite of all opposition, and the natty-minded suggestions of natty-minded people—(loud cheers)—have had the courage to speak out plainly and clearly. Mr. Bradlaugh felt that starvation was caused by the pressure of population against the means of subsistence, and that, therefore, the only remedy was to limit population. I don't agree with him. I believe that Socialism is the remedy which will, in the end, come into operation. But all the more I honestly admire him for having spoken out so plainly and suffered so much as he has done, in that matter. (Cheers.) Now I propose to give you two or three reasons why I protest against the action of the House of Commons in excluding Mr. Bradlaugh, and, of course, the first reason is simply a constitutional one. According to the Christian ideal the State is a very sacred thing indeed, and the theory of the English State is that every single grown person is to have a voice in the government of the country. We know
we have not quite got up to the ideal yet, but still that is the theory. The representatives meet in the House of Commons simply because it is impossible for everybody—the whole body of the people—to meet to transact the business of the country on account of the vastness of the numbers. But there has grown up a kind of notion that the House of Commons is a kind of club, and that the members of that club have some kind of right to object to this or that kind of man joining them unless they approve of him. (Laughter. It sounds almost ridiculous when you put it in that way, but that is practically what it comes to. (Cheers) We must protest against that with all the force we can. It is for simple constitutional rights you are standing up. It has not anything to do really with the opinions I have just expressed with regard to Mr. Bradlaugh. If Mr. Bradlaugh were the most tremendous Tory on the face of the earth it would be just as much your duty to fight the constitutional question, and place him in the position to which you sent him (Cheers.) Then I object very much to the action of the House of Commons on the ground of the damage done to true religion even by the appearance of religious people trying to gag an opponent. A country rector telegraphed to Sir Stafford Northcote on the occasion of the first agitation on this matter: "It is you who are making Atheist wholesale." (Loud cheers.) And, without doubt, to one who has not really seriously studied the principles of Christianity as apart from the practice of the large majority of Christians, and especially of Christian officers and clergymen, it must seem as if our religion were a very weak thing indeed if it were just to topple over because Mr. Bradlaugh got into the House of Commons. (Cheers.) That is what a large majority of Christians seem to think. I think it is a most suicidal thing to try to gag any kind of opinion, that in the end it always acts against the person who tries to gag the opinion and for the person who is gagged. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Bradlaugh—whose opinions on religion I object to very strongly—is very much strengthened by the action of the so-called Christians in the House of Commons. (Loud cheers.) And now to go a little more into detail in reference to the action of these Christians. They say, you know, it would be blasphemy for Mr. Bradlaugh to take the oath. Well, now, that is not a logical position to take up. How can an Atheist blaspheme? When Mr. Bradlaugh was willing to take the oath, though he preferred not to, it strikes me that his action in the matter, though not as politic as it might have been, has been most straightforward and honorable. (Cheers.) He felt that people would be distressed by his using the phrase "So help me God," and so he wished to make the simple affirmation which was made by Quakers and others. When people tell you that he would blaspheme when he said the words "So help me God," and that he would be false to his principles, I cannot see what they are talking about. The word "God" has no meaning to him, he does not understand it in any definite sense; but the oath would be binding on him though the word "God" had no meaning to him. He would rather not use a word which has no meaning to him, but which is sacred to many people; though if the law of the land compels him to do so he will do so. And if any nonsensical words were used at the end of the oath he would use those if he were called upon to do so. To Mr. Bradlaugh the word "God" is nonsensical, that is, it is without sense to him—conveys no definite idea to his mind, and so he would much rather not use it; but if compelled to use it he will use it There seems to me nothing at all in any way shrinking difficulties in the course he has taken, or in any way fencing the matter, but it all appears to me perfectly straightforward, and that the Christians who accuse him of offering to blaspheme are really talking about what they do not understand. (Cheers.) Now Mr. Bradlaugh's opponents in the House of Commons may, it seems to me, be divided into three classes; and it is rather important to consider them. First of all, there are the really earnest religious people, and they deserve very great respect for their honesty. One such, the vicar of this parish, wrote to me when he saw I was advertised to come here, protesting very strongly against me so doing. I most truly believe him to be a most earnest, honest, and well-intentioned man—(laughter and cheers)—but of course, I could not for a moment think that a clergyman of a parish has the right or the responsibility or the duty to settle what lectures should be given in the public Town Hall which happens to be in his parish. If the Rector of a certain church in Piccadilly were held responsible for all the songs sung and the speeches made at St. James' Hall, or the Vicar of St. Michael's, Burleigh Street, for all that was done in Exeter Hall, they would have a great deal of responsibility on their shoulders which it would be difficult to bear. And though I very much respect the earnestness of purpose of the Vicar of the parish in regard to his lecture, he is one of those who I understand are earnest, religious opponents of Mr. Bradlaugh, and such people, who are in earnest, deserve our sympathy and respect. But while these religious people deserve our respect on account of their earnestness, one cannot say very much for their common sense. (Laughter and cheers.) They seem to think that if Mr. Bradlaugh were to say very steadily for some time, and his followers were to say for some time : "There is no God," that it would make some difference, that it would make it an open question. That is the line they seem to take. They seem to think that the negations of these few men—for there are only a few men Atheists in the country—that it might have some serious effect on the Christian faith. My line is quite plain. I know as far as I know anything about the Christian religion, that though Atheists say they don't know God, God knows them, is speaking to them. (Hear, hear.) I say that Mr. Bradlaugh and his followers so far as they do good work are inspired by God to do it. (Cheers.) And that is the line I hope you will take with Christian opponents in this town. Make them understand that Christ taught that all good works came from God's good
Spirit. It is really blasphemy to say that anybody does any good except by means of God's good spirit. (Cheers.) And if you acknowledge, as everybody is bound to acknowledge, that Mr. Bradlaugh's political work is good work, then you are bound to acknowledge that that comes from God's good spirit, though Mr. Bradlaugh and his Secularist friends do not acknowledge the source of it (Cheers) Religious people—though I don't like to say it—are real blasphemers in this matter. It is they who are dragging the religion of Christ in the mud; it is they who are denying the great truth that Jesus Christ is the great emancipator, the great deliverer, the Secularist Reformer, who seeks the establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven upon Earth—it is they who are the blasphemers, not Mr Bradlaugh. It is these good people whose earnestness I respect very much, but whose logical position I cannot understand. (Cheers.) Then there is another set of people who oppose Mr. Bradlaugh very strongly, political opponents. Many of them, of course, use a certain show of religion on this matter, but I am afraid we cannot say the House of Commons, or the majority of the House of Commons, who are opposing Mr. Bradlaugh consists entirely of earnest religious people. (Hear, hear) But there are political opponents who, as you know, are very glad of the Bradlaugh incident as a weapon with which to strike a blow at Mr. Gladstone and to hinder the progress of Liberal measures. (Cheers.) For such people I have no respect whatever. For the earnest religious man who thinks he must keep Mr. Bradlaugh out of the House of Commons, for the honor of God, I can have respect—(cheers)—but the man who tries to discredit reform and a great Liberal statesman by trying to oppose Mr. Bradlaugh, deserves no pity from us, and I hope all such will be very well remembered at the next election (Loud cheers.) Then there are also those, both in the House of Commons and out of it, who may be called the social opponents of Mr. Bradlaugh, to whom Mr. Bradlaugh's social opinions are very dreadful This is the kind of thing you hear in London drawing-rooms. I have had the satisfaction of meeting a good large body of clergymen who felt that Mr. Bradlaugh's social and moral position was so dreadful that nobody ought to associate with him, and "having it out" with them, I found they were very ignorant of the matter; and they have no right to speak of Mr. Bradlaugh or any other man without knowing. (Cheers.) But still the talk of these people, just as the talk of the London drawing-rooms, is ignorant talk, and as such it must be simply met and answered as far as possible. The little body of clergy to whom I have referred already I was able to convince that Mr. Bradlaugh was not the dreadful, terrible anti-social person they thought he was. The great joke from my point of view was their speaking of Mr. Bradlaugh as a dreadful socialist, the very last thing he is. He is a stern political economist of the Malthusian type. When the matter was explained to them they saw it in a different light. That explanation has been going on in various ways and must go on still. But the social argument against admitting Mr. Bradlaugh into Parliament, even if it were all they say it is, should be of no weight what ever. You would have a precious time of it, if you were going to have an enquiry into the moral character—using "moral" in the narrow sense of the word—of every member of Parliament before he took his seat. (Laughter and cheers.) If people who were not acceptable in London drawing-rooms were not to be admitted into the House of Commons, you would have a very curious House of Commons indeed. (Renewed laughter) But if this were true it would have nothing to do with the question, because the House of Commons is not a great social club, but the great representative body of the whole nation. (Cheers,) These, then, are the three classes of opponents, the religious, the political, and the social, and the chief people with whom Mr. Bradlaugh and his fellows have to deal I cannot help saying that especial blame is attaching in this matter to those persons to whom I have referred as weak-kneed Liberals. (Hear, hear.; There is something consistent in the Conservative action: it may be rather sharp practice. But the action of the weak-kneed Liberals, like Mr. Sam. Morley—(hisses)—and others, is so inconsistent that it makes me tremble for the future of Liberalism—when you find people are only Liberal so far as it suits their convenience, and won't carry their principles to their legitimate conclusion. You found it in the French Republic, when the executive was so very illiberal towards the religious societies in France; and I was proud to find that Mr. Bradlaugh was one of the few people who protested, in the National Reformer, against the action of the French Republic. So he seemed to be a true Liberal. Though he could have but little sympathy with those religious societies, he felt the importance of giving fair-play all round. I say to my weak-kneed friends: "Take care that a terrible day is not awaiting you. The day may come when Mr. Bradlaugh and his friends will be in power; and suppose they treat you as you treat them, and they refuse to let any religious person be in Parliament, and they use physical force against religion, as you have against irreligion—you would be treated in a way that would serve you right, though in a way that no honest Radical would ever treat you." (Loud cheers.) I think I must have exhausted your patience pretty well by this time. (Cries of "Go on!") I don't know how right I am in feeling personally that, greatly as I respect Mr. Gladstone, he is to some extent to blame for not having put his foot down firmly in this matter. (Loud cheers) I know there are those, and some of Mr. Bradlaugh's best friends, who say Mr. Gladstone is perfectly right, that Mr. Bradlaugh has now a constitutional right to enter Parliament, that to pass a law to let him in would be giving in to the unconstitutional action which keeps him out, and that we must bide our time. But still, in a matter of practical politics like this, if Mr. Gladstone, instead of being so fond of Mr. Bradlaugh as Lord Randolph Churchill tried to make out, had not had a shuddering objection to Mr. Bradlaugh on account
of his religious principles, and if he had put his foot down rather more strongly than he did at first, the difficulty would have been got over. (Cheers.) However, perhaps I do wrong, being so young in the cause, to criticise his work. These, then, are the main matters I wish to bring before you with reference to Mr. Bradlaugh's case and views of it as a Christian clergyman. I am so much in the habit of having discussion after my lectures, that if there is anyone who wishes to ask a question, or to put the other side of the question to see how far I am right in this matter, I should be glad to answer his questions. I feel very strongly indeed from the Christian standpoint that my position is perfectly strong, that Jesus Christ is above everything else, the Emancipator of the People, the Defender of the Oppressed, and the great Secular Worker of the World; and that, therefore, all those who go in for the emancipation of the people, and the Secular well-being of the people, should be supported by Christians—that the fact of their calling themselves Atheists does not separate them from you by any means, and that we are bound to give, if possible, more than justice to those whom we differ from in these matters. The religious people of North-hampton should say: "Now at any rate Mr. Bradlaugh is the elect of this town, and we will show that we feel, because we are Christians, we wish justice to be done, more to an opponent than we should have wished a friend." (Cheers.) If there are any questions put to me I shall be happy to answer them. (Loud Cheers.)

No question being asked,

Mr. Headlam again rose and said: I see I am announced as the curate of St. Michael's, Shoreditch, London. I should not like to come here under any false pretences, and I should not like it to be thought that I represented anyone but myself. It so happens that on account of my political teaching my connexion with St. Michael's will soon be brought to a conclusion. The Church of England is in this envious position, that the clergy are not elected by the people, but are forced on the people by this or that patron, and the curate is the servant, the almost absolute servant, of the Vicar, who may dismiss him as he chooses. I have been on very good terms with my Vicar, but he finds my political teaching is too strong for his friends, so we have to part. (Laughter and cheers.) You must take my utterances as the expression of my own opinion, and not the opinion of any Church Society. (Loud cheers.)
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Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster.

To His Eminence Henry Edward,

Three times your Eminence has—through the pages of the Nineteenth Century—personally and publicly interfered and used the weight of your ecclesiastical position against me in the Parliamentary struggle in which I am engaged, although you are neither voter in the borough for which I am returned to sit, nor even co-citizen in the state to which I belong. Your personal position is that of a law-breaker, one who has deserted his sworn allegiance and thus forfeited his citizenship, one who is tolerated by English forbearance, but is liable to indictment for misdemeanor as "member of a society of the Church of Rome." More than once, when the question of my admission to the House of Commons has been under discussion in that House, have I seen you busy in the lobby closely attended by the devout and sober Philip Callan, or some other equally appropriate Parliamentary henchman. Misrepresenting what had taken place in the House of Commons when I took my seat on affirmation in July, 1880, your Eminence wrote in the Nineteenth Century for August, 1880, that which you were pleased to entitle "An Englishman's Protest" against my being allowed to sit in the Commons' House, to which the vote of a free constituency had duly returned me. In that protest you blundered alike in your law and in your history. You gave the Tudor Parliamentary oath Saxon and Norman antiquity. You spoke of John Horne Tooke as having had the door of the House shut against him by a by-vote, no such by-vote having been carried, and the statute which disabled clergymen in the future not affecting John Horne Tooke's seat in that Parliament. You declared that in the French Revolution the French voted out the Supreme Being; there is no record of any such vote. In March, 1882, when the House had expelled me for my disobedience of its orders in complying with the law, and taking my seat, you again used the Nineteenth Century. This time for a second protest, intended to prevent my re-election. You, in both your articles, reminded the bigots that I might be indicted for
blasphemy. Your advice has since been followed. Persecution is a "two-edged sword," and I return the warning you offer to Lord Sherbrooke. When I was in Paris some time since, and was challenged to express an opinion as to the enforcement of the law against the religious orders in France, I, not to the pleasure of many of my friends, spoke out very freely that in matters of religion I would use the law against none; but your persecuting spirit may provoke intemperate men even farther than you dream. In this country, by the 10th George IV., cap. 7, sees. 28 and 29, 31, 32 and 34, you are criminally indictable, Cardinal-Archbishop of Westminster. You only reside here without police challenge by the merciful forbearance of the community. And yet you parade in political contest your illegal position as "a member of a religious order of the Church of Rome," and have the audacity to invoke outlawry and legal penalty against me. Last month, in solemn state, you, in defiance of the law, in a personal and official visit to the borough of Northampton itself, sought to weaken the confidence of my constituents; and you were not ashamed, in order to injure me, to pretend friendship with men who have for years constantly and repeatedly used the strongest and foulest abuse of your present Church. An amiable but ignorant Conservative mayor, chief magistrate of the borough, but innocent of statutes, was misled into parading his official robe and office while you openly broke the law in his presence. In the current number of the Nineteenth Century you fire your last shot, and are coarse in Latin as well as in the vulgar tongue. Perhaps the frequenting Philip Callan has spoiled your manners. It else seems impossible that one who was once a cultured scholar and a refined gentleman could confuse with legitimate argument the abuse of his opponents as "cattle." But who are you, Henry Edward Manning, that you should throw stones at me, and should so parade your desire to protect the House of Commons from contamination? At least, first take out of it the drunkard and the dissolute of your own Church. You know them well enough. Is it the oath alone which stirs you? Your tenderness on swearing comes very late in life. When you took orders as a deacon of the English Church, in presence of your bishop, you swore "so help me, God," that you did from your "heart abhor, detest and abjure," and, with your hand on the "holy gospels," you declared that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preeminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm." You may now well write of men "whom no oath can bind." The oath you took you have broken; and yet it was because you had, in the very church itself, taken this oath, that you for many years held more than one profitable preferment in the Established Church of England. You indulge in inuendoes against my character in order to do me mischief, and viciously insinuate as though my life had in it justification for good men's abhorrence. In this you are very cowardly as well as very false. Then, to move the timid, you suggest "the fear of eternal punishment," as associated with a broken oath. Have you any such fear? or have you been personally conveniently absolved from the "eternal" consequences of your perjury? Have you since sworn another oath before another bishop of another church, or made some solemn vow to Rome, in lieu of, and in contradiction to, the one you so took in presence of your bishop, when, "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," that bishop of the church by law established in this country accepted your oath, and gave you authority as a deacon in the Church you have since forsaken. I do not blame you so much that you are forsworn: there are, as you truly say, "some men whom no oath can bind and it has often been the habit of the cardinals of your Church to take an oath and break it when profit came with breach; but your remembrance of your own perjury might at least keep you reticent in very shame. Instead of this, you thrust yourself impudently into a purely political contest, and shout as if the oath were to you the most sacred institution possible. You say "there are happily some men who believe in God and fear him." Do you do either? You, who declared, "So help me, God" that no foreign "prelate .... ought to have any jurisdiction or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm." And you—who in spite of your declaration on oath have courted and won, intrigued for and obtained, the archbishop's authority and the cardinal's hat from the Pope of Rome—you rebuke Lord Sherbrooke for using the words "sin and shame" in connexion with oath-taking; do you hold now that there was no sin and no shame in your broken oath? None either in the rash taking or the wilful breaking? Have you no personal shame that you have broken your oath? Or do the pride and pomp of your ecclesiastical position outbrine your conscience? You talk of the people understanding the words "so help me, God." How do you understand them of your broken oath? Do they mean to you: "May God desert and forsake me as I deserted and forsook the Nineteenth Century? You fire your last shot, and are coarse in Latin as well as in the vulgar tongue. Perhaps the frequenting Philip Callan has spoiled your manners. It else seems impossible that one who was once a cultured scholar and a refined gentleman could confuse with legitimate argument the abuse of his opponents as "cattle." But who are you, Henry Edward Manning, that you should throw stones at me, and should so parade your desire to protect the House of Commons from contamination? At least, first take out of it the drunkard and the dissolute of your own Church. You know them well enough. Is it the oath alone which stirs you? Your tenderness on swearing comes very late in life. When you took orders as a deacon of the English Church, in presence of your bishop, you swore "so help me, God," that you did from your "heart abhor, detest and abjure," and, with your hand on the "holy gospels," you declared that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, preeminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm." You may now well write of men "whom no oath can bind." The oath you took you have broken; and yet it was because you had, in the very church itself, taken this oath, that you for many years held more than one profitable preferment in the Established Church of England. You indulge in inuendoes against my character in order to do me mischief, and viciously insinuate as though my life had in it justification for good men's abhorrence. In this you are very cowardly as well as very false. Then, to move the timid, you suggest "the fear of eternal punishment," as associated with a broken oath. Have you any such fear? or have you been personally conveniently absolved from the "eternal" consequences of your perjury? Have you since sworn another oath before another bishop of another church, or made some solemn vow to Rome, in lieu of, and in contradiction to, the one you so took in presence of your bishop, when, "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," that bishop of the church by law established in this country accepted your oath, and gave you authority as a deacon in the Church you have since forsaken. I do not blame you so much that you are forsworn: there are, as you truly say, "some men whom no oath can bind and it has often been the habit of the cardinals of your Church to take an oath and break it when profit came with breach; but your remembrance of your own perjury might at least keep you reticent in very shame. Instead of this, you thrust yourself impudently into a purely political contest, and shout as if the oath were to you the most sacred institution possible. You say "there are happily some men who believe in God and fear him." Do you do either? You, who declared, "So help me, God" that no foreign "prelate .... ought to have any jurisdiction or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm." And you—who in spite of your declaration on oath have courted and won, intrigued for and obtained, the archbishop's authority and the cardinal's hat from the Pope of Rome—you rebuke Lord Sherbrooke for using the words "sin and shame" in connexion with oath-taking; do you hold now that there was no sin and no shame in your broken oath? None either in the rash taking or the wilful breaking? Have you no personal shame that you have broken your oath? Or do the pride and pomp of your ecclesiastical position outbrine your conscience? You talk of the people understanding the words "so help me, God." How do you understand them of your broken oath? Do they mean to you: "May God desert and forsake me as I deserted and forsook the Queen's supremacy, to which I so solemnly swore allegiance"? You speak of men being kept to their allegiance by the oath "which binds them to their sovereign." You say such men may be tempted by ambition or covetousness unless they are bound by "the higher and more sacred responsibility" involved in the "recognition of the lawgiver in the oath." Was the Rector of Lavington and Graffham covetous of an archbishopric that he broke his oath? Was the Archdeacon of Chichester ambitious of the Cardinal's hat that he became so readily forsworn? Lord Archbishop of Westminster, had you, when you were apostate, remained a poor and simple priest in poverty and self-denial, although your oath would have still been broken, yet you might have taunted others more profited by their perjuries. But you, who have derived profit, pride, and pomp from your false swearing—you, who sign yourself "Henry Edward, Cardinal-Archbishop" by favor of the very authority you abjured in the name of God—it is in the highest degree indecent and indecorous for you to parade yourself as a
defender of the sanctity of the oath. As a prince-prelate of the Church of Rome you have no right to meddle with the question of the English Parliamentary oath.

Your Church has been the foe of liberty through the world, and I am honored by your personal assailment. But you presume too much on the indifference of the age when, in this free England, you so recklessly exhibit as weapons in an election contest the outward signs of the authority the Vatican claims, but shall never again exercise, in Britain.
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The True Basis of Morality.

In these stirring times of inquiry, when everything is put to the test, and is required to show its raison d'être, when the existence of the supernatural is challenged, or denied, when the authority of the Bible is criticised, and by many rejected, when the old landmarks are being torn up, and there has not yet been time to root the new ones firmly in their places, there is a serious, and a very real, danger, that morality itself will for a time go down in the struggle, and will be trampled under foot by the combatants. It therefore becomes the duty of everyone who fights in the ranks of Freethought, and who ventures to attack the dogmas of the Churches, and to strike down the superstitions which enslave men's intellect, to beware how he uproots sanctions of morality which he is too weak to replace, or how, before he is prepared with better ones, he removes the barriers which do yet, however poorly, to some extent check vice and repress crime. In every revolution, be it political or religious, a grave responsibility rests on the leaders of the movement; if they venture to break the fetters which restrain the violent, and thus help to protect the weak, they must be prepared to afford safeguards which will continue to preserve society from anarchy, while they shall be free from the disadvantages of the restraints that have been destroyed. The leaders who strike down, but cannot build up, who can lead their followers to victory in the field, but cannot preserve order after the conquest, show that they are too weak for the task they have ventured to begin, and the weakness which results in misery to others is no longer a pardonable frailty—it is a crime. That which touches morality touches the heart of society; a high and pure morality is the life-blood of humanity; mistakes in belief are inevitable, and are of little moment; mistakes in life destroy happiness, and their destructive consequences spread far and wide. It is then a very important question whether we, who are endeavoring to take away from the world the authority on which has hitherto been based all its morality, can offer a new and firm ground whereupon may safely be built up the fair edifice of a noble life.

We ought, however, to start with a clearly-defined idea of what we mean by the word morality. Morality, in the usual acceptation of the term, is nothing more than obedience to certain arbitrary and conventional rules, rules which do not lie in the nature of things, and which do not appeal to the surrounding system of law for their authority: they are supernatural, not natural. But morality, in the deeper and truer meaning of the word, means harmony with natural order; physical morality is harmony with all those laws obedience to which results in physical vigor; and moral morality is harmony with all those laws obedience to which results in moral vigor. This definition really carries in it the whole gist of this essay, for, if morality be harmony with law, the true basis of morality must necessarily be sought for in the study of law, as manifested in phænomena. But we will examine first the grounds of morality generally offered, before proceeding to test the new basis. These grounds are, authority and intuition.

During the past ages of the world morality has been based wholly on authority; it has drawn its sanctions from the supposed will of the gods or god; it has been rendered alluring by bribes of heaven and enforced by threats of hell. It is the favorite argument of the upholders of a supernatural revelation, that we deprive them of all sure resting-place if we do not base morality on the revealed will of god, and they assert that those who reject the Bible have not, and cannot have, any "settled standard of morality." It is just as if it had been said at the beginning of the present century to the students of the newly-born science of geology: "You must take care whither you are drifting; certain truths about the formation of the world are revealed to you in the Bible, and on this sure ground you must build your geological theories; if you desert it, you may indeed discover a few isolated facts, but you will be wandering about in a labyrinth without a clue; you will have no 'settled standard' of geological truth." If geologians had deferred to this reasoning, geology would have been stifled at its birth;
yet there was truth in what was urged. If they cast their boat off from its Bible moorings they would go sailing off into the ocean of the unknown; they would have no "settled standard" by which to try their conclusions; they would have to be content to collect facts patiently, to collate them carefully, to reason from them, to reach conclusions slowly: only, when the conclusions were reached, they were sure, they were positive, they were true. The fact is, that while our opponents are perfectly right in saying that we shall have no "settled standard" to appeal to if we give up the Bible, they are perfectly wrong in thinking that a "settled standard" is a valuable thing to have. We merely lose a thing which is not only useless to us, but which is positively injurious, because it acts as a barrier to inquiry and discussion. There is no such thing as a settled standard of knowledge allowed in science; our utmost scientific achievements are not the measure of future attainments. Every newly-discovered fact, every assured advance, is not an approach to a "settled standard," but is only a vantage ground from which to scale new heights. Science is progressive; it knows no limits save the limits of human thought; it owns no bounds, save the iron boundary of the unknowable. If morality, like geology, and like every other department of human thought, is to have the gyves of revelation struck off its limbs, it must be removed from the basis of authority, and be transferred wholly to the basis of science. But science takes nothing for granted; it permits no assumptions to be reasoned from as though they were facts; it studies phenomena only, from phænomena it reasons up to laws. If moralists desire to construct a morality which will bear all assaults unshaken, and which can maintain its ground against hostile criticism, they must be content to give up their heaven-born theories, and to walk humbly in the path of the study of earth-born phænomena; they must follow the scientific method, and must be able to demonstrate the solidity of every position they take up. Hitherto morality has floated in the air, and has been supposed to be sustained there by cords let down from heaven; henceforth it must descend and tread firmly on the ground, so that it may grow into the ruler, the king, of men.

It is obvious to every careful and intelligent student of the Bible, that the morality laid down in that collection of ancient Jewish writings is not susceptible of being formed into a code of laws, which should throughout be consistent with each other. In fact, the Bible itself offers us numerous "standards of morality," some high, some low; varying, for instance, between the gross immorality practised by the "man after God's own heart," to the ascetic life and teachings of that "Son of man" in whom the "Father was" also "well pleased." This variety is inevitable from the nature of the case, for the books were written at long intervals of time; they incorporate many of the ancient and impure traditions of the early ages of the world, and they reflect, one after another, the gradual purification and civilisation of the people of whose literature they form the most important part. There is, therefore, nothing to be surprised at in the varying morality of the Bible; rather, it is just what was to be expected. And this has been seen in another light by liberal Christian commentators, and the most thoughtful Christian students have pointed out that the revelation of god's will given in the Bible is a gradual revelation, because of the "hardness of men's hearts," and that the light had to win its way slowly through the heavy clouds of human ignorance and folly. The morality of Genesis is lower than that of Romans, and the law of Moses is far inferior to the moral code attributed to Jesus of Nazareth. The fact of the supercession of the Jewish polity, and the installation in its room of the "kingdom of heaven," whose principles are sketched out in the Sermon on the Mount, shows that the morality of the Bible is not at one with itself throughout, but is essentially progressive and ascending. It is well to notice this, although I would not for a moment be understood to mean, that personally I attach any weight to the systems of morality found in the Bible above that which is due to all honest efforts of human thought; but in order to see that, although their own book sanctions moral growth, yet Christians are inconsistent enough to check the moral development of the race at the death of the immediate followers of Jesus. Here they build up a barrier over which morality for ever may not pass; here they mould an iron casing, beyond which morality may never grow. The deeds and thoughts stamped with the signet of Jesus and his Apostles are to be, for evermore, the highest virtues of morality; those, on the other hand, on which they frowned, are to be, for evermore, reprobated and accursed. If, however, morality is to be accepted on authority at all, it seems necessary to admit the soundness of the Christian position, and to allow that the tides of human morality can never rise higher than they did in Judæa eighteen hundred years ago. To the Western nations no moral authority is so venerable as that of the Bible, and no other book has so great a prescriptive claim on our obedience. If we reject this authority, there is no other authority to which we can logically defer; we may struggle to make good our footing on some other round of the ladder, but if we are not strong enough to mount to the embattled tower of reason, we must ultimately fall backwards into the yawning gulf of absolute submission. Only those who take as their guide knowledge instead of faith, those who submit to no authority quâ authority, but bow solely to the dictates of reason, those only have a right to reject the Bible as a moral teacher; there is no logical standpoint between entire submission to authority, and entire freedom of judgment; our opponents are continually urging this on waverers as a threat, and we reiterate the assertion as a deliberate and solemn warning; we had better quietly accept whatever is presented to us for our homage with a fair show of authority, if we are not prepared to take the trouble to "prove all things," and to follow, at whatever
pain, the guiding torch borne in the hand of Free Thought.

There exists a school of religionists who found morality on what poor Charles Lamb used to call "some awkward process of intuition." This school has something in common with the two opposing parties of submission and of freedom, but it has the strong points of neither. It claims that there is in man a certain faculty called the "moral sense," which is the god-given arbiter of right and wrong, and is the true authority in matters of morality; and it also claims freedom for the individual to follow his own moral sense, and to be judged by that. That the moral sense exists, may be admitted frankly and without dispute, and we will presently inquire what it is, and whence it arises; but we must see whether this sense is a safe guide in matters of morality, and whether intuition may be trusted. If morality be in harmony with natural order, if there be a law outside ourselves by conformity to which moral health and strength can alone be secured, it follows necessarily that a knowledge of this law cannot be arrived at by any process of intuition. All laws, if they exist at all, reveal their existence through the phenominal effects they produce, and it is by careful observation of these phænomena that we discover the law which guides them; in fact, what we call "laws" are in reality nothing more than the observed succession of phænomena, a succession which is invariable, so far as our observation has extended. But an objective law cannot be reached by the subjective process of intuition; it is as unreasonable to hope to discover a moral law through intuition, as to hope thus to discover a physical law. No true advance was made in physics until men gave up guessing, and began to study facts; and no true advance will be made in morals until the same plan be pursued. It seems, however, a waste of time to bring proofs of this, because one fatal defect promptly disposes of the claims of intuition as a safe and reliable basis for morality. Intuition, or moral instinct, to be of any real value, must be fairly universal in its testimony; but intuitional morality is as variable as the various nations of the earth. It depends on civilisation, on custom, on habit; intuition does not speak one moral language, it speaks in many tongues; it varies its dictates according to the use of the people. That which is moral to the Thug is hideous immorality to the European; the highest virtue of the one is the worst crime of the other. It has been seriously urged that, if the Thug lived up to the light within him, he would no longer sacrifice to his terrible goddess; but it is very difficult to see why the European should lay down his intuition as the rule of morality, if he maintains that intuition is a universal gift to all from the "Father of Spirits." To say that intuition is god's voice in the soul of man, and then to exalt one set of intuitions as the rule for the world, is simply to juggle with words, and to set up a new authority on the pedestal whence the old has been taken down. It is a new "thus saith the Lord," without the venerable age of the Bible to recommend it, without the sanction of ages, or the tender memories of childhood and of home; and yet it threatens to usurp over men's souls an authority as absolute as that of the supernatural revelation, an authority which is already impatient of opposition, and arrogant in self-assertion. Who is to decide on the true morality, when so many claimants start up, all basing their right to be heard on the fact that they are the voice of intuition? If the reason and the judgment are to be called in to decide between them, a hard blow is struck at the idea that intuition is the voice of god, speaking in the soul of man. For if one intuition be pronounced to speak justly, then all other intuitions, speaking at variance with it, must be held to be false; the reason and judgment of one man will choose differently from the reason and judgment of his neighbor; and so there will be many divine voices, contradicting each other, a result not consonant either with reason or with reverence. Besides, if intuition deceives our fellow creatures on all sides, are we wise, or even safe, in trusting it in our own cases? Is there any particular reason why our intuition should be the intuition? Against this party the Christian has always ready to his hand the crushing retort, that intuitive morality varies according to the customs of various races, and, if no surer basis for morality can be found than the shifting sands of intuition, the Bible is, after all, the safer guide of the two, because the more intelligible to the mass. The real truth is, that intuition is only the result of transmitted moral tendencies; it is a conveniently vague word under which to group certain movements of the mind, which are governed by laws at present unknown to us. Instinct—and intuition is only moral instinct—is, so far as we yet know, a tendency to do certain actions without thought, and this tendency arises from our ancestors having done these actions for generation after generation, until the doing became a habit, transmitted from parent to child. Instinct is the accumulated experience of the race impressed upon the brain of the yet unborn creature, and moulding many of its habits before any personal thought or experience comes in. And so intuition, or the moral sense, is the accumulated moral experience of the race, and is transmitted to the individual with his outward frame; this experience varies with the race, and thus it happens that the moral instinct of the Thug differs so widely from that of the European; the previous experience of his ancestors is different from that of the ancestors of the European, and just as he receives a different physique, so does he receive a different morale. Instinct varies with the experience of those through whom it is transmitted, and intuition, however poetically it may be described, or however artistically it may be gilded, is nothing more than moral instinct, subject to all the laws which guide instinct throughout the world. The moral sense, as found in the European, and as cultured by the highest existing civilisation, is doubtless generally—though by no means universally—a fair guide to right and wrong. But the utmost the moral sense can do towards forming a true
science of morality, is to offer a good working hypothesis round which facts may conveniently be grouped, which hypothesis must ultimately be disproved or verified, according to its disagreement or agreement with the result of the collated facts.

It is convenient to notice here a slight mental confusion sometimes arising as to the province of the moral faculty, commonly called Conscience. It is often said that Conscience directs man to hate evil, and to love good. There is considerable confusion of thought in this idea. Conscience does not enable a man to discern between good and evil: the decision as to the morality or immorality of an action is made by the reason, whether that reason be enlightened or unenlightened. All that conscience does is to urge the man to follow that which the reason declares to be right. When the brain has declared "such and such a thing is good," then the conscience says, "do it." If the reason judge falsely, the conscience will then point to the wrong action as a duty, and thus it has happened that some of the worst actions in the world have been done at the command of conscience. The most cruel persecutions have been carried out with perfect conscientiousness, and priests, with streaming eyes and bleeding hearts, have burned heretics to the "greater glory of God." Conscience is not a safe guide—in fact, it is no guide at all; it is not the eye which chooses the path, but the foot which blindly carries us wherever the brain directs.

If authority and intuition both fail us, to what are we to turn? There is only one ground left to us—a humble ground, but a very sure one; a ground called cold by some, but found by those who build thereon to be warm with the sunshine of Truth; a ground called hard and dry by some, but found by those who toil thereon to be covered with the fragrant violet flowers of rewarded labor, to be softened by gentle showers from heaven, on whose falling drops glisten the rays of the rising sun, making them glow with the fairy hues of the rainbow-arch of Hope. The true basis of morality is utility; that is, the adaptation of our actions to the promotion of the general welfare and happiness, the endeavor so to rule our lives that we may serve and bless mankind. Through the scientific method only can the true rules of morality be discovered, and an irrefragable answer returned to all questionings concerning right and wrong. The first step towards building up a science of morality is to collect facts, and as in other sciences facts are collected by the observation of surrounding phenomena, so must moral facts be collected by the observation of moral phenomena, facts in sociology, recorded in history. We must find out, by careful analysis, what courses have tended most to the advancement and ennoblement of society; we must trace out the results of various lines of conduct, and see which have best promoted the general welfare of the race. That which promotes the general happiness is right; that which lessens or undermines the general happiness is wrong. These are the axioms on which a scientific morality must be grounded.

The selection of the production of happiness as the ultimate test of right and wrong, is a theory of morals which is objected to by many, who desire to cling to a transcendental philosophy, and who cry out that to aim at happiness only is a low and despicable rule of life. Miss Francos Power Cobbe, one of the best-known leaders of the Theistic and intuitional school, especially combats the idea that men should so direct their conduct as to make the securing of happiness their ultimate end: virtue, she protests, is the end for which moral and intelligent beings should live. We will not follow her through the somewhat strange logic by which she proves that moral and finite beings must necessarily be imperfect, or ask how it comes to pass that, although two infinites are "mathematically impossible," it is yet possible that infinite and finite can exist together; these questions, however interesting, do not involve the point to which we wish to draw attention. She urges that virtue and not happiness is the true aim of life, and we challenge her to show that by aiming at what she calls virtue she is not really aiming at happiness. For what is virtue but the highest good, and the keenest gratification attainable by man? When she urges that men should be ready to undergo suffering, and to encounter trial and pain, in order to be true to themselves, and to do good to others, she is in reality only bidding us to resign lower pleasures for higher ones, selfish pleasures for unselfish, physical pleasures for moral. Opponents of utilitarianism generally fall into the error of speaking of the happiness which is set forward as the criterion of morality, as though it only included the lower kinds of pleasure and animal enjoyment. But the happiness which is intended by utilitarians includes every possible phase of physical, mental, and moral enjoyment. Miss Cobbe ought not to fall into this common misrepresentation, for she begins by rightly defining happiness as the gratification of all the desires of our nature: she then somewhat oddly argues that happiness cannot be the true end of life, because we must often resign some of the desires of our nature in order to do right. If utilitarians aimed at securing perfect happiness, which is impossible, her arguments would have some force, but as they only aim at securing the greatest attainable amount of happiness, this portion of her strictures falls to the ground. She then drops the true definition of happiness out of sight, and always afterwards speaks of "happiness" as though it consisted only of sensual and material gratification. She considers that virtue and happiness are antithetic, and that they clash when virtue "bids us suffer hunger and cold that we may feed and clothe others," oblivious of the truth that generous self-sacrifice affords a keener and a fuller pleasure than sensual gratification. Although a virtuous man may renounce some material enjoyment in order to do right, or to aid others, yet in that very renunciation he wins a moral happiness greater than the resigned material one.
Thus it is perfectly consonant with utility to resign a personal gratification for a mental exertion, or to give up a
personal gratification for the keener and nobler pleasure of doing a kindness to another. To do a virtuous action
at the cost of material suffering, is really to aim at a purer pleasure than the pleasure resigned; it is to climb
higher up on the mountain of happiness, to an elevation where the air is brighter and more exhilarating.

Carefully analysed, the aiming at virtue is the aiming at happiness; all things that cause happiness are
naturally desirable to us, and we "desire" virtue. Why? Surely because virtue is an indispensable part of all true
and solid happiness. Happiness cannot exist without virtue, because a virtuous action is an action that tends to
the benefit of society, or to some special part of society; and to say that an action tends to the benefit of society,
the same thing as saying that it tends to the happiness of society. Miss Cobbe might retort that she desires
virtue, not in order that she may be happy, but because by being virtuous she pleases god. But why does she
desire to please god? Is it not because in so doing she finds her truest rest, her purest happiness? If a course of
action she believed to be virtuous brought her not only material loss, but internal discomfort, if it hindered
prayer, and clouded spiritual light, would she not immediately conclude that her judgment had erred, and that
the inner unhappiness proved that the course was a wrong one? Unhappiness, like pain, is Nature's check to
our mistakes, and her spur to our indolence. All that we desire, we desire because the gain of it will give us
pleasure. Is any one so unnaturally constituted as to desire pain because it is pain? Even ascetics endure pain
only in the hope of a thereby-won future bliss. We may submit to suffering willingly when it is the means to a
greater good, a good which can only be attained through the suffering; but no one in the possession of their
faculties selects undesirable—i.e., unpleasant—things in preference to pleasant. So that all that the teachers
who make virtue the supreme end of life really tell us is, that when a lower and higher pleasure come into
antagonism, we are to select the higher, and let the lower go—an opinion in which we are all perfectly agreed.
But it is, after all, only reasonable that happiness should be the ultimate test of right and wrong, if we live, as
we do, in a realm of law. Obedience to law must necessarily result in harmony, and disobedience in discord.
But if obedience to law result in harmony, it must also result in happiness; for when our actions are in harmony
with each other and with our environment, they find nothing against which they can jar, and a feeling of
satisfaction arises from the consciousness of this smooth working—i.e., we feel happiness. All through nature
obedience to law results in happiness, and through obedience each living thing fulfils the perfection of its being,
and in that perfection finds its true happiness.

As unconsciously as M. Jourdain had been speaking prose all his life, so have societies of men based their
morality on utility. As men grew out of utter barbarism, and began to form a society, certain laws became
necessary to keep that society together. The good of the whole had to be considered, and arrangements had to
be made for its promotion. On what were these laws based except on utility? Murder and theft were forbidden.
Why? Because the half-savage citizen's intuitions were against them? Not at all; but because men could not live
together in security if these things were allowed. Lying became a sin, because it was found to destroy all
confidence between man and man, and because confidence was necessary for the successful and convenient
carrying on of work. The distinction between virtue and vice has been gradually evolved, through one course of
action being proved to be beneficial, and the contrary course being proved to be hurtful to society. The very
intuitions on which some modern religiousists pride themselves, were primarily based on the utility they despise.
By the sharp test of "the survival of the fittest," certain actions have been stamped as good, others as bad. We,
"heirs of the ages" gone before, inherit those habit-views of right and wrong, which the moral experience of
mankind has proved to be, roughly speaking, for the good of the community. Our task now is to correct these
"rough and ready" views of morality by a just and careful revision, to sift and systematise the facts which lie
ready to our hand, and to carefully collect and collate other moral phænomena. From these collected and
collated facts must be deduced the laws of morality, which, based on undeniable phænomena, will have all the
certainty that science, and science alone, can give. Scientific morality has this great advantage over both
authoritative and intuitive, that it stands on firm, unassailable ground; new facts will alter its details, but they
can never touch its method; like all other sciences it is at once positive and progressive. Of course, in regarding
its bearing on happiness as the true criterion of the morality of any given course, utilitarians consider the
general rather than the individual good. A course of conduct is right or wrong according as it promotes, or
injures, the general happiness. No scientific law can be based on a solitary phænomenon, and a law of morality
must be grounded on a wide survey of that which tends to promote the welfare of society as a whole. It may
often be found that individual happiness suffers by obedience to a law which yet promotes the well-being of the
community, and it is therefore necessary not to jump too hastily to a conclusion that a given course is wrong
because in some special case an individual suffers by following it. Individual happiness would sometimes be
promoted by a course which, if followed by all, would destroy the general happiness, and, in such a case, the
individual must sacrifice himself to the good of the many.

No accusation which has been levelled at Utilitarianism shows so entire an ignorance of its teaching as does
the accusation that it inculcates—or at least nourishes—selfishness of an evil kind. Utility teaches that the
general happiness is to be the aim of the individual. The criterion of an action of A.B. is not whether A.B. thereby secures or increases his own happiness, but whether the tendency of the action is beneficial or detrimental to society. If A.B. secures his own happiness by a course which injures others, or which, if generally pursued, would be prejudicial to the interests of the community, he is at once condemned by the principles of utility, even although he may have thereby increased his own individual happiness. Mr. J. S. Mill justly remarks that the standard of Utilitarianism "is not the agent's own greatest happiness, but the greatest amount of happiness altogether; and if it may possibly be doubted whether a noble character is always the happier for its nobleness, there can be no doubt that it makes other people happier, and that the world in general is immensely the gainer by it." It is one of the great merits of Utilitarianism that it cultivates the social feelings, and tends to bind men into a brotherhood, wherein the good of all is the aim of each. The new morality will indeed lessen individual suffering by removing some foolish and conventional restrictions which now exist—restrictions which sacrifice individual happiness without thereby insuring some greater social good. There is, at present, a large amount of individual suffering caused by the accepted and arbitrary system of morality, which is productive of no wider happiness; and, being unnecessary, is therefore unjust. Utility would allow to each individual every possible freedom of development, and every facility for ensuring his private happiness, which did not conflict with the welfare of society, or trench on the rights of others. But its moral laws will be the more rigid and the sterner because they will be based on facts. Law is rigid. All Nature's laws are stern; but it is utterly futile to fight against them, and to cry out that they are cruelly inexorable. When, by careful study of facts, by keen analysis of the consequences of actions, by wide surveys of the happiness and unhappiness caused by opposite courses of conduct, moralists are able to say that such and such deeds are right, and such and such are wrong, the wise will accommodate themselves to the laws which surround them, and adapt themselves to the necessary conditions of their being. Moral laws exist just as much as do physical laws; and even as inquiry into physical laws has enabled us to combat disease, and to spread health and comfort, so will inquiry into moral laws enable us to heal society of the terrible evils with which it is afflicted.

But if a law must not be based on a single fact, neither must it be drawn hastily from passing phenomena. The individual may snatch at a temporary good, which would promote his present, at the cost of his future, welfare; thus a man commits excesses in food or drink, and thereby ruins his physical powers; or he is sensual and destroys his health. No course of conduct can be more contrary to the utilitarian code of morality. The agent has actually sacrificed permanent health and strength for the gratification of passing impulses. Instead of aiming at the greatest possible happiness, he has grasped at the poorest and most fleeting.

It will doubtless be remarked that in the ground which is suggested in this essay, as the true basis of morality, no reference whatever has been made to the supposed will of "God as a Moral Governor," or to any idea of pleasing him. The omission is made deliberately and intentionally. Round the idea of god rages, at the present day, much fierce debate; the nature and existence of god are problems which are keenly investigated and hotly disputed. Most schools of thought agree that the existence of god is not demonstrable; many of our deepest thinkers reject altogether the idea of god. Men and women, who have mental and moral courage enough to face this gravest of all questions, find themselves compelled to renounce, one by one, all the notions of the deity which once they held. They see that the attributes ascribed to him by Christian and devout Theist are but projected into boundless space, and dignified by the title of infinite, are bound up together into one ideal heroic figure, that will, personality, intelligence, consciousness, are nothing but human imperfections and limitations, which, indeed lessen individual suffering by removing some foolish and conventional restrictions which now exist—restrictions which sacrifice individual happiness without thereby insuring some greater social good.

As, then, the grave subject of the existence of deity is a matter of dispute, it is evidently of deep importance to society that morality should not be dragged into this battlefield, to stand or totter with the various theories of the divine nature which human thought creates and destroys. If we can found morality on a basis apart from theology, we shall do humanity a service which can scarcely be overestimated. The moment we base morality on the supposed will of a being whose very existence is not demonstrable, that moment we remove it from a solid, scientific basis, and cast it on the foaming waves of theological disputation, to be tossed hither and thither on the supposed will of a being whose very existence is not demonstrable, that moment we remove it from a theology, we shall do humanity a service which can scarcely be overestimated. The moment we base morality to face this gravest of all questions, find themselves compelled to renounce, one by one, all the notions of the deity which once they held. They see that the attributes ascribed to him by Christian and devout Theist are but magnified human attributes, the gigantic mist-shadow formed by the human figure. They are forced to allow that will, personality, intelligence, consciousness, are nothing but human imperfections and limitations, which, projected into boundless space, and dignified by the title of infinite, are bound up together into one ideal heroic figure, and baptised with the name of god. Sober thinkers acknowledge humbly that the mind cannot transcend itself, that every conception which we form, every image that we create, are necessarily limited by the capabilities of our faculties, and conditioned by our consciousness.

As, then, the grave subject of the existence of deity is a matter of dispute, it is evidently of deep importance to society that morality should not be dragged into this battlefield, to stand or totter with the various theories of the divine nature which human thought creates and destroys. If we can found morality on a basis apart from theology, we shall do humanity a service which can scarcely be overestimated. The moment we base morality on the supposed will of a being whose very existence is not demonstrable, that moment we remove it from a solid, scientific basis, and cast it on the foaming waves of theological disputation, to be tossed hither and thither with the ebb and flow of the tide. The basis of the morality suggested in this essay is purely phenomenal; it is ruled by laws whose workings can be traced; and I affirm that these laws are sufficient for our guidance, and that there is nothing to be gained by building on an unknown ground when a known and firm ground is under our feet. Our faculties do not suffice to tell us about god; they do suffice to study phenomena, and to deduce laws from correlated facts. Surely, then, we should do wisely to concentrate our strength and our energies on the discovery of the attainable, instead of on the search after the unknowable. If we are told that morality consists in obedience to the supposed will of a supposed perfectly moral being, and that we are to aim at righteousness of life, because in so doing we please god, then we are at once placed in a region where our
faculties are useless to us, and where our judgment is at fault. But if we are told that we are to lead noble lives, because nobility of life is desirable for itself alone, because in so doing we are acting in harmony with the laws of Nature, because in so doing we spread happiness around our pathway, and gladden our fellow men—then indeed motives are appealed to which spring forward to meet the call, and chords are struck in our hearts which respond in music to the touch.

Christian morality has had its turn; and the present state of society, its crying shames, its cruel sufferings, tell us that authoritative morality has failed. Intuition gives us no hope for the masses, the uncultured, the despised, who have no intuitions, beyond the blind yearning for a change which will bring them some gleam of hope, or at least some lightening of despair. Surely it is time, then, that we should bestir ourselves to place morality on some firm basis before the lowering storm breaks over our heads, and sweeps us and our present feeble structure away. Amid the fervid movement of society, with its wild theories and crude social reforms, with its righteous fury against oppression, and its unconsidered notions of wider freedom and gladder life, it is of vital importance that morality should stand on a foundation unshakeable; that so through all political and religious revolutions human life may grow purer and nobler, may rise upwards into settled freedom, and not sink downwards into anarchy. Only utility can afford us a sure basis, the reasonableness of which will be accepted alike by thoughtful student and hard-headed artisan. Utility appeals to all alike, and sets in action motives which are found equally in every human heart. Well shall it be for humanity that creeds and dogmas pass away, that superstition vanishes, and the clear light of freedom and science dawns on a regenerated earth—but well only if men draw tighter and closer the links of trustworthiness, of honor, and of truth. Equality before the law is necessary and just; liberty is the birthright of every man and woman; free individual development will elevate and glorify the race. But little worth these priceless jewels, little worth liberty and equality, with all their promise for mankind, little worth even wider happiness, if that happiness be selfish, if true fraternity, true brotherhood, do not knit man to man, and heart to heart, in loyal service to the common need, and generous self-sacrifice to the common good.
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Evolution.

ENGLISH papers and reviews, not to speak of Colonial publications, have of late supplied us with elaborate and interesting notices of the life and work of the great naturalist, Darwin. With some exceptions, they speak of him in terms of praise such as falls to the share of few, even of the foremost men of science that the world has known. There is good reason for much of this eulogy. A very superficial study of Darwin's books will convince the reader of his merits. He brought to his work, as a naturalist, abilities of the highest order, and he used them successfully, with singular patience and perseverance, to the end of a long life.

As a contributor to our knowledge of natural history, he has probably no rival, both as regards the originality of his discoveries, and the picturesque power with which he describes the structure and habits of animal and vegetable life. But it is not on this ground alone that Darwin's fame is supposed to rest. His doctrine of Evolution, of the Origin of Species, of the Descent of Man, is a far more ambitious effort of genius than the mere description of natural phenomena, however accurate and original that may be. It is one thing to describe things as they are, another to discover the why and the wherefore of things. If Darwin has accomplished this, he is entitled to a place, which some enthusiastic followers claim for him, among the ranks of those great men who have actually discovered some of the grand laws of nature. But I think we do him no injustice if we hesitate to award him this honour, inasmuch as the doctrine of Evolution is still a mere hypothesis, and has received no such verification as its supporters ought to be able to adduce, if they claim our acceptance of it as a scientific truth. This claim is made so freely and so dogmatically by the followers of Darwin,—though I do not find that he makes it himself,—that I venture to ask your attention to some criticism on it which I have put together in this paper.

You will no doubt assume, in the outset, that being more or less of a theologian, I do not take an impartial view of Darwin's work and of the doctrine of Evolution. Of course, if one believes in the revelation which the Bible gives of a personal God, and of his personal and direct agency in the creation and maintenance of this
earth, it is impossible to approach a theory which seems to deny this without a certain prejudice of mind. In such a case a man holds a brief for his faith. I do not deny this, whilst at the same time I try to read Darwin and his commentators as impartially as I can. But on the other hand, I cannot help thinking that the untheological man of science is as much possessed with the odium theologicum as the theologian, and that he, in his turn, is prejudiced against the idea of a Personal God and his direct and personal agency in creation. And I fancy that it is this prepossession of mind which induces him to advance on Darwin's work, and to exalt Darwin above what the author of the Origin of Species would approve of. This certainly appears to be the case in such writings as those of Professor Häckel, of the University of Jena, a man, no doubt of extreme views, but which indicate the tendency of this school of thought. Häckel states that the only alternative for those who refuse thorough-going Evolution, is the acceptance of a supernatural creation,—either one or many creations. He apparently thinks that the argument of design and personal creation can only be got rid of by complete Evolution, and having this in view,—this prejudice, in fact—he endeavours to make Darwinism mean more than it does in the mouth of its author.

Now, a theologian who wishes to be impartial, with such plain evidence before him of the eager prejudice of the un-theological mind, and conscious also of his own prepossession in favour of a Personal and Active God, begins to doubt whether any man can be impartial in this great question. And the impossibility of this impartiality is a most significant fact. Is it not, in itself, powerful evidence of the existence of a personal God and of His direct agency in Creation? I believe this prepossession of mind, one way or the other, for or against such an idea of God, to which I allude, is due to man's innate conscience and ideas of God, which revelation meets and appeals to. This sense of a personal God inevitably disturbs the dry light of scientific study of nature, in spite of the student's distaste for it. There is abundant evidence of a supreme mind in all material nature, and of intelligent power in Creation, and in the causes of things; and we who are the offspring of the same intelligence, which directs the natural phenomena of the world, though of far nobler kind and higher characteristics than they are, cannot ignore this evidence of intelligence and direct agency of a Supreme Power in the world; nor can we stand neutral in our discussion of it. It seems to me that we can either welcome evidence of a Creator and Supreme God, or else we do our best to put him out of court. None of us, I believe, can be what the scientific man claims to be, absolutely impartial and unprejudiced.

If this be so, and if the extreme evolutionists are prejudiced against the idea of a personal, active God, it is natural they should exalt Darwin in a manner which he would repudiate. They speak of evolution in its most pronounced form as scientific truth, and they claim your allegiance to it, with no little scorn of any hesitation. But so far as I have read, I cannot discover any substantial verification of the doctrine. I understand evolution to mean, that the different orders of animated nature have been evolved, either with a few breaks, or without any breaks at all, from one primary root. Apart from a mere poetical use of the term, it must mean this, but I cannot find in Darwin's Origin of Species, any facts which verify such an idea. Nor, so far as I have read, can I see anything which commends evolution to one's acceptance, as more than an hypothesis, at present unverified by facts. On the other hand there is plain evidence of an evolution entirely in accordance with observed facts, and also with the assertions of Revelation: I mean Evolution of design on the part of the Designer of the universe. This evolution of design, the gradual fulfilment of what was in the mind of the Creator accounts for the gradual series of created things, and for a certain connexion between each group in the series, and a certain likeness between them, which may be mistaken for a natural outgrowth of the one from the other, as you rise in the scale of creation. For example, man is like all animal nature, and indeed is like inanimate nature, in many respects, yet he is not therefore the natural outgrowth of any order in nature beneath himself. He is the last, at present, so far as our experience goes, of a long series of creative work, each unit in the series being above the last before it, and an increase upon it, all the units also being of similar materials, and related one to another both in order and in matter, but yet each having its own special identity superadded, and apparently distinct in each case. Thus, observation clearly demonstrates the community of matter which subsists between the body of a man, a horse, a mole, a worm, and the lowest form of animal life; and it is also clear that there is a relationship between, say the lowest insect, and man, not only in regard to the material of their physical structure, but in regard to the structure itself. There is evidently a relation of order between them, the one is an advance on the other, and to a certain extent, is the result of the other. We might compare this to the relationship which the figure of a triangle bears to a straight line; a triangle is an advance on a straight line; it is a complex figure which is, in some sense, the result of the simple figure, and the simple is the forerunner of the complex. The simple figure, also, contains, by way of anticipation, the complex figure. So far, then, there is a likeness and relation between the two, the insect and the man, there is a literal likeness of physical materials, and a relationship of structure, which may suggest to some minds actual evolution of the higher from the lower, but certainly does not prove it. And I think we are wrong in interpreting the sense of this suggestion which nature makes, if we assume it to be actual evolution in things themselves. Really, I believe it suggests design on the part of the Designer of nature, his plan, his intention, and not a mechanical order of progress, inherent in the
things themselves. Of the latter kind of evolution there is no actual evidence, all is hypothesis, but the former is abundantly illustrated by the facts which scientific research has arrived at.

I am therefore a believer in Evolution, so far as evolution of design on the part of the Designer of this world is shown by facts; and it seems natural that in such a case the lower and primary orders of Creation should contain in their structure anticipations of the higher, and also that the successive creations should be of similar materials, under similar conditions of a general kind, so that all creation may be said to be, so far, of one piece.

Assuming, then, that we find in nature evidence of design on the part of the Creator, and of the gradual development of things, but a development brought about by the Creator, and not by the natural outgrowth of the things themselves, the question arises, is there actual evidence of separation between the ascending stages of creation, and of the distinct individuality of the various species of nature? To this I would reply, (1) In geological records both of animal and vegetable life there is plain evidence of a succession of breaks between successive stages of creation, and no evidence of any intermediate forms of life. For example, I believe it is a fact that the orders of Invertebrate and Vertebrate animals proceed upwards in a series of development, but with distinct breaks between each unit in the series. We may illustrate this by reference to the orders which constitute the great animal kingdom of Invertebrates, namely, the Radiata, Articulata, and Mollusca, and then the orders which constitute the great Vertebrate kingdom, namely, fishes, reptiles, birds and mammals. In each of the orders there is a something quite distinct and new superadded as the series rises in the scale of creation; and in each species of each order, which partakes of the general characteristics of the order, there is also a distinction of some special characteristic belonging to it only, and not to its predecessors. Thus in the order Radiata, such as jelly fish, sea anemones, corals and star fish, we find the following characteristics:—a body which has no blood-vascular system, but in lieu of that a water-vascular system; no distinct organs for circulation or respiration; in most cases no nervous system; there is a distinct cavity inside the body, and a distinct mouth; the bodily organs are disposed so as to radiate from a centre. Next the order Articulata may be described, with its characteristics. It includes crustaceous animals, such as lobsters, spiders, scorpions, centipedes, insects, and leeches and worms of all kinds. These various species of this order possess a body, arranged in segments or rings along a long axis, a nervous system, organs for respiration, a blood-vascular system, a digestive system, and in some cases articulated appendages, which serve for locomotion. Next we come to the order Mollusca, such as shell fish, cuttle fish, octopus, snails and slugs. These are soft-bodied animals, usually with a skeleton outside them; with a blood-vascular system, complex organs for respiration, nervous system, digestive system, and a distinct heart, more or less developed, always bearing in it two chambers for the circulation of blood. So far we have dealt with the kingdom of Invertebrate animals; we come now to the Vertebrate animal kingdom, and in that we find the following characteristics always present. The body is built up on a bony axis or spine; the skeleton of the body is inside; the body is divided into two portions or tubes, and is not merely one tube, as in the case of the Invertebrates. One portion contains the nervous system, that is, the spinal cord and brain, the other the organs of blood circulation and the organs of nutrition, together with certain portions of the nervous system, known as the Ganglionic or Sympathetic system; the heart is perfectly developed; the limbs are never more than four in number, and are true limbs with an inner skeleton. Thus the spinal and brain system are something superadded in the Vertebrate animal, distinguishing it from all Invertebrates, and to this special distinction we may add the organs of sight, hearing, taste and smell, contained in the bony cavity of the head, which are always to be found in varying degrees of perfection in the Vertebrate animal. Again, each species of the Vertebrate order, whilst partaking of these general characteristics of the order, possesses its own scientific differences which belong to itself, and not to its predecessors, as may be seen in the species of horse, monkey, and man, which are included in the order of Mammal. Now, so far as research has gone, whether in the Geological records of the earth, or in what we know of species still existing, the links and intermediate forms between these stages of creation which Evolutionists imagine will be found, in fact, never have been found.

Further, in the Vegetable World, we find, in a similar way, plan evidence of an ascending series of Creation, in which each unit of the series is more highly developed than its predecessor, and is also specifically separated from it. For example, in the first Vegetable Age, of which there is distinct Geological record, we find the order called "Thallogens," flowerless plants, with neither stems nor leaves, such as seaweeds. Next, the order "Acrogens," flowerless plants, with stems and leaves, such as ferns and spore bearing plants. Next, the order "Endogens," such as palm trees. Next, the order "Gymnogens," such as cone-bearing trees, including pines, firs, larches, cedars, cypresses, yews, junipers, and auralcarias. And, lastly, the order "Exogens," which includes our deciduous forest trees, fruit trees, flowers, and flowering shrubs. Between each order in the series, and between each species within the orders, nature shows plain evidence of a break; and and there is, simply, no evidence whatever of any intermediate links or forms of life. Such forms exist only in the imagination of Evolutionists. The doctrine of the gradual evolution of one species from another is, then, a purely speculative doctrine. It seeks to explain the phenomena of plant and animal life by processes which may have happened.
Science, however, ought not to estimate the probability of what may have happened at more than its worth, and since in that case the phenomena of life, as a matter of fact, are evidence of the fixity of species, the real value of the doctrine of Evolution is only that of a guess. Again, the evidence of Geology proves, beyond a doubt, that all existing organisms, whether animal or vegetable, had a beginning, and that there was a time when they did not exist, and that before that time other organisms did exist. For example, it is certain that not one of our present plants or animals had come into existence in the Cretaceous period, when the earth was teeming with huge reptiles and gigantic birds. If, then, it is a fact that the various species have appeared on the earth fully organised from time to time, and that they then made their appearance for the first time, what becomes of Evolution?

It is noticeable that himself Darwin admits in his Origin of Species that he cannot substantiate this theory. He says:—"There are difficulties in the way of my theory, which to this day I can hardly reflect on, without being staggered. If species have descended from other species, why do we not see everywhere intermediate transitional forms? Why is nature so well defined? Is it possible to believe that an animal like a bat or a giraffe should have been formed by modification from some other animal of widely different structure? What of instinct? Could the bee have acquired its wonderful instinct of making cells by modification from an inferior order of animal? Could such a wonderful organ as the eye, as it exists in, say, the eagle, have been gradually acquired by slow process of modification from a low form of fish which has a very rudimentary imperfect organ of vision?" He thus owns to this difficulty of proof; in facts, he produces no evidence beyond his own theory. For example, the reason he alleges for the non-discovery of the intermediate forms of life is as follows:—"In the race and conflict of life, stronger things destroy the weaker, and only the strongest survive. Hence, all intermediate forms of life, being in a process of change and and imperfect, became extinct." Thus he admits he has no facts whereon he can base his theory; and, when he is asked why the geological records of the earth do not show traces of these supposed intermediate links, his reply is:—"That there is no geological evidence for them, but then only a small portion is geologically explored," and formations may be found beneath the sea which might afford the evidence he desires. All the evidence we have therefore is in favor of each order being after its kind, with no confusion of species at anytime. 2. Further evidence seems to prove that each of these orders and species has been introduced as a new form of matter already existing, with a something quite new superadded. This new element or form is certainly a development and improvement upon the previous forms of life, and it is a regular development from simple to complex, from lower to higher; yet it is distinctly introduced, brought in from without; it is not the result of anything contained in the lower forms of life. This may be illustrated by the successive improvements, the result of human invention and skill noticeable in a simple lever, then in a wheel, then in a watch. You may say that the lever, on its fulcrum, contains in itself the anticipation of a wheel. The inventor of the wheel improved on the lever, and added something new to it, which gave it its separate identity. The wheel is an anticipation of a watch, and the inventor of the watch improved on the wheel, adding something new to it, which established its individual existence. But in any such case, the real and actual development is in the mind of the inventors, not in the things themselves; and in any such case also each thing is complete and separate after its kind. There is a distinct break between a wheel and a watch—a distinct introduction from without of a new and superadded form and power. There is evolution of design, similarity of materials, but until the power from without chooses to introduce new and enlarged designs, the lever, the wheel, the watch remain as they are, within the limits of their own specific type of existence. This is clearly seen in the separate species of animal and vegetable life. They cannot exceed the limits of their special form of existence. It is true that they are capable of improvement within those limits, but they cannot exceed them of themselves, and yet some power external to them, has evidently improved upon them, giving them an ascending series of development, but giving to it them from time to time on the large scale of Creation, as the human mind with its little power, which, little as it is, is a miniature of the great power of God, gives to the lever, the wheel, and the watch their separate existence and development.

Suppose, now, that in order to support his theory of the natural out-growth of one species from another, and to combat the facts of their separate creation, each after its kind, an Evolutionist sets himself to experiment on vegetable or animal life, to produce, if possible by gradual improvement, one species from another. What is the result? This theory rests, of course, on the supposition that the various species, at any rate, in bye gone ages had a tendency to improve of themselves, and gradually using that tendency, emerged into a higher state of being. His experiments must upset this theory altogether. Each species, he will find, is capable of some improvement, strictly within its own limits of existence, so long as his superior will, power, and intelligence are at work upon it, or so long as circumstances of climate and other influences are favorable. But the native tendency of each species is to degenerate, and not to improve. Let him experiment, say, on pigs. After time and due care he produces a breed of animals like, we will say, the Berkshire pig, the acme of porcine perfection. But let him turn out those pigs on some of the mountain ranges of the Mackenzie Country, leave them to themselves, and in a few years he will find that they have reverted to the type of pig which the early settlers luxuriated on for want
of mutton, coarse, bristly, gristly, lantern-jawed, and degenerate. You can by culture produce a delicate white
gladiolus from a coarse scarlet bloom, or a Baroness Rothchild rose from a dog rose; but leave them alone for
a few years, and they go back to their simple type. The tendency of each species is, in fact, to degenerate, not to
improve, unless some improving influence, external to itself, is present; so that the first condition which the
Evolutionist requires for his theory of self-evolved development from one species to another is wanting.

The same holds good of man. He is capable of great improvement within the conditions of this present
nature; but, I believe, all improvement which we accomplish in ourselves, or which others bring about in us, is
against the grain of the Old Adam, and is a victory over a tendency to degenerate. Man here has to fight against
this tendency to degenerate, which is as surely his characteristic as it is that of the lower forms of Creation. And
yet man has in himself anticipations of a higher state. He feels them, even though as a heathen, and he may be
ignorant of the truths which Revelation teaches. In the lower stages of animal existence, such anticipations are
not consciously felt, for the mute animal has not the power of self-consciousness and reflection which has been
superadded to man's nature. Man, however, can interpret himself, and read in himself the signs of a higher state,
which in a lower degree he sees and interprets in the lower orders of Creation which have preceded him. But
man, I think, interprets these anticipations of a higher state wrongly, when, with the extreme Evolutionist, he
assumes that the species of man grew out of the species monkey, or any species lower than himself, by virtue of
some self-inherent power of improvement, or when he argues that the Human Race has improved, and will
continue to improve and develop into a higher state of civilization, personal and social, and of individual
welfare of body and mind, of happiness, yet without any distinct break or introduction of a new order of things,
and without the creative agency of God. The Doctrine of Evolution seems to demand some such higher order of
being, but how can it come about without the introduction of a new state of things? All the evidence we have
seems to be in favor of successive breaks and introductions of new powers and forms of life. This may possibly
go on into infinity. Death and Resurrection are doubtless one of these intended by the Creator, and an
introduction of a higher state of life. In this present state of things Creation, so far as we can see, has ceased.
The Creator seems to be at rest, so far as creative work in concerned. In a future state after the break of death,
we shall be the same, and yet not the same; we shall realise what is meant by the words: "And I saw a new
heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away."

Extreme Evolutionists, I suppose, limit their ambition to this present state of existence, for how can they
look beyond death, which is, so evidently, the destruction of the individual man, such as he is in this life? And
yet, Evolution naturally demands something higher and better than this state of things. Is there to be no higher
state, with new powers superadded to the old life? I entirely accept the principle of Evolution, so far that God
designs a gradual evolution of perfection, which He will bring about in His own time, and by His own power. I
believe in—

That God which ever lives and loves.
One God, one law, one element,
And one far off Divine event,
To which the whole Creation moves.

But, so far as our knowledge goes, nothing less than God's power, the power of a new creation, can bring a
man once dead out of death into a new life. And, to quote some well known words, "If in this life only we have
hope, we are most miserable." According to the strict argument of the Evolutionist, man ought to develop here,
and in this present state, to a state of great improvement. But, lo! man's chances are gone! He is dead! He has
not developed into a higher state. There is no evidence of the improvement of man's state here, except within
certain limits, and those limits are as iron bars, through which he vainly tries to pass. Evolution logically
requires a state of development in man far higher than ever has been seen, or will be seen here, whether in men
as a race or as individuals. Where is the man who, as a man, is better than his forefathers centuries ago? Apart
from certain special advantages of culture, or of Divine influence, he is still in the normal condition of
manhood of the species man, such as man has been since the fall. He may know more, have more power over
himself; but the more he knows, the more he sees his own limited powers of knowledge. He may fight a better
fight with his degenerate nature than his forefathers, but he is still at war with himself as they were. If richer or
healthier than they were, yet he is mortal. The grave is never very far away. As to modern intellect, Homer and
Socrates, Plato and Aristotile, were as grand developments of the human mind as Shakespeare, Newton, or
Darwin. Moses has never been excelled as a law-giver, Phidias as a sculptor, or Milo as an athlete. Inventions
progress, but inventors are not men of acuter intellect than of old. Stephenson was not a greater man than Friar
Bacon, nor either of them than Archimedes. We can in these latter days do more, see more, and have more than
men could in old times; but, as men, we are not more than men were then. The great general conditions of life
are the same, and out of them there is evidently no distinct evolution either for the individual or the race, except by the break of death, and death distinctly destroys man. *Debemur morti nos nostraque.* But, "Death is swallowed up in victory." "For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. Now He that has wrought us for the self same thing is God."

So far, then, I believe in Evolution, that I see evidence of it as the intention of the Creator, who successively introduces new stages of creation. And this evidence is supported by what we may learn from the laws which the Creator has impressed on created things. These laws seem to point to the maintenance or destruction of each species of Creation in itself, but in no way indicate the growth of one species out of another. For example, there is the law of gravitation of which it might truly though poetically be said—

-Thou dost preserve the stars from wrong,
And the most ancient heavens through thee are fresh and strong,

-or the laws which regulate the life of a tree or a man, and which account for their death. But I have never heard of any law which could account for the production of a bird from a reptile, or cause a monkey to become a man, or a dead man to become again a living, sentient, rational being. There must be some power external to these things which cannot accomplish such an evolution from lower to higher, in fact, it must be a power of introducing new creations. Now, such a power is certainly equivalent to what is commonly termed miraculous power; that is to say, a power which is above nature, and yet works when it pleases in and with natural things; a power of personal, intelligent, and immediate agency, not necessarily intelligible to our minds, and yet evidently seen in its results. Of course, I freely admit there is a great difficulty in accepting the idea of such a power; but, to my mind, the difficulty is sufficiently overcome by considerations of the following kind:—

1. An *a priori* consideration. The human mind is capable of the idea of such a power. Men are invariably either credulous or deliberately incredulous in the presence of any seeming manifestation of it. We are all either inclined to belief in it, or to strong scepticism. Sometimes we are all superstitiously afraid of it, sometimes defiant, sometimes glad of it. The idea of it finds us, touches us, and challenges attention. We either believe in it in a rational, sober way, having some account to give for our faith, or we cower before it in abject terror, or we resent the idea, and seek to explain it away. We cannot let it be. Is not this a fact noticeable in human nature; as much a fact, in its way, as our capacity for love, hatred, calculation, or construction? And if so, does not such a fact point to the existence of God the Creator, whose agency is direct and immediate is this world?

2. The laws of nature, such as we observe and verify, are constantly found to be overruled in a manner wholly unintelligible, save by the belief of some higher power which acts as it wills. For example, the laws which account for the life and welfare of the human body are regular in their operation, and are readily demonstrated; but there is a higher power quite above all known law, which evidently, at its will, interferes with the orderly existence of the body. This is the power of the human will itself. You see its effects but cannot explain them or reduce them to a law. The human will can, for the time, annul the power of gravity, as in every instance when you lift your arm; it can induce oblivion of pain; it can overcome or suspend the course of disease; and it does this spontaneously; its action cannot be predicted or analysed so as to reduce it to any system of known law. We have in it, in fact, a personal agent interfering with the orderly laws of nature. Such a fact prepares the way for the acceptance of the idea of a personal, active God, who in a manner above known law, deals with nature from time to time as He wills. And in urging this, it must be remembered that we are bound to take into consideration *all* the facts of nature which are before our eyes, not merely such as belong to our physical, but also to our mental nature. The whole nature of man must be investigated.

Further, it seems to me quite as difficult to accept the idea of thorough evolution, in which all things are supposed to proceed from the lowest to the highest of themselves, as to believe in a personal God, who from time to time introduces new forms of creation, with new powers of life. What greater marvel could you imagine than that even the highest in the scale of inanimate creation should evolve into the lowest of animate things? Can you imagine a sensitive plant becoming, by any process you can think of, a sentient insect? Can you imagine a twig becoming a caterpillar, or a whale becoming a bear? Darwin's exponents appear to think that something of this kind has taken place. I do not find that he himself asserts it; but, on the other hand, Evolution must mean something of this kind, if life proceeds on earth by natural selection, and not by the introduction of new life. It is, in fact, just as hard to believe as a miracle. The miracle of Moses' rod becoming a serpent is not more difficult to accept than that animal life should come from plant life. The same holds good of the idea of a man springing from a monkey. What law that we know of, what habit, what accidents of food, of climate, or education could produce in a monkey a conscience of right or wrong, self-consciousness, reflection, memory, speculation, true reasoning power, and self-respect? The question is not merely one of anatomy. There is
certainly an enormous difference between the brain of the lowest type of man and the highest type of monkey—a difference in favor of the man of not less than eleven cubic inches in volume. But this is not the real point of difference. Man's mental and spiritual faculties belong to himself. They appear for the first time in man. The monkey possesses none of these. They co-exist, certainly, in man together with much which the man shares with the monkey, as, for instance, with eyesight, or hearing, or with instinct and the sense of pleasure or pain. But, nevertheless, they are the peculiar property of man, and there is no evidence of any kind to show that they grew out of germs possessed by the monkey nature. We might illustrate this by the power of speech and articulate language, which is one of the peculiar properties of the human race. Darwin supposes that man has inherited speech through some of his progenitors who were in an immediate state between man as he is now, and man as he was, little removed from the monkey. It is supposed that the voices of animals are brought into play chiefly in regard to each other, in order to express their sense of love, rivalry, and triumph. Certain monkeys are said to have the power of uttering musical notes, ascending and descending an exact octave of sound, with the half tones well defined. Such a phenomenon as this is taken as an argument in favor of man gradually acquiring his power of speech from the lower orders of Creation. The progenitors of man are supposed to have acquired the habit of using musical tones to express their strong emotions of love or triumph. This habit developed into articulate and plain speech, the muscles of the vocal organs being by degrees so shaped by exercise that speaking became possible. Darwin gravely suggests a most amusing idea to account for the strange power and effect of music, a power which all feel, but which we can seldom analyse or describe. He says: "Man recalls, in an indefinite way, those strong emotions which were felt in bye-gone ages, when our progenitors courted each other in vocal tones." This is an astounding theory of the origin of music. I prefer the suggestion of an old English poet—

Music, soft charm of heaven and earth,  
Whence didst thou borrow thy auspicious birth?  
Or art thou of eternal date?  
Sire to thyself, thyself as old as Fate—  
Ere the rude ponderous mass  
Of earth and waters from their chaos sprang,  
The morning stars their anthems sang,—  
And nought in heaven was heard but melody and love.

To turn from this theory to that of Darwin is deep bathos. Instead of the music of the spheres he would have us believe that music is the recollection of the loves of the monkey tribe! Really, the difference between the ludicrous whine of a monkey, or the pleasant purr of a cat, or the canary's song, and human speech, is not a difference of degree but of kind. The power of articulate speech is the result of powers of deliberate thought. Man alone was furnished by the Creator with the two things necessary for speech—1st, the power of distinct and comprehensive thought; 2nd, the power of clothing thought in words. These two powers are not found in any brute; they are found in all mankind. A brute can hear, feel, taste, smell, as man does; a monkey can compare one nut with another, choose one, and reject another; but he cannot think and reason so as to form general conclusions, such as "all light nuts are hollow." A parrot can imitate sounds, but he cannot think, and express thought in words. The neighing of a horse, the lowing of a cow, the chattering of monkeys are only signs and ejaculations, not true language; for language is the deliberate embodiment in speech of man's ideas about the things he sees, or about his thoughts about himself and others. No lower animals, such as monkeys, could have gradually invented speech. It is evidently one of the special gifts of the Creator to man. There is, as in all creation, a sort of likeness between the lower animals and man in this as in other respects, which is evidence of the intention of the Creator in His evolution of things; but that is all. We may fully admit this, acknowledging, say, the superiority of the monkey species to those species which preceded it, at the same time repudiating our own personal relationship to them. It may be of service to recall the humourous words of Sydney Smith on this subject. He says: "I feel so sure about the superiority of mankind, I have so decided a contempt for the understanding of every baboon I see, and I feel so sure the blue ape without a tail will never rival us in painting, poetry, or music, that I see no reason whatever for not doing justice to the few fragments of understanding, which the lower animals really possess." This is the language of fun, but it also has a serious meaning.

We have then no evidence of the gradual growth of man from the lower animal creation. And this brings me to what seems the grand fallacy of the doctrine of Evolution. If it means any thing, it means that the higher orders of nature are born from the lower. Now, birth is the only natural process known to us which produces life; and yet, experience universally declares that like is only produced by like. No evidence has as yet been
discovered of birth producing a form of life essentially distinct from the life of the parent. To imagine this is so contrary to experience, and so inexplicable by any known laws, that it is as difficult to accept as a miracle. I include in the term "birth," all known kinds of birth,—birth from an egg, birth from a seed, and that process of reproduction which takes place when a cutting is made from a plant, or a portion of a zoophyte, or a coral, separates from the parent stock and becomes a separate individual. Centuries ago, philosophers anticipated the doctrine of our modern Evolutionists, and propounded the theory of generatio æquivoca: that is to say, some kind of birth which is unlike the known process of generation, and which might account for the appearance of new species, so that it would be possible to assert that like is not always produced by like. But no facts have ever been discovered to prove that a generatio (Equivoca) has ever taken place, or that a new species was ever born of one already in existence; and yet this is really what Evolutionists ask us to accept as scientific truth.

In making these assertions, I can lay no claim to original research, or any special knowledge of natural history. But, taking for granted, the facts of natural history as they are recorded in the best books on the subject, I may safely say they are beyond contradiction, so far as any actual experience has gone; and if so, it certainly seems that the encomiums bestowed upon Darwin by many of the writers of the day, are beyond the mark. He is spoken of as the discoverer of the grand law of the origin of species. The fact is, that he has simply hazarded a guess, as philosophers did in old times, when they suggested the theory of æquivoca generatio.

Darwin has been compared to Newton. But the parallel will not hold. Darwin's unverified hypotheses cannot be ranked with Newton's discoveries; Darwin's hypotheses in themselves, apart from verification, are vague, inexact, and deficient in that precision which is the main characteristic of the grand laws of nature. Newton's law of gravitation, even when he announced it provisionally, awaiting proof, was strictly exact and definite. I believe he indignantly repudiated the idea of its being an hypothesis. Hypotheses non fingo. In his proposition he not only asserted the general law of mutual attraction between material bodies, nor did he only describe it in a vague way as decreasing with a decrease of distance, but he stated the exact numerical rate at which the decrease would take place. He had built up this statement on facts, and on precise mathematical reasoning; afterwards it was proved, as, for example, by the revolution of the planets, but even if it had not been fully demonstrated, it was evidently in itself true. I cannot see then that Darwin has claim to the rank of such men as Newton, though his work is in the first rank of natural philosophy. His hypotheses may be valuable. It often happens that a bold guess leads to some discovery of truth. But a guess unverified, cannot be ranked with a definite discovery of any of the laws of nature.

One other point I should like to allude to. It is urged that even if Evolution be proved to be true, to the extent its extreme supporters desire, yet it does not on that account militate against faith in God. To this I would reply:—(1) We must always look to the actual evidence of facts. No doubt God would be as much the Creator of all things if he created matter once for all in some simple form, and then left it to develop itself in multiform ways, as if He introduced new creations from time to time. But in the search for truth, we must look to facts, and facts are against this idea of Evolution. (2) This idea of Evolution does seem to me to contradict the revelation which we assume God has given us of his Creation in the Bible. The simple meaning of the first chapter of Genesis certainly is that God created everything after its kind. No one, I think, without a predisposition to read into its lines the theory of Evolution, would interpret this chapter, except as a record of successive stages of creation. And further, the idea of Evolution in its extreme form, seems to conflict with man's innate conceptions of God's personal Providence, which are most certainly confirmed by the Revelation of the Bible. The idea of the Creator having created an original atom of matter which during long ages evolves itself into the spiritual being of man, thrusts God so far back from man that He becomes an unreality. Evolution thus makes man the product of natural forces. His body with all its curious physical conditions is supposed to have been produced by the spontaneous and gradual action of some lower organism, which of itself had power to take advantage of certain favourable circumstances, and grow into a human being. His mind and his spirit are supposed to have come into existence in a similar way. They grew somehow out of some merely sentient organism, which in its turn came from mere inanimate, motionless, lifeless matter. Now I would contend that such an hypothesis cannot account for the facts of man's spiritual and mental nature. These facts consist of our conscience which recognizes and fears God, of our sense of responsibility to Him, of duty, of right and wrong, of punishment, and reward. Some such conscience exists in all men, however degraded. What is the Evolutionist to do with these facts? Does he deny them? No! Most of the extreme Evolutionists of the day are evidently men who have, and act up to, very high notions of right and wrong. How then does he account for them? His theory is that conscience of God has gradually come into existence, through stages of being, in which there was evidently less and less consciousness either of God, or self, or any thing at all, until you get back to an atom of original matter, which he will allow the Creator has made in the first instance. Now is it not strange, nay absolutely inconceivable that such feelings as are involved in the expressions, "I must," "I ought," "I can;" or in the words, "duty," "obedience," "responsibility," and this in reference to the Creator of the world, as a matter of personal allegiance, can have come into existence out of lower stages of being in which there was
not the slightest indication, or anticipation of such a conscience of God? Evolution has more than it can do to prove the gradual production of a man's physical nature; all it can do is to assert that it seems likely that man grew gradually into existence, such as he is now. Well, it is perhaps, conceivable but there is no evidence to prove, that a mollusc should gradually evolve into a mammal. But surely it is inconceivable that an atom of matter, or even matter highly organised, as, say, an insect or a brute animal should develop into a being conscious of God, able to love Him, and to fear Him. This is, remember, an evolution which begins with a lifeless atom, which is bound by mechanical laws impressed on it by its Creator, utterly unable to think of itself, or of Him who made it, and ends with human intelligence of God, and human responsibility for right and wrong.

It might, perhaps, be argued that indications of it may be traced in previous creations. The mechanical laws which bind together certain gases in the form of clay may be faint indications of the spiritual law of free will, free obedience, and love and fear of God in man, but then they are only the barest indications of what the Creator was about to do, and not more. Between even the highest kind of instinct which animal possesses and the conscience of a mere savage human being there was an impassable gulf over which no natural laws could cast a bridge. A new creation was needed.

There is but one real alternative, I think, to this conclusion, if evolution of this kind be adopted. To be logically consistent, we must deny man the possession of a spiritual being, we must become materialists; for man, according to such a theory, can only be the product of previous states of being, the earlier of those previous states being purely material, and the later of them being in no true sense spiritual, that is, having no intelligent or even emotional consciousness of anything higher than this world, having no sense of a Supreme Being who is above the world, and no anticipation of a higher and better and future life. Hence we must become materialists if we are extreme evolutionists, and our actions and thoughts would be governed only by motives which are of this earth, earthy; for if we are the product of the natural circumstances, only of the earthy conditions of life, we must make the best of them, and the best can only be materialism. This is, I think, the danger of such theories. There are, of course, materialists and materialists. There is the sensual materialist, whose creed is coarse and clear,—"Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die,"—and if he be an extreme evolutionist he may derive much satisfaction from the thought that he has inherited his ideas of self-gratification in direct order from the lower animals, in whom animal sensations are the only and, for them, the proper rule of conduct. It may be a satisfaction to him to believe that when he takes his stand on the principle of pleasure or pain, as his rule in life, gradually inherited from the brute creation, he can see himself, when he is looking back at his ancestry, in the nearest pigstye or in the filthy antics of the monkey or baboon. There is also the intellectual materialist, a very different type, who desires the utmost improvement of the human race, but who regards it as the natural evolution of the natural conditions of life, thoroughly well used. But even he seems to me to be, by his theory, hopelessly unable to provide sanctions of conduct and principles of action which will hinder sin and command obedience. If he is asked to define conscience of right and wrong he is obliged to say that it has only been evolved gradually either by the common consent of men or that it is what the best of men have agreed upon. I need hardly say that he would find himself in considerable difficulty, if he attempted to put these arguments to the test, should a bushranger propose to him to stand and deliver his purse and watch. Should the robber be of a literary turn of mind he might answer to the plea that the best of men do not approve of robbery, that he holds his own opinion;—

"For why? because the good old rule
Sufficeth him, the simple plan,
That they should take, who have the power,
And they should keep who can."

Nor would he fare much better, in trying to persuade a toper to give up his liquor, or a glutton his heavy feeding, or a spendthrift his extravagance, or a vicious man his pleasures, on the plea that the common consent of man, evolved after generations of experience, is against self-indulgence; nor, if he sought to rule himself, will he find such motives sufficient to curb the passions of his lower nature. The old Adam would win the day; the refinement of such intellectual materialism would soon degenerate into coarse sensual self-indulgence.

This is, I believe, the danger of such theories. At the same time I believe, as a matter of fact, in this generation, in which the practical influence of Christianity is so widely felt, that most of those who advance these doctrines, are true to their early training, and innate sense of obedience to God. Many of the leading exponents of this school of thought, are men of pure, charitable, and in a word, godly lives. But yet, if their theories are likely to endanger virtue and godliness, they should not pass without criticism.

In conclusion, I wish again to state that I can lay no claim to any knowledge of natural history, beyond that
which any intelligent reader can pick up in the brief hours of leisure taken from a busy life; and, so far, it may seem presumptuous to offer criticism on the writings of so great a man as Darwin. Without, however, special knowledge of the minutiae of scientific research, it is within the power of ordinary intelligence, to analyze the general principles which scientific men propound, and to compare these principles with the actual record of scientific fact, which they produce.

So far, we may compare theory with fact, and from our own conclusions, whether we can accept the doctrines offered us in the name of science. Tried by this test, I have been led to the deliberate conclusion, that the Darwinian theory of Evolution, as represented by so many of its supporters, completely breaks down.
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The Harmony Between Geology and Genesis.

The science of Geology has but lately sprung into existence and its infancy, like that of all other systems of human knowledge, was surrounded by a mass of impossible and incongruous theories— theories so absurd and wild that the science was deemed by very many careful thinking men to be unworthy of notice, and geologists were regarded as visionaries. But just as Chemistry took form from the hazy and curious researches of those who sought for the philosopher's stone, and as Astronomy's sun has slowly risen above the fog-banks and weird shadows of Astrology, so has Geology gradually emerged from the errors that surrounded its youth, and has now taken its place as, perhaps, the Queen of all the Sciences. It is remarkable that, just as of old there was supposed to be a conflict between Astronomy and what I shall ask permission to call Revelation in the earlier times when Astronomy was merging from its misty daylight to its glorious sunrise, so now, in the early days of Geology (and we must remember that not a tithe of the problems Geology presents have been yet solved), there is an attempt made to disparage the statements of Revelation by comparing its record with the few facts that Geology has yet brought to light. But no one now uses Astronomy as a weapon against Revelation, and in clearer clays in the future, scientific geologists will pursue their researches into these interesting fields, leaving the student of Revelation to clear away the misconceptions which interfere with the right understanding of the record he has to study—to remove the mass of false interpretation arising from defective translations, and from erroneous systems of Theology and belief built upon these misconceptions of Revelation;—misconceptions which interfere more with the true meaning of Revelation than any one outside the circle of Theological teaching can have any idea of. And here I would ask all readers and thinkers to discriminate carefully between a revelation and the record of that revelation. Much of the so-called conflict between Religion and Science is due simply to the disregard of this caution. The end is the test of a Divine Revelation, and that is really the glorious warm sun although it rises cold and chill on a winter's morning, shrouded in earthly fog and smoke and mist.

I shall first endeavour to give you some idea of the origin and history of the world, ascending with the latest
scientific discoveries. The theory which is usually called "Laplaces theory" may be briefly indicated with regard to the solar system as follows:—The sun, planets, and moons first existed as a vast cloud of gaseous vapour, extending over infinite distances, tremulous with diffused light, electricity, and heat. This began to condense at a certain place where more concentrated influences began to be exerted, and gradually a nucleus formed, which, as it condensed, had a whirling motion imparted to it, and slowly gathered the materials of this fire mist towards these central influences. At length the whole mass partook of this rotary motion, and, as this motion increased, centrifugal force hurled enormous portions of this loosely attached mass to great distances. These were the future planets, which, themselves whirling round on their own axis, again threw off smaller portions of their own substance, which became rings, as in the case of Saturn; or moons, such as Jupiter's or our own. These bodies gradually condensed, and glowed with fiery heat. As they cooled further, their light departed, and at length they grew dark—the smaller losing their light and heat first, while the larger retained it longest. In the solar system we see the smaller bodies, such as the moons of our system, perfectly cold and dead; the next larger bodies (the smaller planets) dying; the earth in middle aye; the young giant planets, Saturn and Jupiter, shining with a dull red glow through their vapours; and the mighty sun flashing with fiery brilliance.

Geology, taking up the story where Laplace leaves it, tells us how, through long ages of immense duration—periods of time of which it has been well said, that a million of years is but the geological twinkling of an eye—gradual changes took place in the cooling earth. At first the liquid interior was surrounded by a solid crust, too hot to allow water to rest upon it, and above the crust vapours of various metals and minerals, with the materials of the ocean, the water of lakes, rivers, icebergs, glaciers, and all that has now soaked into the rocks, surrounded the fiery lava of the future world. This crust then cooled all round, allowing the water to fall and rest upon it in an universal ocean, and allowing also the deposition of various chemical substances, which were then in a state of chemical decomposition. Out of these materials the acid corrosive rains of that early period formed the early rocks, which were washed hither and thither by the swirling seas, which rushed unimpeded by any shore (for the waters covered the whole earth) while the earth revolved much faster than now. These vapours clouded this universal sea in pitchy darkness, until the vapours thinned and let through the light; then came the first earthquakes, and consequent elevation and subsidence of the crust, so that the dry land appeared. These early elevations were inconsiderable, and over these low shores the tides rushed faster and further than they do now, washing mud into the hollows very rapidly from the swiftly decomposing rocks, which, when again elevated, hardened into solid slates, or sandstones, or what not.

I will give the remainder of the geological story in the words of a scheme I submitted to one of the greatest geologists living, who signed it with his approval.

- The earth was once a globe of fiery matter, covered first with a thin hard crust subject to various undulatory movements. Above the crust was an universal ocean, and surrounding this ocean a dense mass of vapours totally excluding all light.
- These vapours thinned and allowed a diffused light to pass through them.
- This light being due to the sun, light and darkness would alternate as the earth revolved, causing day and night, and evening and morning.
- These vapours now thinned still more, part descending in rain and part rising in the form of one vast unbroken cloud all round the globe, hanging above the air which rested upon the universal sea.
- The liquid nucleus shrank away from the solid crust, which cracked and fell into ridges and hollows into which the sea flowed, leaving part of the hot crust dry.
- In the Laurentian rocks abundance of carbon is found (Dawson), showing evidence of plant life, but of too soft a nature to be preserved.
- In the Lower Devonian Gymnosperms make their first appearance.
- In the Upper Devonian Trigonocarpum and fleshy fruits first appear. (These all grew as in an universal hothouse under the unbroken cloud, forced upwards by the heat of the earth. No seasons so far.)
- The clouds at length broke, allowing the sun's light and heat to influence the seasons, while the colder earth could not maintain an universal spring. Trees are then first found with woody rings. When the clouds became thinner the moon appeared, and when they broke, the stars.
- In the Silurian seas Trilobites and Lingula are found, and throughout the Permian, Oolitic. Tirassic, and Liassic periods there was abundance of marine life. Ammontes, Belemnites in millions, and many others, with ganoid and placoid fishes in great numbers.
- In the New Red Sandstone the footprints of birds appear for the first, according to Hitchcock, Dana, &c.
- Then appeared also giant sea lizards. The Ichthysoaurs, Plesiosaurs, Mososaurs, Elasomaurus, and feathered birds.
- Then upon the land are found the Iguanodon, Dinotherium, Megatherium, Palaeotherium, Machaerodus, Mammoth, and other gigantic beasts of the vertebrate type.
Next appear various kinds of cattle—the horse, the ox, the sheep in order.
During this period numberless creeping things, insects, beetles, butterflies, &c., appeared.
And last of all appeared Man.
Since whose appearance no new species have appeared, and the condition of the various plants and animals of the earth remain as they were when he appeared.

And now, ladies and gentlemen, to go into this matter a little in detail, and compare the Mosaic record, as we proceed, with the scientific record, as far as we know it.

First, let me say that all the phenomena of the material universe, as far as we know, are due simply to two things—matter and force—and these two things are quite sufficient to account for all we know of this material universe. And I believe the future revelation of Science will be that all forms of matter will be found to be the result of one element, and all forces to be derived from one force—many recent discoveries tend that way. The one element I believe to be Hydrogen; the one force, Electricity. Of the origin of matter and force Science confesses herself hopelessly ignorant and I believe she will some day, cheerfully admit that the origin of both is simply God.

You know now how closely light and electricity are connected, and light and heat, electricity and motion. Perhaps you do not know that the word used by Moses, where he says, "God said, let there be light," is almost the word that is used for heat as well, and both these are the result of electricity. I believe, then, that a great expanse of hydrogen filled the universe, and that, at a certain time in the beginning, a permeating impulse rushed through it: a quivering, pervading flow of electricity changed it, and a flush of light like the aurora followed. Do you ask me what that impulse was? I believe it was the breath of God—and in that breath was contained the germs of all life that has been produced since, and by virtue of which we live and move and have our being.

I must pass over rapidly the first history of this universe, merely saying that it is certain there was some such cloud of gaseous material, quivering with electricity and light, which gradually cooled and condensed as I have described.

Let me now bring you to where Moses begins, and show you our earth in the great vast of space, formless and empty, with great billowy masses of cloud surrounding it, and away in the sky the burning haze of the nebulous sun, and the shilling moon, and the countless millions of stars. The heavens and the earth which, as Science says, existed in the beginning, and which Moses says God created in the beginning. Now, it would take me all night, and all next week, and the next ten years, to tell you all that Science teaches about the formation of the world, so I will simply compare those periods which Moses mentions, asking you to remember that it was not Science Moses wanted to teach, but Theology; and as for Moses having left out various things—suppose I said to you, "I am going to describe the places in Europe in order—There's Spain, France Switzerland, Holland, Belgium, Sweden, Norway, Germany, Italy, Prussia, Austria, Poland, Turkey, and Russia." Surely you would not say the account was not correct because I had not named all the rivers on the route; or, if I described the capitals of each country, you would not say I was incorrect because I did not name all the small towns as well! Just so. Moses wanted to teach Theology to prevent his people from worshipping sun and moon and stars, because God made them for man; and so of beasts and birds—they were all made by God, and all put under man's dominion, and only God was above him, therefore, he must worship God only. And so, under Divine direction, Moses wrote his account of the primitive traditions of the creation of the world, which existed at that time almost universally; and how wonderful it was that he should place the events in their proper order I will show you later—separating them from the mass of error and impossibility of which all other accounts are full.

After its misty, formless, empty state, the earth, says Science, at one time of its history, was a ball of fire covered with several coverings—first, of hard rock, then an universal sea, then a dense mist of hot steam many hundreds of miles in thickness, causing the universal sea to be in the grossest, blackest darkness. Moses says, "Darkness was upon the face of the deep." "Darkness" and "deep" are both correct, says Science. Then, says Science, the cloudy envelope gradually thinned, and much fell in the form of rain, and a dim light slowly diffused over the earth. Moses says, "And God said let there be light, and there was light." "Light" is correct, says Science.

Then the mist rose, and a layer of very much lighter clouds floated in the air, gradually moved upwards, and left the space between these watery clouds and this universal sea comparatively clear. Moses says, "And God said, let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters." "Sea below, cloud water above, air between. Quite right," says Science.

Now, says Science, conies a long period during which, under this universal sea, the Plutonic rocks were formed—such as the granites, and also some of the lavas and the basalts—and when this crust grew hard, the awful forces groaned in captivity and at last burst forth, and then terrific earthquakes upheaved great tracts of land, and formed mighty hollows; after which gradual cooling caused gradual sinking, and so the waters flowed into the hollows, and more and more dry land appeared above the universal sea. What says Moses: "And God
said, Let the dry land appear." "It never appeared before: quite right," says Science.

Then, says Science (modern Science, mind you, of the last ten years), upon this universal mud, and under this universal cloud, that still hung unbroken over the earth and permitted only the veiled light of the sun to pass through, grew a low order of plants, soft and cellular and watery, like marshy, pulpy weeds: of enormous size, but so soft that they could not be preserved whole, but were changed to a pulpy mass and squashed into watery mud, which, in its turn, produced more plants; and so numerous must have been the exuberance of plant life at this time that, in the Laurentian rocks, there are deposits of carbon in the form of graphite of such thickness that, as Dr. Dawson says, there is evidence of a more abundant flora there than even in the coal measures. Some beds, 8 feet thick, contain 20 per cent, of carbon, and other beds 25 feet thick, 30 per cent. Moses says, "And God said, Let the earth sprout forth sproutage, (deshè). "Sproutage," says Science, "well, yes, sproutage is all you can call this vegetable mush. Right again!"

Then, says Science, leaving the annuals for a little while, as these layers of carbon grew thicker in the vegetable mould, a higher order of plants appeared—Phaeogams or flowering plants, of a low order; Pynnosperms, with naked seeds, such as the conifers (Dana mentions coniferous woods in the lower Devonian). Moses continues next, "the herbs seeding seed." "Yes," says Science, "seeds were never seen before. Quite right, Moses."

And then, says Science, followed a higher class of flowering plants, with seeds not naked, but covered with a fleshy fruit, like the Ginkgo of Japan eaten to-day (of which the Trigonocarpum is an example), found, as Lyell says, by the bushel. What says Moses : And the fruit tree yielding fruit whose seed is in itself." "Yes, that is true," says Science, "fruit never appeared before. Right again."

During all this time, says Science, the earth was surrounded with dense vapours, in and above the air, which kept out the direct rays of the sun, only allowing a diffused light to come through, while the heat of the interior was so great that there were no seasons, but only a warm, moist continued summer existed. During this time the Placoid and Ganoid fishes swam about in the warm Silurian seas, and the Trilobites, with other crustaceans and a few mollusces, dwelt in the waters, while enormous forests grew with inconceivable rapidity in the dense humid air, gradually clearing it of its carbonic acid (carbonic anhydride) and making it more fit for life. All their beauty, luxuriance, and magnificence we can gain but a dim notion of. They grew, perhaps, many feet in every twenty-four hours in this universal hot house. Time rolled on—ages, perhaps—and the clouds gradually thinned, and one day there was a break in them, and they rolled nearly away and disclosed the glorious sun, and some time after they were thin enough to allow the moon to be seen; and, when at last they broke, the trembling stars appeared, that were then, for the first time, permitted to see through this dense cloudy envelope. Then began the interchange of the seasons. Then cold air first stopped the luxuriant growth of plants. Then for the first time appeared trees with woody rings, which, as you know, are the result of the alternately slow and fast growth of winter and spring. So that the history of this age is shortly this: The mist subsided, and the sun and moon and stars appeared. The sun first, for his rays alone would clear the vapour; then, long after, the moon might be seen through the thinner clouds; then, last of all, the stars. What says Moses : "And God said, Let there be luminaries in the expanse of the heavens, and let them be for signs and for seasons, and for days and for years; and God appointed two great luminaries—the greater luminary to rule the day, the lesser to rule the night; and the stars. "Yes," says "Science, the sun never appeared before; there were no seasons before; and the sun appeared first, and then the moon, then the stars." Quite right again.

"And then," says Science, "that bright sun woke nature up into more prolific life than before, and the waters swarmed with new forms of life. The Placoids and Ganoids died, and the Ctenoids and Cycloids took their place. What says Moses : "And God said, Let the waters swarm forth swarmers." "And indeed," says Science, "throughout all this period there were swarms of life in the Permian, Oolitic, Triassic, and Liassic seas. Beautiful Ammonites, millions of Belemmites, and many other forms of marine life." So the record is right again. Then, say some scientists—such as Hitchcock, Deane, Dana, and Lyell—in the New Red Sandstone the footprints of birds appeared for the first time; for the air was clearer now and fowls could live and fly. "And fowl," says Moses, "that may fly above the earth, in the open expanse of the heavens." And now, after the birds, great sea-monsters appeared. The Ichthyosaurs, and the Plesiosaurus, the Mososaurus and Elasmosaurus, reigned in the ocean, with their enormous bodies, and awful eyes as big as your hat, horrible jaws a fathom long, and fins a yard long, enormous tails, that lashed the sea as they splashed and roared in the waters. "And God," says Moses, "created great sea-monsters," even greater than those crocodiles which the Egyptians ignorantly worship. "Quite right," says Science again, "monsters, indeed; as well as abundance of other animals in the sea, and fowls in the air, as Moses says." So much for the sea.

Now, as to the land. What does Science say? "That great beasts, such as the Megalosaurus, Iguanodon, Dinotherium, Megatherium, Mastodon

*A mastodon's molar tooth weighed 17lbs; he could have had a good deal of toothache.

, and Mammoth, all mighty beasts of enormous size, appeared before the advent of cattle. Moses says,
"And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle and every creeping thing after its kind." "Quite true," says Science; "for it was not till after these great beasts had perished, or nearly so—not until just at the end of geological time—that bovine tribes made their appearance upon the earth, and it was not till long after them that sheep made their appearance."

On the harmony between verses 24 and 25 see pamphlet published by G. E. Ardill, 277 Pitt Street. Then appeared upon the earth, according to Agassiz, the principal flowers, fruit trees, and cereals—the grass appearing before the cattle came, in the Cretaceous period; and after them the plum, the walnut, and the vine, in the Miocene; while the apple, the pear, the quince, the cherry, the peach, the apricot, nectarine, almond, raspberry, strawberry, and various bramble berries with all the roses and potentillas, were introduced shortly before the last act of all, at the time when Moses says, "The Lord planted a garden." And last of all, when all is ready for him, comes man, the latest formed of all animated life, the sum and perfection of them all. Even as Moses says, "And God created man"—the only one of all the ages to whom all this procession of life would be intelligible. He only was fitted to receive the Divine communication. He alone it was to whom God personally spoke. He only has the power to survey the past, and say, as he addresses his Maker in return, "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy hands." And he alone can look past the changing present beyond to the future when they shall have passed away, and add, "They shall perish, but Thou shalt endure. They all shall wax old as a garment, and as a vesture shalt Thou fold them up, and they shall be changed; but Thou art the same. Thy years shall not fail." Science says that no species of plants have appeared since man, and Moses says, "And God rested from His work."

There are two very common difficulties about the Mosaic record—one referring to the "firmament," and the other to the "days" of creation. I will first speak of the idea that the Bible speaks of a solid firmament supported on pillars, above which the waters were gathered, and over which God dwelt, and either shut or opened the windows to keep back the rain or let it fall. Now, I observe first that the Bible record says nothing of the kind, and the English word is a mistranslation—just as the Septuagint *stereoma* is a mistranslation. But the Hebrew *rakiah* has no such meaning; it means the open expanse in which the birds fly, and the same word is used in that sense further on. Job, indeed, speaks of the "pillars of heaven," but the context clearly shows he merely means the lofty mountains. Rain is called the bottles of heaven, and is said to be poured out of the lattices of heaven. 

Do you mean to say that you think the Bible means that there are real lattices and real bottles, and do you refuse to read words addressed to and written by the most poetical people on the earth in a metaphorical manner? If any one does, and comes to us in the name of Science with such words, then, ladies and gentlemen, I shall say he is ignorant of the rudiments of Science. The fact is, the idea of solid crystal spheres was much later than the Hebrew cosmogony, and finds no support or countenance in the record. It has been put into it by those who hold the Bible up to ridicule. The waters above the firmament are, of course, the clouds which once contained more than half the sea, and the thick and humid air, expanse, or firmament divided the waters from the waters. Let me read you what Dr. Dawson says about this: "The idea that the Scriptures teach the doctrine of a solid firmament is a modern figment of man, and needs to be exposed as a barefaced imposture."

I come now to the last objection which is worth noticing, and that is about the "days" of creation. Mr. Denton says Science teaches us the world was created during a procession of ages, and that the Bible says all was done in six days of twenty-four hours each. That the earth was void and dark, and it became light in one day; the firmament came the next day, and next day the waters were gathered back in a heap, as the boy thinks they are who sees the sea for the first time, and thinks it higher than the land. Next day God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, and immediately a green carpet swept round the earth. Then, next day, the sun, and moon, and stars were cut out and stuck in their places in the solid firmament. That next day the fish swam, and the birds flew, and the whales came, and all suddenly, and within the twenty-four hours. And next day all the beasts and all cattle—tigers, bears, elephants, rhinoceri, &c. Then, next day, man appeared on the scene, and set about at once naming this new creation and putting it into its place. And all this wonderful process but took six days of twenty-four hours! "Well, but," says Science, "this won't do. Here are records of millions of ages." Oh, then we'll stretch our days out, say the preachers and teachers; and so, says Mr. Denton, do violence to the record, and take an unwarrantable liberty with the sacred text, which says that there was evening and there was morning each day, and so the days can't be of gum elastic. Well, there are deeper harmonies between the records in the rocky leaves of the earth and those of the Bible, that make us quite fearless about this apparent discrepancy. Many there are indeed, who say, as St. Augustine did 1400 years ago, that as there was no day and night after the last "days" of the earth—for the earth was fiery and gave its own light—so it could not be a day of twenty-four hours measured by sunlight and dark. It is not true, therefore, that theologians have only lately lengthened the days. Others have seen in the inspired record a series of visions. Others have made the days of gum elastic, and stretched them out into infinite periods.

But, ladies and gentlemen, I'm not going to shirk any difficulty. What I want is truth, and if the Bible says six days bounded by evening and morning, I'm not going to say it does not, no matter what happens. I accept
the twenty four-hour theory if you like. Oh, hurrah! say our opponents, now we have him; and others say, If you do that you'll run your head against a wall. No, I'm not going to run against a wall; I'm going along by the side of it when I reach it. You can run against it, if you like; or you can stop this side if you like. There's a gate just a little way from here which I'm going through.

Suppose I add to Shakespeare's seven ages of man in this way:—

All the world's a stage,
And the men and women on it merely players:
They have their exits and their entrances;
And each man in his turn plays many parts,
His acts being Seven Ages.
At first, the infant, muling and puking in the nurse's arms,
The infant's evening dies in night.
And then the whining schoolboy, with his satchel and shining morning face,
Creeping, like snail, unwillingly to school.
Soon ends the evening of the schoolboy's day.
And then the lover, sighing like furnace, with a woeful ballad made to his mistress' eyebrow.
That day of madness dies, and
Then a soldier, full of strange oaths, and bearded like the pard,
Jealous in honour, sudden and quick in quarrel,
Seeking the bubble, reputation, even in the cannon's mouth.
The eve of glory comes, and then
The justice, in fair round belly, with good capon lined,
With eyes severe and beard of formal cut,
Full of wise saws and modern instances,—
And so he plays his part, till that day passes too.
The sixth age shifts into the lean and slippered pantaloon,
With spectacles on nose, and pouch on side;
His youthful hose—well saved—a world too wide
For his shrunk shank, and his big manly voice,
Turning again towards childish treble, pipes and whistles in the sound.
Then evening comes again, and in the morn
Last scene of all, that ends this strange eventful history,
Is second childishness and mere oblivion,
Sans teeth, sans eyes, sans taste, sans everything.
And so the night of death
Draws down the curtain and the play is o'er.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, suppose some one were to say, Why that is ridiculous, you have made the man only seven days old; for you have spoken of an evening and a morning, and therefore you cannot say your days are not 24 hours long—and how absurd it is to suppose a man could be a baby on Sunday, and a schoolboy on Monday, and a lover on Tuesday, and a soldier on Wednesday, and a judge on Thursday, and a superannuated pensioner on Friday, and an old decrepit man on Saturday. Why you'd tell your critic to go to a lunatic asylum; or, if he looked hopeful, you might pause to say that although the word "day" in this, as in the Mosaic record, means—only as far as the word itself goes—24 hours, just as death, and day, and life, and bath, mean what they usually do in those lines where Shakespeare speaks of sleep as, "The death of each day's life, sore labour's bath." We take them in their proper relative sense. And so in Scripture: when we come to such expressions as God's arm, God's eye, God's mouth, how do we deal with them? We do not say that "arm" does not mean arm, or "eye," eye, or "mouth," mouth, but we say, while the words themselves are to be taken in the literal sense, the ideas they convey are not to be pressed literally, but only by way of accommodation. The terms arm, eye, mouth are the best human representation of the Divine realities denoted by them. So when we say that "God went down to see," "smelled a savour of rest," "repented," we do not say that "go down" means anything but go down, or "smell" anything but smell, or "repent" anything but repent, yet we do not apply these actions literally to God, but we assert that there were actions having the like relation to His nature which these actions, taken literally, have to our nature. The natures are widely different, and therefore the pararellism must not be pressed too closely, but still it remains the truest representation of the actual verity which the imperfection of human thought will allow of: and so of the words "created," and "made," and "blessed," and "called," and so also of the
word "day." We are to understand that God created all things in such periods of time as might, to man's finite mind, be most fitly represented by six days.

"Did man wish to know how God created, he had the image in his own command over his immediate servants. Did he wish to know how God regarded His creation, he had the image in his own satisfied inspection of some finished work. Did he wish to know what God did after creation, he had the image in his own repose after toil. Did he wish to know how long God took to create, he had the image in one of his own weeks of labour. Vast as the universe was, and various as were its inhabitants, he was to regard it as being to God no greater task, no more arduous labour, than a week's work to himself; and just as the busiest week he had ever known was but a small part of his life, so, he might believe, might God look back upon the creation of the universe as a small and insignificant labour as compared with the work and powers of His existence."

And as to the rest of the Sabbath. Man was placed in the garden of Eden—whatever that means—and was invited to join in and enjoy the rest of God. He rebelled and was sent forth into the world to work; and his physiological frame was such that six days was exactly the time during which he ought to work, as Science asserts to-day. And then he was allowed a day's rest which he was to keep in memory of the rest he had forfeited—the long day of God's rest, who had worked as man must work. And if man is to enjoy the hallowed rest of his Sabbath Day, he must also work faithfully during the time of six human days of 24 hours, when it was light, as God worked during the six Divine days, measured by the hours marked by the oscillations of the universe.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think I'm through the gate. "Oh, but stop," says an objector, laying hold of my coat tails, "how about Adam's rib and the origin of Eve?" Well, taking the lowest ground, that of the pseudo-scientific objector, I find a harmony, even here, in comparative anatomy and physiology, which is Science too. It is true of the lowest animals—from which, say some scientists, man was developed—that they have not two sexes, but are produced in various ways, some by division of substance (fission), some containing the organs of both sexes in one individual; and it is well known that the two sexes in any animal are merely modifications of each other. In the theory of development it is admitted that it is by special differentiation of the same type that the two sexes were produced, and, therefore, Science teaches—whatever she thinks man's ancestor was—that there was originally only one sex, and the one had been differentiated out of the other.

But I am far from affirming that to be the true explanation of this scene. I believe that Adam, feeling within him the breathings of the Divine Spirit, longed for some one to sympathise with those feelings and found no response or satisfaction in the animal world around him. Seated, perhaps, on some high mountain, and gazing at the animals placidly grazing on the plain or crouching in the bushes, a sense of utter solitude came over him, and he fell into a "deep sleep" (compare Genesis xv. 12, &c.) and (born of his waking thoughts) it seemed as if God came to him and took from his "side" (which is the meaning of the word—not "rib") a part of himself, instinct with that life of the Spirit which had been breathed into him. Waking, full of these thoughts (and who has not experienced this?), descending the mountain he meets "his high ideal love," and they dwell together in the garden of Eden until their sad and pitiful fall.

Further particulars on this subject and the Pre-Adamite race will be found in the "Debate" published by George Robertson.

At the time of the meeting of the British Association in 1860 a manifesto was drawn up and signed by 617 scientific men, many of whom are of the highest eminence, in which they declare their belief not only in the truth and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures, but also in their harmony with natural science. This manifesto is as follows:

We, the undersigned students of the Natural Sciences, desire to express our sincere regret that researches into scientific truth are perverted by sonic in our own times into occasions for casting doubt upon the truth and authenticity of the Holy Scriptures.

We conceive that it is impossible for the Word of God as written in the book of Nature, and God's Word written in Holy Scripture, to contradict one another, however much they may appear to differ.

We are not forgetful that physical science is not complete, but is only in a condition of progress, and that at present our finite reason enables us only to see as through a glass darkly, and we confidently believe that a time will come when the two records will be seen to agree in every particular.

We cannot but deplore that Natural Science should be looked upon with suspicion by many who do not make a study of it, merely on account of the unadvised manner in which some are placing it in opposition to Holy Writ.

We believe that it is the duty of every scientific student to investigate Nature simply for the purpose of elucidating truth, and that if he finds that some of his results appear to be in contradiction to the written Word, or rather to his own interpretations of it, which may be erroneous, he should not presumptuously affirm that his own conclusions must be right, and the statements of Scripture wrong. Rather leave the two side by side till it
shall please God to allow us to see the manner in which they may be reconciled; and instead of insisting upon
the seeming differences between Science and the Scriptures, it would be as well to rest in faith upon the points
in which they agree.

Here follow the names. In Sir David Brewster's case no less than eleven lines are occupied with his literary
and scientific titles.

I can only say to both scientists and theologians, Wait. To those deluded by false views of Science, who
would persuade us to cast away our Bible, I say, No. What is true cannot be the result of what is false. The
result of what the Bible describes is the formation of lives and characters which are more true than any the
world has ever seen, when judged by the moral standard you would have us accept. Therefore, the teaching of
the Bible cannot be false, and to so-called scientific meddlers I say, You are dissecting the dead body of truth,
and taking no regard of the spirit which once animated it. Your objections are no new thing. In the century
arose Celsus, who boasted himself to be somebody, and said quite as clever and weighty things against the
Bible and Christianity as you can say, and Celsus and his system are gone and Christianity is flourishing still.
You may stand on the desert of criticism, and cast your pebbles of objection into the river of truth as others sail
by, and the splashing water will fascinate those who behold it for a moment, the running ripples will laugh at
you as they break towards the shore, but the great broad river will flow on calmly towards the boundless ocean
of God's infinite knowledge, whence it came to refresh the soul of man and to carry those who trust themselves
to its calm and even current into the peaceful islands of everlasting rest.

The Meaning of History. Two Lectures.
By Frederic Harrison, M.A.
Trübner and Co. London 60, Paternoster Row. MDCCCXII HARRILD, PRINTER, LONDON.

Preface.

The following pages contain two lectures recently addressed to a mixed audience in London, as an
introduction to a course of teaching in History, which, was subsequently commenced by the writer. They are
printed (nearly as they were spoken) at the request and chiefly for the use of those who heard them. It will be
seen that they belong to the most elementary kind of popular instruction, and they will have little interest for the
general reader, much less for the regular student of history. I was led to attempt the course of lectures, and
afterwards to print these pages, by my conviction that the first want of our time is the spread amongst the
intelligent body of our people of solid materials to form political and social opinion. To stimulate an interest in
history seems to me the only means of giving a fresh meaning to popular education, and a higher intelligence to
popular opinion.

I am aware that nearly every sentence in this outline, were it not too slight, might give room for serious
question, and possibly for severe criticism. But if opposite opinions are not noticed, they have still been
carefully weighed. If I have spoken of many still debated topics almost as though they were decided, it is only
because in such a plan as this any sort of controversy is out of place, not that I forget or slight all that has been
urged on the other side. But discussion, like research, must have an end somewhere, and the great need now is
not to increase but to use our stores of historical learning. After all, the only real answer to any theory of
history, professing to be complete and not manifestly inconsistent, is the production of a counter theory at once
more complete and consistent. The view of history here put forward it will be seen is in no sense my own. It is
drawn with some care from the various writings of Auguste Comte. Although far from being able to adopt all
his philosophical and religious conclusions, I am persuaded that the conception of the past, which is embodied
in his works, and the political and social principles of which that conception forms the basis, point out the sole
path towards all future improvement.
F. H.

The Meaning of History.

Lecture I.
The Use of History.

THE question for which we are about to seek an answer is this:—What is the use of historical knowledge? Is an acquaintance with the events, with the men, with the ideas of the past, of any real use to us in these days? has it any practical bearing upon the happiness and conduct of each of us in life?

Now, it must strike us at once, that two very different, nay, contradictory answers may be given, in fact, are very frequently given, to this question. But, opposite as they are, I hardly know from which I more thoroughly dissent. Some persons tell you roundly, that there is no use at all. We are, they would say with Bacon, the mature age of the world; with us lies the gathered wisdom of ages. To waste our time in studying exploded fallacies, in reproducing worn-out forms of society, or in recalling men who were only conspicuous because they lived amidst a crowd of ignorant or benighted barbarians, is to wander from the path of progress, and to injure and not to improve our understandings. What can be the good to us, they ask, of the notions of men who thought that the sun went round the earth; who would have taken a steam-engine for a dragon or a hippogriff, and had never even heard of the rights of man? On the other hand, the other class of persons would say of historical knowledge, that it has fifty different uses. It is very amusing to hear what curious things they did in by-gone times. It is highly entertaining to know about forefathers of our own who were nearly as funny as Chinese. Then, again, it is very instructive as a study of character; we see in history the working of the human mind and will. Besides, it is necessary to avoid the blunders they committed in past days: there we collect a store of moral examples, and of political maxims; we learn to watch the signs of the times, and to be prepared for situations whenever they return. And it cannot be doubted, they add, that it is a branch of knowledge, and all knowledge is good. To know history, they conclude, is to be well-informed, is to be familiar with some of the finest examples of elegant and brilliant writing.

Now, between the two, those who tell us plainly that history is of no use, and those who tell us vaguely that history is of fifty uses, I do not see much to choose. I thoroughly disagree with them both, and of the two I would rather deal with the former. Their opposition, at any rate, is concentrated into a single point, and may be met by a single and a direct answer. To them I would say, Are you consistent? Do you not in practice follow another course? In rejecting all connection with the facts and ideas of the past, are you not cutting the ground from under your own feet? You are an active politician and a staunch friend of the principles of the liberal party. What are the traditional principles of a party but a fraction, small, no doubt, but a sensible fraction of history? You are a warm friend of free trade. Well, but free trade has a history of its own; its strength lies in the traditions of a great victory achieved by right over might. You believe in the cause of progress. But what is the cause of progress but the extension of that civilization, of that change for the better which we have all witnessed or have learned to recognize as an established fact? Your voice is always heard for freedom. Well, but do you never appeal to Magna Charta, to the Bill of Rights, to the Reform Bill, to American Independence, or the French Revolution? You will suffer no outrage on the good name of England. You are ready to cover the seas with armaments to uphold the national greatness. But what is the high name of England if it is not the memory of all the deeds by which, in peace or war, on sea or land, England has held her own amongst the foremost of the earth? Nor is it true that you show no honours to the men of the past, are not guided by their ideas, and do not dwell upon their lives, their work, and their characters. The most turbulent revolutionary that ever lived, the most bitter hater of the past, finds many to admire. It may be Cromwell, it may be Rousseau, or Voltaire, it may be Robert Owen, it may be Thomas Paine, but some such leader each will have; his memory he will revere, his influence he will admit, his principles he will contend for. Thus it will be in every sphere of active life. No serious politician can fail to recognize that, however strongly he repudiates antiquity, and rebels against the tyranny of custom, still he himself only acts freely and consistently when he is following the path trodden by earlier leaders, and is working with the current of the principles in which he throws himself, and in which he has confidence. For him, then, it is not true that he rejects all common purpose with what has gone before. It is a question only of selection and of degree. To some he clings, the rest he rejects. Some history he does study, and finds in it both profit and enjoyment.

Or, again, let us suppose such a man to be interested in any study whatever, either in promoting general education, or eager to acquire knowledge for himself. Well, he will find, at every step he takes, that he is appealing to the authority of the past, is using the ideas of former ages, and carrying out principles established by ancient, but not forgotten thinkers. If he studies geometry he will find the first text hook put into his hand was written by a Greek two thousand years ago. If he takes up grammar, he will be only repeating rules taught by Roman schoolmasters and professors. Or is he interested in art? He will find the same thing in a far greater degree. He goes to the Museum to see the stuffed birds or the fossil reptiles, and he walks into a building which is a good imitation of a Greek temple. He goes to the Houses of Parliament to hear a debate, and he enters a
building which is a bad imitation of a mediæval town-hall. Or, again, I might say to him, does he never read his
Shakespeare or Milton; feel no respect for the opinions of Bacon or of Hume, or Adam Smith? I know that he
does. I know that such a man the moment he takes a warm interest in anything—in politics, in education, in
science, in art, or in social improvement—the moment that his intelligence is kindled, and his mind begins to
work, that moment he is striving to throw himself into the stream of some previous human efforts, to identify
himself with others, and to try to understand and to follow the path of future progress which has been traced out
for him by the leaders of his own party or school. Therefore, I say that such a man is not consistent when he
says that history is of no use to him. He does direct his action by what he believes to be the course laid out
before him; he does follow the guidance of certain teachers whom he respects.

I have then only to ask him on what grounds he rests his selection; why he chooses some and rejects all
others; how he knows for certain that no other corner of the great field of history will reward the care of the
ploughman, or bring forth good seed. In spite of himself, he will find himself surrounded in every act and
thought of life by a power which is too strong for him. If he chooses simply to stagnate, he may, perhaps,
dispense with any actual reference to the past; but the moment he begins to act, to live, or to think, he must use
the materials presented to him, and, so far as he is a member of a civilized community, so far as he is an
Englishman, so far as he is a rational man, he can as little free himself from the influence of former generations
as he can free himself from his personal identity; unlearn all that he has learnt; cease to be what his previous
life has made him, and blot out of his memory all recollection whatever.

Let us suppose for a moment that any set of men could succeed in sweeping away from them all the
influences of past ages, and everything that they had not themselves discovered or produced. Suppose that all
knowledge of the gradual steps of civilization, of the slow process of perfecting the arts of life and the natural
sciences wereblotted out; suppose all memory of the efforts and struggles of earlier generations, and of the
deeds of great men, were gone; all the landmarks of history; all that has distinguished each country, race, or
city, in past times from others; all notions of what man had done, or could do; of his many failures, of his
successes, of his hopes; suppose, for a moment, all the books, all the traditions, all the buildings of past ages, to
vanish off the face of the earth, and with them the institutions of society, all political forms, all principles of
politics, all systems of thought, all daily customs, all familiar arts; suppose the most deep-rooted and most
sacred of all our institutions gone; suppose that the family and home, property, and justice, were strange ideas
without meaning—in a word, that all the customs which surround us each from birth to death—aye, and beyond
death, in the grave—were blotted out; suppose a race of men whose minds, by a paralytic stroke of fate had
suddenly been deadened to every recollection, to whom the whole world was new—can we imagine, if we can
imagine it, a condition of such utter helplessness, confusion, and misery—such a race might retain their old
powers of mind and of activity, nay, both might be increased tenfold, and yet what would it profit them? Can
we conceive such a race acting together, living together, for one hour? They would have everything to create.
Would any two agree to adopt the same custom, and could they live without any? They would have all the arts,
all the sciences, to reconstruct anew; and how would their tenfold intellect help them there? Even with minds of
the highest order it would be impossible to think, for the world would present one vast chaos; even with the
most amazing powers of activity, they would fall back exhausted from the task of reconstructing, reproducing
everything around them. Had they the wisest teachers or the highest social or moral purposes, they would all be
lost and wasted in an interminable strife, and continual difference; for family, town, property, society, country,
nay, why not language itself, would be things which each would be left to create for himself, and each would
create in a different manner. It would realize, indeed, the old fable of the tower of Babel; and the insane pride
of self be followed by shameful confusion and dispersion, and a race with ten times the intellect, twenty times the
powers, and fifty times the virtues of any race that ever lived on earth would end, within a generation, in a state
of hopeless barbarism; the earth would return to the days of primeval forests and swamps, and man descend
almost to the level of the monkey and the beaver.

Now, if this be true, if we are so deeply indebted and so indissolubly bound to preceding ages, if all our
hopes of the future depend on a sound understanding of the past, I cannot fancy any knowledge more important,
nay, so important, as the knowledge of the way in which this civilization has been built up. If at once the
destiny of our race and the daily action of each of us are so completely directed by it, surely the useful existence
of each depends much upon a right estimate of that which has so constant an influence over him, will be
advanced as he works with the working of that civilization, above him, and around him, will be checked as he
opposes it; it depends upon this that he mistakes none of the elements that go to make up that civilization as a
whole, and sees them in their due relation and harmony.

And now this brings me to that second class of objectors of whom I spoke; those who, far from denying the
interest of the events of the past, far from seeing no use at all in their study, are only too ready in discovering a
multitude of reasons for it, and at seeing in it a variety of incongruous purposes. If they tell us that it furnishes
us with parallels when similar events occur, I should say that similar events never do and never can occur in
with a morbid curiosity, there are surely Chinese puzzles or chess problems left for them to make out without murder, or unveil the secrets of some public job? There are plenty of things to find out, or if people are afflicted not exercise their ingenuity on something worth knowing? Why not discover the author of the last mysterious Mask, or who was the author of Junius court impostor. Why, libraries could be filled with all the dreary wrangling as to who was the Man in the Iron coronet, and the brightest colours of the palette are lavished on a pantaloon whose buffooneries have attracted harmless than, that contained in histories in which the foreground is filled by any villain that wore a crown or a Peerage by heart, and know the names of the grandfathers and grandmothers of our hereditary rulers. Why not be able to repeat the good and great of former days, who we may almost fancy sit “holding high converse” in grave and solemn conclave together. No, history read upon such a plan is worse than nothing. You are quite right if you pass by untouched these piles of memoirs of the unmemorable—these lives of those who never can be said to have lived. Pass them all by in contempt and pity—these riotings and intrigues, and affectations of worthless men and ages. Better to know nothing of the past than to know only its follies, though set forth in eloquent language and with attractive anecdote. What good can come of such a knowledge? What can it profit you in your daily life, how are you a better or a happier man, because you know the names of all the kings that ever lived, or let me say rather existed, and the catalogue of all their whims and vices, and a minute list of their particular weaknesses, with all their fools, buffoons, mistresses, and valets? You had better learn the Peerage by heart, and know the names of the grandfathers and grandmothers of our hereditary rulers. Why not be able to repeat the Court Circular? Why is not such knowledge just as human, and just as valuable, and far more harmless than, that contained in histories in which the foreground is filled by any villain that wore a crown or a coronet, and the brightest colours of the palette are lavished on a pantaloons whose buffooneries have attracted the eyes of a crowd? Or, again, some odd incident becomes the subject of the labour of lives, and fills volume after volume of ingenious trifling. Some wretched little squabble is exhumed, utterly unimportant in itself, utterly unimportant for the persons that were engaged in it, utterly trivial in its results. Lives are spent in raking up old letters to show why or how some parasite like Sir T. Overbury was murdered, or to unravel some plot about a maid of honour, or a diamond necklace, or some conspiracy to turn out a minister, or to detect some court impostor. Why, libraries could be filled with all the dreary wrangling as to who was the Man in the Iron Mask, or who was the author of Junius, or who was Pope Joan? Who in the world wants to know? Why do men not exercise their ingenuity on something worth knowing? Why not discover the author of the last mysterious murder, or unveil the secrets of some public job? There are plenty of things to find out, or if people are afflicted with a morbid curiosity, there are surely Chinese puzzles or chess problems left for them to make out without
ransacking the public records and libraries to find out which out of a nameless crowd was the most unmitigated scoundrel, or who it is that must have the credit of being the author of some peculiarly venomous or filthy pamphlet? Why need we have six immense volumes to prove to the world that you have found the villain, and ask them to read all about him, and explain in brilliant language how some deed of darkness, or some deed of folly really was done? Why all this? Let it be unknown—let the dark thing remain dark—let them all rot together.

And they call this history. This gladly serving up in spiced dishes of the clean and the unclean, the wholesome and the noxious; this plunging down, without a lamp to guide them, into the charnel-house of the great graveyard of the past, and stirring up the decaying carcases of the outcasts and malefactors of the race. What good can conic of such a work? Without plan, without purpose, without breadth of view, and without method; with nothing but a vague desire to amuse, and a morbid craving for novelty. Do you suppose such a knowledge can teach you anything? Do you think it can touch the heart? Do you gather from it incentive to action? Do you not feel you might as well be reading bad novels or trashy newspapers? Would you not learn as much from a trial for murder or a trial of divorce? I would call all such, not histories, but police reports. I would call such writers, not historians, but paragraph writers. Have nothing to do with such. If there is one common purpose running through the whole history of the past, if that history is the story of man's growth by one unceasing progress in dignity, and power, and goodness, if the gathered knowledge and the gathered conscience of past ages does control us, support us, inspire us, then is this trifling with the blots and flaws of this great whole, this commemorating these parasites and offscourings of the human race worse than pedantry or folly. It is filling us with an unnatural contempt for the greatness of the past, it distorts our conception of that greatness, it is committing towards our spiritual forefathers the same crime which Ham committed against his father Noah. Is it not a kind of sacrilege to the memory of the great men to whom we owe all we prize, that we waste our lives in poring over the acts of the puny creatures who only encumbered their path, who were traitors to them, to us, and to our kind? Is it not the most wanton ingratitude and meanness to feel no thought for, no reverence for, those long labours, those great deeds of daring, endurance, magnanimity, and genius, by which the earth has been smoothed for us, and civilization age after age wrought out for us, and to think only of some puerile wrangle which has dishonoured or retarded the great work? Men on the battle-field or in their study, by the labour of their brains or of their hands, have given us what we have, and made us what we are; a noble army who have done battle with evil barbarism and the powers of nature, martyrs often to their duty; yet are we to turn with indifference from the story of their long march and many victories, and find amusement amidst the very camp followers and sutlers who hang upon their rear. If history has any lessons, any unity, any plan, let us turn to it for this and for this alone. Let this be our test of what is history and what is not, that it teach us something of the great advance of human progress, that it tells us of some of those mighty spirits who have left their mark on all time, that it shows us the nations of the earth woven together in one purpose, or is lit up with those great ideas and those great purposes which have kindled the conscience of mankind. If not, we shall be like him in the Pilgrim's Progress, who is seen raking amidst straw and litter, whilst an angel is offering him a crown he will not reach forth his hand to take.

It is a very different spirit, I know, that you are prepared to look at history. You want to see how it may be made a part of education—the moral training of a rational man. About the importance, the meaning, and duty of education we surely shall all agree. It is to a wise education to which men turn in the break up of all old systems, creeds, and parties. Why else are we here to-night? You have not come here to pass an idle hour. I have not the wish if I had the power to make it pass pleasantly, unless we both came with a purpose. Your presence, then, our presence together in a place of education, a place designed to extend the benefit of wider knowledge can teach you anything? Do you think it can touch the heart? Do you gather from it incentive to method; with nothing but a vague desire to amuse, and a morbid craving for novelty. Do you suppose such a knowledge can teach you anything? Do you think it can touch the heart? Do you gather from it incentive to action? Do you not feel you might as well be reading bad novels or trashy newspapers? Would you not learn as much from a trial for murder or a trial of divorce? I would call all such, not histories, but police reports. I would call such writers, not historians, but paragraph writers. Have nothing to do with such. If there is one common purpose running through the whole history of the past, if that history is the story of man's growth by one unceasing progress in dignity, and power, and goodness, if the gathered knowledge and the gathered conscience of past ages does control us, support us, inspire us, then is this trifling with the blots and flaws of this great whole, this commemorating these parasites and offscourings of the human race worse than pedantry or folly. It is filling us with an unnatural contempt for the greatness of the past, it distorts our conception of that greatness, it is committing towards our spiritual forefathers the same crime which Ham committed against his father Noah. Is it not the most wanton ingratitude and meanness to feel no thought for, no reverence for, those long labours, those great deeds of daring, endurance, magnanimity, and genius, by which the earth has been smoothed for us, and civilization age after age wrought out for us, and to think only of some puerile wrangle which has dishonoured or retarded the great work? Men on the battle-field or in their study, by the labour of their brains or of their hands, have given us what we have, and made us what we are; a noble army who have done battle with evil barbarism and the powers of nature, martyrs often to their duty; yet are we to turn with indifference from the story of their long march and many victories, and find amusement amidst the very camp followers and sutlers who hang upon their rear. If history has any lessons, any unity, any plan, let us turn to it for this and for this alone. Let this be our test of what is history and what is not, that it teach us something of the great advance of human progress, that it tells us of some of those mighty spirits who have left their mark on all time, that it shows us the nations of the earth woven together in one purpose, or is lit up with those great ideas and those great purposes which have kindled the conscience of mankind. If not, we shall be like him in the Pilgrim's Progress, who is seen raking amidst straw and litter, whilst an angel is offering him a crown he will not reach forth his hand to take.

It is in a very different spirit, I know, that you are prepared to look at history. You want to see how it may be made a part of education—the moral training of a rational man. About the importance, the meaning, and duty of education we surely shall all agree. It is to a wise education to which men turn in the break up of all old systems, creeds, and parties. Why else are we here to-night? You have not come here to pass an idle hour. I have not the wish if I had the power to make it pass pleasantly, unless we both came with a purpose. Your presence, then, our presence together in a place of education, a place designed to extend the benefit of wider education—witnesses that this is the end to which we look. Why are we here, except it is that we all share the conviction which grows stronger day by day, that only as education grows amongst us, wider, more universal, more sound, more moral, with higher aims and broader foundations, will true progress in public or private life be won. Have you not all, in the failure of your most ardent hopes, in the baffling of your best efforts, in the consciousness of want of true knowledge and guidance, in despair over social miseries and social wrongs, have you not often, I say, turned back and felt within you that, until better and truer knowledge was spread abroad to all, all hopes were deceitful and all efforts in vain? Has not every one of you who ever believed in or laboured for a political cause or a public measure, who has stood by some principle of social good, some temperance movement, some sanitary scheme, some educational plan, who has ever longed for or worked for a happier feeling to spring up between the classes of employers and employed, or rich and poor, still more each one of you who has ever thought to see old superstitions fall, that bigotry, spite, intolerance, ignorance, brutal ignorance or coarseness, old prejudices, new jealousies, and general apathy, divergence, and confusion were not so easily to be done away? Has he not felt
that acts of parliament, movements, plans, and societies of all sorts were paralyzed and helpless until a truer knowledge could bring men to closer agreement, until a higher moral standard had set in, until the principles both of those who sought to change and of those who sought to retain could be tested by some system of truer science and philosophy, until, in short, **education became general, and sound, and moral and universal.***

I have felt this, and therefore only am I here. In this spirit, for this purpose only, do I suppose that you have come. In this spirit, and this spirit only, let us seek to comprehend the use and meaning of history.

Now, if this is what we mean when we speak of education, let us consider how a knowledge of history forms any part of it, otherwise it will be better to leave it alone. Do we ever ask ourselves why knowledge of any kind is useful? It is not so very easy a matter to give a satisfactory answer after all. It is certainly not true that a knowledge of facts, as facts, is desirable. Facts are infinite, and it is not the millionth part of them that is worth knowing. What some people call the pure love of truth is after all a very poor affair if we come to think of it. It often means only a pure love of intellectual fussiness. A statement may be true, and yet wholly worthless. It cannot be all facts which are the subject of knowledge. For instance, a man might learn by heart the **Post-Office Directory**, and a very remarkable mental exercise it would be; but he would hardly venture to call himself a well-informed man. No; we want the facts only which add to our power, or will enable us to act. They only give us knowledge—they only are a part of education. For instance, you begin the study of mathematics; of algebra, or geometry. What do you do this for? You hardly expect to turn it to practical account. You are not like Hudibras, who could "tell the clock by algebra," nor do you find Euclid's geometry help you to take the shortest cut to your own house. No, this is not your object. Your object is to know something of the simplest principles which underlie all the sciences. You want to understand practically what mathematical demonstration means. You want to bring home to your minds the conception of scientific axioms. All men count—all men work out calculations—all men measure something. Well, you want to know what this counting means; what rules will serve all calculation and all measurements. You want to know what they call the abstract laws of the human understanding. You want, in short, to improve the mind. Again, you study some of the physical laws of nature; you read or hear plain facts about gravitation, or heat, or light. Well, you don't expect to be able to become a practical discoverer, or to take out a patent for a new balloon, or a new stove, or a new lamp. No. You want to know why Faraday is a great teacher. You want to know what it is which seems to affect all nature equally; which brings you down heavily upon the earth if you stumble, and keeps the planets in their orbits. You want to understand what are laws of nature. Again, you want to improve your mind. You take up such pursuits as botany or geology; but then, again, you don't expect to discover a new medicine, or a gold-field, or a coal-mine. No, you want to know something of the mystery around you. You want to see intelligible structure, consistent unity, and common laws in the earth on which we live, with the view, I presume, of feeling more at home in it, of becoming more attached to it, of living in it more happily. Some of you, again, study physiology—that is, you take interest in the structure of the human body, especially of the human brain, and its relation to the body, and its relation to the mind and will. Well, why is this? Again, you do not expect to discover the elixir of life, like an eminent novelist of the clay, and you hardly expect to dispense with the aid of the surgeon. Is not the interest you take in all this, that you want to get a glimpse of that marvellous framework of the human form, some notion of the laws of its existence, some idea of the powers which affect it, which depress or develop it, some knowledge of the relation of the thinking and feeling process, and the thinking and feeling organ. Well, then, you seek to know something of the influences to which all human nature is subject, to be able to understand what people mean when they tell you about laws of health, or laws of life, or laws of thought. You want to be in a position to decide for yourself as to the trustworthiness of men upon whose judgment you depend for bodily existence. No, what you want is to be able to know something of the simplest principles which underlie all the sciences. You want to understand practically what the abstract laws of the human understanding are. You want, in short, to improve the mind. Again, you study some of the physical laws of nature; you read or hear plain facts about gravitation, or heat, or light. Well, you don't expect to be able to become a practical discoverer, or to take out a patent for a new balloon, or a new stove, or a new lamp. No. You want to know why Faraday is a great teacher. You want to know what it is which seems to affect all nature equally; which brings you down heavily upon the earth if you stumble, and keeps the planets in their orbits. You want to understand what are laws of nature. Again, you want to improve your mind. You take up such pursuits as botany or geology; but then, again, you don't expect to discover a new medicine, or a gold-field, or a coal-mine. No, you want to know something of the mystery around you. You want to see intelligible structure, consistent unity, and common laws in the earth on which we live, with the view, I presume, of feeling more at home in it, of becoming more attached to it, of living in it more happily. Some of you, again, study physiology—that is, you take interest in the structure of the human body, especially of the human brain, and its relation to the body, and its relation to the mind and will. Well, why is this? Again, you do not expect to discover the elixir of life, like an eminent novelist of the clay, and you hardly expect to dispense with the aid of the surgeon. Is not the interest you take in all this, that you want to get a glimpse of that marvellous framework of the human form, some notion of the laws of its existence, some idea of the powers which affect it, which depress or develop it, some knowledge of the relation of the thinking and feeling process, and the thinking and feeling organ. Well, then, you seek to know something of the influences to which all human nature is subject, to be able to understand what people mean when they tell you about laws of health, or laws of life, or laws of thought. You want to be in a position to decide for yourself as to the trustworthiness of men upon whose judgment you depend for bodily existence.

Now, in this list of the subjects of a rational education, does it not strike you that something is wanting? Is it not like the old saying about the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out?

"**The proper study of mankind is man.**"

And where in this outline is MAN? Does it not strike you that whilst this object is wanting, all the rest remains vague and incomplete, and aimless? For instance, when you are learning arithmetical or geometry, you are not seeking to perform feats of memory. You do not want to turn yourself into one of Babbage's calculating machines. Mathematics would indeed be only a jumble of figures if it ended in itself. But the moment you come to learn the influence which some great discovery has had on the destinies of man; the moment you see, for instance, how all human thought was lighted up when Galileo saw that the sun, and not the earth, was the centre of our world; the moment you feel that the demonstrations of Euclid are things in which all human minds must agree—indeed, are almost the only things in which all do agree—that moment the science has a meaning, and a clue, and a plan. It had none so long as it was disconnected with the history and the destiny of man—the past and the future. It is the same with every other science. What would be the meaning of laws of nature unless by them man could act on nature? What would be the use of knowing the laws of health, unless we supposed that a
sounder knowledge of them would ameliorate the condition of men? What, indeed, is the use of the improvement of the mind? It is far from obvious that mere exercise of the intellectual faculties alone is a good. A nation of Hamlets (to take a popular conception of that character) would be more truly miserable, perhaps more truly despicable, than a nation of Bushmen. What, then, is it that we mean when we say a cultivated mind, a mental training, a sound education. We mean, if we mean anything good, a state of mind by which we shall become more clear of our condition, of our powers, of our duties towards our fellows, of our true happiness, by which we may make ourselves better citizens and better men, more forbearing to others, more loyal towards true teachers, more zealous for social harmony, more civilized, in short. Well, then, all these preceding studies have been but a preparation, as it were. They have been only to strengthen the mind, and give it material for the true work of education—the inculcation of human duty.

All knowledge, then, is imperfect, we may almost say meaningless, unless it tends to give us sounder notions of our human and social interests. And how, then, are we to prepare ourselves for this? What we need, are clear principles about the moral nature of man as a social being; about the elements of human society; about the nature and capacities of the understanding. We want safe landmarks to guide us in our search after worthy guides, or true principles for social or political action. We want, in short, a general clue to public and private conduct. Few here, I imagine, will expect to learn this in any other method than by an acquaintance with human nature. But human nature is unlike physical nature in this, that its varieties are infinitely greater, and that it shows continual change. The earth rolls round the sun in the same orbit now as in infinite ages past; but man moves forward in a straight line of progress. Ago after age develops into new phases. It is a study of life, of growth, of variety. One generation shows one faculty of human nature in a striking degree; the next exhibits one different to it. All, it is true, leave their mark upon all succeeding generations, and civilization flows on like a vast river, gathering up the waters of its tributary streams. Hence it is that civilization, being not a fixed or lifeless thing, cannot be studied as a fixed or lifeless subject. We can see it only in its movement and its growth. One year is as good as another to the astronomer, but it is not so to the political observer. He must watch successes, and a wide field, and compare a long series of events. Hence it is that in all political, all social, all human questions whatever, his- tory is the main resource of the inquirer. To know what is most really natural to man as a social being, man must be looked at as he appears in a succession of ages, and in very various conditions. To learn the strength or scope of all his capacities together, he must be judged in those successive periods in which each in turn were best brought out. Can any one suppose that he will find all the human institutions and faculties equally well developed, and all in their due proportion and order, by simply looking at the state of civilization now actually around us? Is it not a monstrous assumption that this world of to-day, so full of misery and discontent, strife and despair, ringing with cries of pain, and cries for aid, can really embody forth to us complete and harmonious man? Are there no faculties within him yet fettered, no good instincts stifled, no high yearnings marred? Have we in this year reached the pinnacle of human perfection, lost nothing that we once had, gained all that we can gain? Surely, by the hopes within us, No! And where are they to be found if not in the history of the past? There, in the long struggle of man upwards, we may watch him in his every mood, and see in him often some now forgotten power, capacity, or art yet destined to good service in the future. One by one we may light on the missing links in the chain which connects all races and all ages in one, or gather up the broken threads that must yet be woven into the complex fabric of life.

But there is another side on which history is still more necessary as a guide to consistent and rational action. We not merely need to know what the essential qualities of civilization and of our social nature really are; but we require to know the general course in which they are tending. The more closely we look at it the more distinctly we see that progress moves in a clear and definite path; the development of man is not a casual or arbitrary motion : it moves in a regular and consistent plan. Each part is unfolded in due order,—the whole expanding like a single frame. More and more steadily we see each age working out the gifts of the last and transmitting its labours to the next. More and more certain is our sense of being strong only as we wisely use the materials and follow in the track provided by the efforts of mankind. Is it possible to mistake how completely that influence surrounds us. Take our material existence alone. Well, the earth's surface has been made, as we know it, mainly by man. It would be uninhabitable but for the long labours of those who cleared its primeval forests, drained its swamps, first tilled its rank soil. All the inventions on which we depend for existence, the instruments we use were slowly worked out by the necessities of the childhood of the race. We can only modify or add to these. We could not discard all existing machines and construct an entirely new set of industrial implements. Take our political existence. There again we are equally confined in limits. Our country as a political whole has been formed for us by a long series of wars, struggles, and common efforts. We could not refashion England, or divide it in half, if we tried for a century. Our great towns, our great roads, the very local administrations of our counties, were formed for us by the Romans fifteen centuries since. Could we undo it if we tried and make London a country village, or turn Birmingham into the metropolis? Some people think they could abolish some great institution, such as the House of Lords, for instance, if they tried very hard
Indeed; but few reformers in this country have proposed to abolish the entire British Constitution. Most people look with repugnance on our existing system of the law of real property. Such as it is it was made for us by our feudal ancestors misreading Roman texts. Well, incubus as it is, we must endure it and attempt to improve it. Few people would expect to sweep it away at once as a whole. Turn which ever way you will, we shall find our political systems, laws, and administrations to have been provided for us. And is not this the case more strongly in all moral and intellectual questions? Are we to suppose that whilst our daily life, our industry, our laws, our customs, are controlled by the traditions and materials of the past, our thoughts our habits of mind, our beliefs, our moral sense, our ideas of right and wrong, our hopes and aspirations, are not just as truly formed by the civilization in which we have been reared? We are indeed able to transform it, to develop it, and to give it new life and action; but we can only do so as we understand it. Without this all efforts, reforms, and revolutions are in vain. A change is made, but a few years pass over, and all the old causes reappear. There was some unnoticed power which was not touched, and returns in full force. Take an instance from our own history. Cromwell and his Ironsides, who made the great English Revolution, swept Monarchy, and Church, and peers away, and thought they were gone for ever. Their great chief dead, the old system returned like a tide, and ended in the orgies of Charles and James. The Catholic Church has been, as it were, staggering in its last agonies now for many centuries. Luther believed he had crushed it. Long before his time it seemed nothing but a lifeless mass of corruption. Pope after Pope has been driven into exile. Four or five times has the Church seemed utterly crushed. And yet here in this nineteenth century, it puts forth all its old pretensions, and covers its old territory. In the great French Revolution it seemed, for once, that all actual institutions had been swept away. That devouring fire seemed to have burnt the growth of ages to the very root. Yet a few years pass, and all reappear,—Monarchy, and Church, peers, Jesuits, and Praetorian guards. Again and again they are overthrown. Again and again, after seventy years, they rise in greater pomp and pride. Turn to the memory of many of us here. They who, with courage, energy, and enthusiasm, too seldom imitated, once carried the Reform of Parliament and swept away with a strong hand the stronghold of abuse and privilege, believed that a new era was opening for their country. What would they think, what do they think, now? When they abolished rotten boroughs, and test acts, and curtailed expenditure, did they think that thirty years would find their descendants wrangling about the purchased votes of some miserable constituency, about church rates, and acts of uniformity, and spending seventy millions a year. Does not the experience of every one who was ever engaged in any public movement whatever remind him that every step made in advance seems too often wrung out from him by some silent and unnoticed power? Has he not felt enthusiasm give way to despair, and hopes become nothing but recollections? What is this unseen power which seems to baffle and undo the best and strongest human efforts, that seems to be an overbearing weight against which no man can long struggle? What is this overacting force which seems to revive the dead, to restore what we destroy, to renew forgotten watchwords, exploded fallacies, discredited doctrines, and condemned institutions; against which enthusiasm, intellect, truth, high purpose, and self-devotion seem to beat themselves to death in vain, which breaks the heart of the warm, turns strong brains into peevish criticism, and scatters popular union in angry discord. It is the past. It is the accumulated wills and works of all mankind around us and before us. It is civilization. It is that power which to understand is strength, to repudiate which is weakness. Let us not think that there can be any real progress made which is not based on a sound knowledge of the living institutions, and the active wants of mankind. If we can only act on nature so far as we know its laws, we can only influence society so far as we understand its elements and ways. Let us not delude ourselves into thinking that new principles of policy or social action can be created by themselves or can reconstruct society about us. Those rough maxims, which we are wont to dignify by the name of principles, may be, after all, only crude formulas and phrases without life or power. Only when they have been tested, analysed, and compared with other phases of social life, can we be certain that they are immutable truths. Nothing but a thorough knowledge of the social system, based upon a regular study of its growth, can give us the power we require to affect it. For this end we need one thing above all,—we need history.

But perhaps I may be told: Yes, all this may be very useful for statesmen, or philosophers, or politicians; but what is the use of this to the bulk of the people? They are not engaged in solving political questions, or devising schemes to improve society. Well, I am not sure of that. The bulk of the people, if they are seeking to live the lives of rational and useful citizens, if they have any self-respect and self-reliance, if they only wish to do their duty by their neighbours, are really and truly politicians and reformers. They are solving political problems, and are affecting society very deeply. A man does not need even to be a vestryman, be need not even have one out of the 20,000 votes for Marylebone in order to exercise very great political influence. A man, provided he lives like an honest, thoughtful, truth-speaking citizen, is a power in the state. He is helping to form that which rules the state, which rules statesmen, and is above kings, parliaments, or ministers. He is forming public opinion. It is on this, a public opinion, wise, thoughtful, and consistent, that the destinies of our country rest, and not on acts of parliament, or movements, or institutions, useful as these often are. He who is forming
this is really contributing to the greatness of his country, though timid statesmen dare not trust him with a vote, and ignorant agitators may tell him he is a slave. Every one of us may do this, every one of us may boldly form and utter his opinion. Every one of us may read his newspaper, and may give his voice for the right and against the wrong, a voice which is not lost, though it be not registered on the hustings, or deposited in a ballot-box. Many around us are doing this. Many, in a quiet way, not useless, though unseen, are working out some useful social scheme, and supporting some well-meant effort. Many are straggling like men through darkness, through superstition, cant, and intolerance, towards some more wholesome way of truth and life, to find something they can believe, something they can trust, and understand, and live by.

Are there not many amongst us, many here whose lives are spent in searching for light, in battling with old forms of error, in looking for some sound bond of union amongst men? If there are such, I would ask them, how they can hope to succeed unless they start armed with some knowledge of the efforts that men have made towards this end age after age; unless they know something of the systems of faith which, in turn, have flourished and fallen, and know why they flourished and why they failed, and what good end they served, and what evil they produced; unless they know something of the moral and spiritual history of mankind? The very condition of success is to recognize the difficulty of the task. The work is half done when men see how much is required to begin. Is it not a sort of presumption to attempt to remodel existing institutions, without the least knowledge how they were formed, or whence they grew; to deal with social questions without a thought how society arose; to construct a social creed without a dream of fifty creeds which have risen and vanished before?

Few men would, intentionally, attempt so much; but many do it unconsciously. They think they are not statesmen, or teachers, or philosophers; but, in one sense, they are. In all human affair there is this peculiar quality. They are the work of the combined labours of many. No statesman or teacher can do anything alone. He must have the minds of those he is to guide prepared for him. They must concur, or he is powerless. In reality, he is but the expression of their united wills and thoughts. Hence it is, I say, that all men need, in some sense, the knowledge and the judgment of the statesman and the social teacher. Progress is the result of our joint public opinion; and for progress that opinion must be enlightened. "He only destroys who can replace." All other progress than this—one based on the union of many minds and purposes, and a true conception of the future and the past—is transitory and delusive. Those who defy this power, the man, the party, or the class who forget it, will be beating themselves in vain against a wall; changing, but not improving; moving, but not advancing; rolling, as the poet says of a turbulent city, like a sick man on the restless bed of pain.

And now, if the value of some knowledge of past history is granted, and I am asked how it is to be acquired, whence it is to come, I admit the difficulty of the question. I know the sea of facts, the libraries of books it opens to the view, yet I do not despair. After all I have said none will suppose I recommend a lifeless catalogue of names, or a dry table of dates. No; it is possible to know something of history without a pedantic erudition. Let a man ask himself always what he wants to know. Something of man's social nature; something of the growth of civilization. He needs only to understand something of the character of the great races and systems of mankind. Let him ask himself what the long ages of early empires did for mankind; whether they established or taught anything; if fifty centuries of human skill, labour, and thought were wasted like an autumn leaf. Let him ask himself what the Greeks taught or discovered. Why the Romans were a noble race, and how they printed their footmarks so deeply on the earth. Let him ask what was the original meaning and life of those great feudal institutions of chivalry and Church, of which we see only the rotting carcasses. Let him ask what was the strength, the weakness, and the meaning of the great revolution of Cromwell, or the great revolution in France. A man may learn much true history by a little thinking, without any very ponderous books. Let him go to the Museums and see the pictures, the statues, and buildings of Egyptian and Assyrian times, and ask himself what was the state of society under which men in the far East had learned to use the plough. A man may go to one of our Gothic cathedrals, and seeing there the stupendous grandeur of its outline, the exquisite grace of its design, the solemn and touching expression upon the faces of its old carved or painted saints, kings, and priests; may ask himself if the men who built that could be utterly barbarous, false-hearted, and tyrannical; or if the power which could bring out such noble qualities of the human mind and heart must not have left its trace upon mankind. Indeed, it does not need many books to know something of the life of the past. A man who has enjoyed the best lives in old Plutarch knows not a little of Greek and Roman history. A man who has caught the true spirit of Walter Scott's novels knows something of feudalism and chivalry. But is this enough? Far from it. These desultory thoughts must be connected. These need to be combined into a whole, and combined and used for a purpose. Above all, we must look on history as a whole, trying to find what each age and race has contributed to the common stock, and how and why each followed in its place. Looked at separately, all is confusion and contradiction; looked at as a whole, a common purpose appears. The history of the human race is the history of a growth. It can no more be taken to pieces than the human frame can be taken to pieces. Who would think of making anything of the body without knowing whether it possessed a circulation, a nervous
system, or a skeleton. History is a living whole. If one organ be removed, it is nothing but a lifeless mass. What you have to find in it is the relation and connection of the parts. You must learn how age develops into age, how country reacts upon country, Low thought inspires action, and action modifies thought. Once conceive that all the greater periods of history have had a real and necessary part to fulfil in creating the whole, and you will have done more to understand it than if you had studied some portion of it with a microscope. Once feel that all the parts are needed for the whole, and the difficulty of the mass of materials vanishes. You will come to regard it as a composition or a work of art which cannot be broken up into fragments at pleasure. You would as soon think of dividing it as of taking a figure out of a great picture, or a passage out of a piece of music. Most of you have listened to one of those noble choruses of Handel, such as that "Unto us a son is born," and have heard the opening notes begin simple, subdued, and slow, until they are echoed back in deeper tones, choir answering to choir, voice joining in with voice, growing fuller and stronger with new and varying bursts of melody, until the whole stream of song swells into one vast tide of harmony, and rolls on exulting, wave upon wave in majestic unity and power. Something like this complex harmony is seen in the gathering parts of human history, age taking up the falling notes from ago, race joining with race in answering strain, until the separate parts are mingled in one, and pour on in one movement together. Let us shrink from breaking this whole into fragments, nor lose all sense of harmony in attending to the separate notes.

Lastly, if I may give a word of practical advice, there is one mode in which I think history may be most easily and most usefully approached. Let him who desires to find profit in it, begin by knowing something of the lives of great men. Not, I mean, of those most talked about, not of names chosen at hazard; but of the real great ones who can be shown to have left their mark upon distant ages. Know their-lives, I mean, not merely as interesting studies of character, or as persons seen in a drama, but solely as they represent and influence their age. Not for themselves only must we know them, but as the expression and types of all that is noblest around them. Let us know, then, those whom all men cannot fail to recognize as great—the Caesars, the Charlemagnes, the Alfreds, the Cromwells, great in themselves, but greater as the centre of the hearts of thousands.

We have done much towards understanding the past when we have learned to value and to honour such men truly. Better to know nothing of history than to know with the narrow coldness of a pedant a record which ought to fill us with emotion and reverence. Of all the faults of the character, surely none is so base as heartless indifference to benefactors. And have we any benefactors like these men? Our closest friends, our earliest teachers, our parents themselves, are not more truly our benefactors than they. To them we owe what we prize most—country, freedom, peace, knowledge, art, thought, and higher sense of right and wrong. Have we received from any services like these; not we only, but all equally in common: and have any services been given at so great a cost? What a long tale of patience, courage, sacrifice, and martyrdom is the history of human progress! Should it not affect us as if we were reading in the diary of a parent the record of his struggles for his children. For us they toiled, endured, bled, and died; that we by their labour might have rest, by their thought might know, by their death might live happily. We know the devotion with which the believers in every creed have felt for the authors of their faith. Intolerant and narrow as this has often been, it yet bears witness to a sense of one of the deepest and best of our emotions. The feeling may become too often partial and bigoted; yet let us beware of neglecting it. Let us dread, above bigotry itself, a temper of irreverence and ingratitude. For whom did these men work, if not for us? Not for themselves, when they gave up peace, honour, life, reputation itself—as when the great French republican exclaimed, "May my name be accursed, so that France be free;" not for themselves they worked, but for their cause, for their fellows, for us. Not that they might have fame, but that they might leave the world better than they found it; that there might be more good, less evil, abroad in it; that for themselves they worked, but for their cause, for us. Not that they might have fame, but that they might leave the world better than they found it; that there might be more good, less evil, abroad in it; that the good time might come. What else but this supported Milton in his old age, blind, poor, and dishonoured, when he poured out his spirit in solitude, full of grace, tenderness, and hope, amidst the ruin of all he loved and the obscene triumph of all he despised? Or what else supported Dante, the poet of Florence, when an outlaw and an exile he was cast off by friends and countrymen, and wandered about begging his bread from city to city, pondering the great thoughts which live throughout all Europe? Was not this spirit, too, in one, the noblest victim of the French Revolution, the great philosopher Condorcet; who, condemned, hunted to death, dying of hunger and suffering, devoted the last few hours of his life to the service of mankind; and, whilst the pursuers were on his track, wrote in his hiding-place that noble sketch of the progress of the human race.

It would be base indeed to see in this nothing but a selfish love of fame. It was at bottom in them all a native love for right, an inborn desire for the good, the instinct of duty, which possessed them. To us, indeed, no similar powers are given, nor on us are similar tasks imposed. Our path is smooth, because theirs was so rough; our work is easy, because theirs was so hard; yet the work of civilization, of progress, and truth, begun by them, must be carried on by us; by all, not by some; for all, not for some; and will best be carried on by knowing what they have done for us, what they could not do, and why and where they failed.
Lecture II.

The Connection of History.

On the last occasion we asked if the history of mankind throughout past ages might not have some meaning and uses for us here to-day? We saw grounds to believe that in its right knowledge, there are some lessons for us all. We saw that our daily life and action in any high sense depends upon our truly comprehending the movement of that great stream of human civilization on which we are borne. We saw that to conceive history rightly we must approach it in no pedantic, narrow, or ungenerous spirit. That we must look into it for its mighty deeds and its great men, believing that they who have slowly built up the world of to-day and surrounded our life with infinite creations of thought and toil, wisdom and skill, are worthy of memory, and sympathy, and reverence—a reverence not narrowed to a few ages, or squandered without thought, but one which can reach back into the twilight of our race, and embrace all its true teachers and guides. We saw, too, how history shows us one continuous march of progress, checked and obscured at times, but never stagnant—how age hands on its work to age—nation beckons across sea or desert to its brother nation—race gives to race the choicest product—thinker hands down to thinker ideas and truths long husbanded and stored as heirlooms of mankind, until at last generation after generation, and people with people take up the tale in the yet half-told drama of the world, of which the catastrophe and issue rest with us and our lives.

Let us now try to sketch the outline of this story, link century to century, continent to continent, and judge the share each has in the common work of civilization. To do so, we must go back to ages long before records began. It is but of the latter and the shorter portion of the duration of progress, that any record has been made or preserved. Yet for a general view materials of certain knowledge exist. If we write the biography of a man we do not begin only with the year of his life in which his diary opens; we seek to know his parentage, education, and early association. To understand him we must do so. So, too, the biography of mankind must not confine itself to the eras of chronological tables, and of recorded specific events. Let us remember also that in all large instances the civilization of an epoch or a people has a certain unity in it—that their philosophy, their policy, their habits, and their religion must more or less accord, and all depend at last upon the special habit of their minds. It is this central form of belief which determines all the rest. Separately no item which makes up their civilization as a whole, can be long or seriously changed. It is what a man believes, which makes him act as he does. Thus shall we see that as their reasoning powers develope all else develope likewise, their science, their art break up or take new forms; their system of society expands; their life, their morality, and their religion gradually are dissolved and reconstructed.

Let us then place ourselves back in imagination at a period when the whole surface of the earth was quite unlike what it is now. Let us suppose it as it was after the last great geologic change—the greater portion of its area covered with primeval forests, vast swamps, dense jungles, and arid deserts. Let us not think the earth had always the same face as now. Such as it is it has been made by man—the rich pasturages and open plains have all been created by his toil—even the grain, and fruits, and flowers that grow upon its soil have been made what they are by his care. As yet the now teeming valleys of the great rivers, such as the Nile, or the Euphrates, or the Po, were wildernesses or swamps. The rich meadows of our own island were marshes, where its corn fields stand now were trackless forests. As yet such countries as Holland were swept over by every tide of the sea, and such countries as Switzerland, and Norway, America, or Russia, were submerged beneath endless pine woods. And through these forests and wastes ranged countless races of animals, many, doubtless, long extinct, in variety and numbers more than we can even conceive. And where in this terrible world was man? Scanty, perhaps, in number, confined to a few favourable spots, helpless, dispersed, and alone, man sustained a precarious existence, not yet the lord of creation, inferior to the brutes in strength, only just superior to them in mind,—nothing but the first of the animals. As are the lowest of all savages now, perhaps even lower, man once was. Conceive what Robinson Crusoe would have been had his island been a dense jungle overrun with savage beasts, without his gun, or his knife, or his knowledge, with nothing but his human hand and his human brain. Ages have indeed passed since then—perhaps some twenty thousand years—perhaps far more—have rolled by. But they should not be quite forgotten, and all recollection perish of that dark time when man waged a struggle for life or death with nature. Let us be just even to those who fought that fight with the brutes, hunted down and exterminated step by step the races too dangerous to man, and cleared the ground of these monstrous rivals. Every nation has its primeval heroes, whose hearts quailed not before the lion or the dragon. Its Nimrod, a mighty hunter before the Lord; its Hercules, whose club smote the serpent hydra; its Odin, who slew monsters.
The forests, too, had to be cleared. Step by step man won his way into the heart of those dark jungles; slowly the rank vegetation was swept off, here and there a space was cleared, here and there a plain was formed which left a patch of habitable soil. Everywhere man began as a hunter, a savage hunter, of the woods or the wilderness, without implements, without clothing, without homes, perhaps without the use of fire. Man's supremacy over the brutes was first asserted when his mind taught him how to make the rude bow, or the flint knife, or to harden clay or wood by heat. But not only were all the arts and uses of life yet to be found, but all the human institutions had to be formed. As yet language, family, marriage, property, tribe, were not, or only were in germ. A few cries assisted by gesture, a casual association of the sexes, a dim trace of parentage or brotherhood, were all that was. Language, as we know it, has been slowly built up, stage after stage, by the instinct of the entire race. Necessity led to new sounds which use developed, sounds became words, words were worked into sentences, and half-animal cries grew into intelligible speech. We must remember this with gratitude, and with no less gratitude those whose higher instincts first taught them to unite in permanent pairs, to cling to the children of one home, to form into parties and companies, to clothe themselves, and put checks upon the violent passions. Surely they who first drew savage man out of the life of unbridled instinct and brutal loneliness; who first showed the practices of personal decency and cleanliness; who first taught men to be faithful and tender to the young and the old, the woman, and the mother; who first brought these wild hunters together and made them trust each other and their chief—surely these were the first great benefactors of mankind;—surely this is the beginning of the history of the race.

And if this was the material and moral condition of man, what was his intellectual; what was his knowledge, his worship, and his religion? Turn to the earliest traditions of men, to the simple ideas of childhood, and especially to the savage tribes we know, and we have the answer. Man's intellect was far feeble than his activity or his feelings. He knew nothing, he rested in the first imagination. He reasoned on nothing, he supposed everything. He looked upon nature, and saw it full of life, motion, and strength. He knew what struggles he had with it, he felt it often crush him, he felt he could often crush it, and he thought that all, brutes, plants, rivers, storms, forests, mountains, were powers, living, feeling, and acting like himself. Is it hard to conceive this? Do not the primeval legends, the fairy tales of all nations, show it to us? Does not the child punish its doll, and the savage defy the thunder, and the horse start at a gnarled oak swaying its boughs like arms in the wind. Man then looked out upon nature, and thought it a living thing—a simple belief which answered all questions. He knew nothing of matter, or elements, or laws. His celestial and his terrestrial philosophy was summed up in this—things act so because they choose. He never asked why the sun or moon rose and set. They were bright beings who walked their own paths when and as they pleased. He never thought why a volcano smoked, or a river overflowed, or thought only that the one was wroth and roared; and that the other had started in fury from his bed. And what was his religion? What could it but be? Affection for the fruits and flowers of the earth—dread and prostration before the terrible in nature—worship of the bright sun, or sanctuary groove or mountain—in a word, the adoration of nature, the untutored impulse towards the master powers around such as we see it in the negro or the Chinese. As yet nothing was fixed, nothing common. Each worshipped in love or dread what most seized his fancy—each family had its own fetishes—each tribe its mountains; often it worshipped its own dead—friends who had begun a new existence. Such was their religion, the unguided faith of childhood, exaggerating all the feelings and sympathies, stimulating love, and hatred, and movement, and destruction, but leaving everything vague, giving no fixity, no unity, no permanence. In such a condition, doubtless, man passed through many thousand years, tribe struggling with tribe in endless battles for their hunting grounds, often, we may fear, devouring their captives, without any fixed abode, or definite association, or material progress, yet gradually forming the various arts and institutions of life, gradually learning the use of clothes, of metals, of implements, of speech—a race whose life depended solely upon the chase, whose only society was the tribe, whose religion was the worship of natural objects.

Now in this first struggle with nature man was not alone. Slowly he won over to his side one or two of the higher animals. Was not this a wonderful victory, assuring his ultimate ascendancy? The dog was won from his wolf-like state to join and aid in the chase. The horse bowed his strength in generous submission to a master. Do we reflect enough upon the efforts that this cost? Are we forgetful of the wonders of patience, gentleness, sympathy, sagacity, and nerve, which were required for the first domestication of animals? Do we sufficiently think upon the long centuries of care which were needed to change the very nature of these noble brutes, without whom we should indeed be helpless? By degrees the ox, the sheep, the goat, the camel, and the ass were reared by man, formed part of his simple family, and became the lower portion of the tribe. Their very natures, their external forms were changed. Milk and its compounds formed the basis of food. The hunter's life became less precarious, less rambling, less violent. In short, the second great stage of human existence began, and pastoral life commenced. Surely this was a great advance! Larger tribes could now collect, for there was now no lack of food; tribes gathered into a horde; something like society began. It had its leaders, its elders, perhaps its teachers, poets, and wise men. Men ceased to rove for ever. They stay upon a favourable pasture for
long together. Next property, that is stored up subsistence, began; flocks and herds; accumulated; men were no longer torn daily by the wants of hunger; and leisure, repose, and peace were possible. The women were relieved from the crushing toil of the past. The old were no longer abandoned or neglected through want. Reflection, observation, thought began, and with thought religion. As life became more fixed worship became less vague and general. Some fixed great powers alone were adored, chiefly the host of heaven, the stars, the moon, and the great sun itself. Then some elder, freed from toil or war, meditating on the world around him, as he watched the horde start forth at the rising of the sun, the animals awakening and nature opening beneath his rays, first came to think all nature moved at the will of that sun himself, perhaps even of some mysterious power of whom that sun was but the image. From this would rise a regular worship common to the whole horde, uniting them together, explaining their course of life, stimulating their powers of thought. With this some kind of knowledge commenced. Their vast herds and flocks needed to be numbered, distinguished, and separated. Arithmetic began; the mode of counting, of adding and subtracting was slowly worked out. The horde's course, also, must be directed by the seasons and the stars. Hence astronomy began. The course of the sun was steadily observed, the recurrence of the seasons noted. Slowly the first ideas of order, regularity, and permanence arose. The world was no longer a chaos of conflicting forces. The earth had its stated times, all governed by the all-ruling sun. Now, too, the horde had a permanent existence. Its old men could remember the story of its wanderings and the deeds of its mighty ones, and would tell them to the young when the day was over. Poetry, narrative, and history had began. Leisure brought the use of fresh implements. Metals were found and worked. The loom was invented; the wheeled car came into use; the art of the smith, the joiner, and the boat-builder. New arts required a subdivision of labour, and division of labour required orderly rule. Society had begun. A greater step was yet at hand. Around some sacred mountain or grove, in some more favoured spot, where the horde would longest halt or oftenest return, some greater care to clear the ground, to protect the pasture, and to tend the plants was shown; some patches of soil were scratched to grow some useful grains, some rude corn ears were cultivated into wheat, the earth began to be tilled. Man passed into the third great stage of material existence, and agriculture began. Agriculture once commenced a new era was at hand. Now organized society was possible. Do we estimate duly this the greatest effort towards progress ever accomplished by mankind? Do we remember how much had to be learnt, how many arts had to be invented, before the savage hunter could settle down into the peaceful, the provident, and the intelligent husbandman? What is all our vaunted progress to this great step? What are all our boasted inventions compared with the first great discoveries of man, the spinning-wheel and loom, the plough, the clay-vessel, the wheel, the boat, the bow, the hatchet, and the forge? Surely, if we reflect, our inventions are chiefly modes of multiplying or saving force; these were the transformations of substances, or the interchange of force. Ours are, for the most part, but expansions of the first idea; these are the creations.

Since it is with agriculture that organized society alone can start, it is with justice that the origin of civilization is always traced to those great plains where agriculture alone was then possible. It was in the basins of the great Asian rivers, the Euphrates, the Tigris, the Ganges, and in that of the Nile, that fixed societies began. There, where irrigation is easy, the soil rich, and country open, cultivation arose, and with cultivation of the soil, the accumulation of its produce, and with more easy sustenance, leisure, thought, and observation. Use taught man to distinguish between matter and life, man and animal, thought and motion. Men's eyes were opened, and they saw that nature was not alive, and had no will. They watched the course of the sun and saw that it moved in fixed ways. They watched the sea, and saw that it rose and fell by tides. Then, too, they needed knowledge and they needed teachers. They needed men to measure their fields, their barns, to teach them to build strongly, to calculate the seasons for them, to predict the signs of the weather, to expound the will of the great powers who ruled them. Thus slowly rose the notion of gods, the unseen rulers of these powers of earth and sky, a god of the sea, of the river, of the sky, of the sun, and between them and their gods rose the first priests, the ministers and interpreters of their will, and polytheism and theocracies began. Thus simply amidst these great settled societies of the plain began the great human institution—the priesthood—at first only some wiser elders who had some deeper knowledge of the arts of settled life. Gradually knowledge advanced: knowledge of the seasons and of the stars or of astronomy, of enumeration or arithmetic, of measurement or geometry, of medicine and surgery, of building, of the arts, of music, of poetry; gradually this knowledge became deposited in the hands of a few, and transmitted and accumulated from father to son. The intellect asserted its power, and the rule over a peaceful and industrious race slowly passed into the hands of a priesthood, or an educated and sacred class. These were the men who founded the earliest form of civilized existence; the most complete, the most enduring, the most consistent of all human societies, the great theocracies or religious societies of Asia and Egypt. Thus for thousands of years before the earliest records of history, in all the great plains of Asia and along the Nile, nations flourished in a high and elaborate form of civilization. We will examine one only, the best known to us, the type, the earliest and the greatest—the Egyptian.
The task to be accomplished was immense. It was nothing less than the foundation of permanent and organized society. Till this was done all was in danger. All knowledge might be lost, the arts might perish, the civil community might break up. Hitherto there had been no permanence, no union, no system. What was needed was to form the intellectual and material framework of a fixed nation. And this the Egyptian priesthood undertook. The spot was favourable to the attempt. In that great, rich plain, walled off on all sides by the desert or by the sea, it was possible to found a society at once industrial, peaceful, and settled. They needed judges to direct them, teachers to instruct them, men of science to help them, governors to rule them, preachers to admonish them, physicians to heal them, artists to train them, and priests to sacrifice for them. To meet these wants a special order of men spontaneously arose, by whose half-conscious efforts a complete system of society was gradually and slowly formed. In their hands was concentrated the whole intellectual product of ages, this they administered for the common good. Gradually by their care there arose a system of regular industry. To this end they divided out by their superior skill all the arts and trades of life. Each work was apportioned, each art had its subordinate arts. Then as a mode of perpetuating skill in crafts, to insure a sound apprenticeship of every labour, they caused or enabled each man's work to become hereditary within certain broad limits, and thus created or sanctioned a definite series of castes. Then to give sanction to the whole, they consecrated each labour, and made each workman's toil a part of his religious duty. Then they organized a scheme of general education. They provided a system of teaching common to all, adapted to the work of each. They provided for the special education of the sacred class in the whole circle of existing knowledge; they collected observations, they treasured up discoveries, and recorded events. Next they organized a system of government. They established property, they divided out the land, they set up landmarks, they devised rules for its tenure, they introduced law, and magistrates, and governors; provinces were divided into districts, towns, and villages; violence was put down, a strict police exercised, regular taxes imposed. Next they organized a strict system of morality, the social, the domestic, and the personal duties were minutely defined: practices relating to health, cleanliness, and temperance, were enforced by religious obligations, every act of life, every moment of existence was made a part of sacred duty. Lastly, they organized national life by a vast system of common religious rites, by imposing ceremonies which awakened the imagination and kindled the emotions, bound up the whole community into an united people, and gave stability to their national existence, by the awful majesty of a common and mysterious belief.

Do we want to know what such a system of life was like? Let us go into some museum of Egyptian antiquities, where we may see representations of their mode of existence carved upon their walls. There we may see nearly all the arts of life as we know them— weaving and spinning, working in pottery, glass-blowing, building, carving, and painting, ploughing, sowing, threshing, and gathering into bams, boating, irrigation, fishing, wine-pressing, dancing, singing, and playing—a vast community, in short, orderly, peaceful, and intelligent; capable of gigantic works and of refined arts, before which we are lost in wonder; a civilized community busy and orderly as a hive of bees, amongst whom every labour and function was arranged in perfect harmony and distinctness; all this may be seen upon monuments at least 5000 years old.

Here, then, we have civilization itself. All the arts of life had been brought to perfection, and indelibly implanted on the mind of men in away that they could never be utterly lost. All that constitutes orderly government, the institutions of society, had been equally graven into human existence. A check had been placed upon the endless and desultory warfare of tribes; and great nations existed. The ideas of domestic life, marriage, filial duty, care for the aged and the dead, had become a second nature. The wholesome practices of social life, of which we think so lightly, had all been invented and established. The practice of regular holidays, and social gatherings, and common celebrations began—the record and division of past ages, the exact times of the seasons, and of the year, the months, and its festivals; the great yet little prized institution of the week. Nor were the gains to thought less. In the peaceful rolling on of those primeval ages, observations had been stored up by an unbroken succession of priests, without which science never would have existed. It was no small feat in science first to have determined the exact length of the year. It needed observations stretching over a cycle of 1500 years. But the Egyptian priests had enumerated the stars, and could calculate for centuries in advance the times of their appearance. They possessed the simpler processes of arithmetic and geometry; they knew something of chemistry, and much of botany, and even a little of surgery. There was one invention yet more astonishing; the Egyptians invented, the Phenicians perfected, the art of writing, and transmitted the alphabet—our alphabet—to the Greeks. Do we rightly estimate the amazing intellectual effort required for the formation of the alphabet; not to shape the forms, but first to conceive that the sounds we utter could be classified, and reduced down to those simple elements we call the letters. Truly I can imagine hardly any effort of abstract thought more difficult than this, and certainly none more essential to the progress of the human mind.

They were indeed great minds who did all this; great because they not so much promoted civilization as created it. Never perhaps before or since have single minds ever received this universal culture; never perhaps
have shown this many-sided activity and strength. Never before or since has such power been concentrated in the same hands—the entire moral and material control over society. They were great minds, great souls also who could conceive and carry through such a task, greater perhaps in this that they did not care to celebrate themselves for posterity, but passed away when their work was done, contented to have seen it done, as Moses did when he went up alone to die in secret, that no man might know or worship at his tomb. The debt we owe these men and these times is great. It is said that man learns more in the first year of his childhood than in any year subsequently of his life. And in this long childhood of the world, how many things were learnt. Is it clear that they could have been learnt in any other way? Caste, in its decline, is the most degrading of human institutions. Can we be sure that without it the arts of life could have been taught and preserved in those unsettled ages of war and migration. We rebel justly against all priestly tyranny over daily life and customs. Are we sure that without these sanctions of religion and law, the rules of morality, of decency, and health could ever have been imposed upon the lawless instincts of mankind. We turn with repugnance from the monotony of those unvarying ages, and of that almost stagnant civilization; but are we sure that without it, it would have been possible to collect the observations of distant ages, and the records of dynasties and eras on which all science and all history rest: would it have been possible to provide a secure and tranquil field in which the slow growth of language, art, and thought could have worked out generation after generation, their earliest and most difficult result?

No form of civilization has ever endured so long; its consequences are stamped deeply still upon our daily life; yet the time came when even these venerable systems must die.

Their work was done, and it was time for them to pass away. Century after century had gone by teaching the same lessons, but adding nothing new. Human life began to be stifled in these primeval forms. The whole empire of the priests grew evil and corrupt. We know them chiefly in their decline, when kings and conquerors had usurped and perverted the patient energies of these long tutored peoples. These great societies passed from industrial and social communities into stupendous tyrannies, made up of cruelty and pride. It was the result of the great and fatal error which lay beneath the whole priestly system. They had misconceived their strength and their knowledge. They had undertaken to organize society whilst their own knowledge was feeble and imperfect. They had tried to establish the rule of mind, of all rules the most certainly destined to fail; and they based that rule upon error and misconception. They pretended to govern society instead of confining themselves to the only possible task, to teach it. They who had begun by securing progress, now were its worst obstacles. They who began to rule by the right of intelligence, now dreaded and crushed intelligence. They fell as every priesthood has fallen, which has ever based its claims upon imperfect knowledge, or pretended to command in the practical affairs of life. Yet there was only one way in which the nightmare of this intellectual and social oppression could be shaken off, and these strong systems broken up. It was no doubt by the all-powerful instinct of conquest, and by the growth of vast military monarchies that the change was accomplished. Those antique societies of peace and industry degenerated at last into conquering empires, and, during 1000 years which precede the Persian empire, Asia was swept from side to side by the armies of Assyrian, Median, Babylonian, and Egyptian conquerors. Empire after empire rose and fell with small result, save that they broke the death-like sleep of ages, and brought distant people from the ends of the earth into contact with each other.

The world seemed in danger of perishing by exhaustion. It needed a new spirit to revive it. But now another race appears upon the scene; a branch of that great Aryan people, who from the high lands of central Asia have swept over Assyria, India, and Europe, the people who as Greeks, Romans, Gauls, or Teutons have been the foremost of mankind, of whom we ourselves are but a younger branch. Now, too, the darkness which covered those earlier ages of the world rolls off, and accurate history begins, and the drama proceeds in the broad light of certainty.

It is about 550 B.C. that the first great name in general history appears, and Cyrus founds the Persian empire. For ages along the mountain slopes between the Himalayas and the Caspian Sea, the Persian race had dwelt, a simple race of wandering herdsmen, apart from the vast empires of Babylon and Nineveh in the plains below. There they grew up with nobler and freer thoughts, not crushed by the weight of a powerful monarchy, not degraded by-decaying superstitions, nor enervated by material riches. They honoured truth, freedom, and energy. They had faith in themselves and their race. They valued morality more than ceremonies. They believed in a Supreme Power of the universe. Just as the northern nations afterwards poured over the Roman empire, so these stronger tribes were preparing to descend upon the decaying remains of the Asiatic empires. They needed only a captain, and they found one worthy of the task in the great King Cyrus. He, marshalling his mountain warriors into a solid army, swept down upon the plains, and one by one the empires fell before him, until from the Mediterranean to the Indus, from Tartary to the Arabian Gulf, all Asia submitted to his sway. His successors continued his work, pushing across Arabia, Egypt, Africa, and Northern Asia itself. There over that enormous tract they built up the Persian monarchy, which swallowed up and fused into one so many ancient empires. The conquerors were soon absorbed, like the Northmen, into the theocratic faith and life of the conquered, and
throughout half of the then inhabited globe one rule, one religion, one system of life alone existed. But the Persian kings could not rest whilst a corner remained unconquered. On the shores of the Mediterranean they had come upon a people who had defied them with strange audacity. Against them the whole weight of the Asian empire was put forth. For ten years fleets and armies were preparing. There came archers from the wastes of Tartary and the deserts of Africa; charioteers from Nineveh and Babylon; horsemen, clubmen, and spearmen; the mailclad footmen of Persia; the fleets of the Phenicians; all the races of the East gathered in one vast host, and as men said, 5,000,000 men and 2000 ships poured over the Eastern seas upon the devoted people.

And who were they who seemed thus doomed? Along the promontories and islands of the eastern Mediterranean there dwelt the scattered race whom we call Greeks, who had gradually worked out a form of life totally differing from the old, who had wonderfully expanded the old arts of life and modes of thought. With them the destinies of the world then rested for all its future progress. With them all was life, change, and activity. Broken into sections by infinite bays, mountains, and rivers, scattered over a long line of coasts and islands, the Greek race, with natures as varied as their own beautiful land, as restless as their own seas, had never been moulded into one great solid empire, and early threw off the weight of a ruling caste of priests. No theocracy or religious system of society ever could establish itself amidst a race so full of life and motion, so exposed to influences from without, so divided within. They had borrowed the arts of life from the great Eastern peoples, and, in borrowing, had wonderfully improved them. The alphabet, shipbuilding, commerce, they had from the Phenicians; architecture, sculpture, painting from the Assyrian or Lydian empires. Geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, they had borrowed from the Egyptians. The various fabrics, arts, and appliances of the East came to them in profusion across the seas. Their earliest lawgivers, rulers, and philosophers, had all travelled through the great Asian kingdom, and came back to their small country with a new sense of all the institutions and ideas of civilized life. But the Greeks borrowed, they did not imitate. Alone as yet, they had thrown off the tyranny of custom, of caste, of kingcraft, and of priestcraft. They only had moulded the ponderous column and the uncouth colossus of the East into the graceful shaft and the life-like figure of the gods. They only had dared to think freely, to ask themselves what or whence was this earth around, to meet the great problems of abstract thought, to probe the foundations of right and wrong. Lastly, they alone had conceived the idea of a people not the servants of one man or of a class, not chained down in a rigid order of submission, but the free and equal citizens of a republic, for on them had first dawned the idea of a civilized community in which men should be not masters and slaves, but brothers.

On poured the myriads of Asia, creating a famine as they marched, drying up the streams, and covering the seas with their ships. Who does not know the tale of that immortal effort—how the Athenians armed old and young, burned their city, and went on board their ships—how for three days Leonidas and his three hundred held the pass against the Asian host, and lay down, each warrior at his post, calmly smiling in death—how the Greek ships lay in ambush in their islands, for the mighty fleet of Persia—how the unwieldy mass was broken and pierced by their dauntless enemy—how, all day, the battle raged beneath the eyes of the great king himself, and, at its close, the seas were heaving with the wrecks of the shattered host. Surely, of all the battles in history, this one of Salamis was the most precious to the human race. No other tale of war can surpass it. Do we enough estimate the heroism, the genius, the marvellous audacity by which these pigmy fleets and armies of a small, weak race, withstood and crushed the entire power of Asia, and preserved from extinction the life and intellect of future ages.

Victory followed upon victory, and the whole Greek race expanded with this amazing triumph. The whole of the old world had been brought face to face with the intellect which was to transform it. The Greek mind, with the whole East open to it, exhibited inexhaustible activity. A century sufficed to develop a thoroughly new phase of civilization. They carried the arts to a height whereon they stand as the types for all time. In poetry they exhausted and perfected every form of composition. In politics they built up a multitude of communities, rich with a prolific store of political and social institutions. Throughout their stormy history stand forth great names. Now and then there arose amongst them leaders of real genius. For a time they showed some splendid instances of public virtue, of social life, patriotism, elevation, sagacity, and energy. For a moment Athens at least may have believed that she had reached the highest type of political existence. But with all this activity and greatness there was no true unity. Wonderful as was their ingenuity, their versatility and energy, it was too often wasted in barren struggles and wanton restlessness. For a century and a half after the Persian invasion, the petty Greek states contended in one weary round of contemptible civil wars and aimless revolutions. One after another they cast their great men aside, to think out by themselves the thoughts that were to live for all time, and gave themselves up to be the victims of degraded adventurers. For one moment only in their history, if indeed for that, they did become a nation. At last, wearied out by endless wars and constant revolutions, the Greek states by force and fraud were fused in one people by the half-Greek Macedonian kings, and by them, instead of by true Greeks, the great work so long postponed, but never through their history forgotten, was at length attempted—the work of avenging the Persian invasion, and subduing Asia. Short and
wonderful was that career of conquest, due wholly to one marvellous mind. Alexander, indeed, in military and practical genius seems to stand above all Greeks, as Cæsar above all Romans; they two the greatest rulers of the ancient world. No story, perhaps, in history, is so romantic as the tale of that ten years of victory when Alexander, at the head of some thirty thousand veteran Greeks, poured over Asia, crushing army after army, taking city after city, and receiving the homage of prince after prince, himself lighting like a knight-errant: until subduing the Persian empire, and piercing Asia from side to side, and having reached even the great rivers of India, he turned back to Babylon to organize his vast empire, to found new cities, pour life into the decrepit frame of the East, and give to these enthranced nations the arts and wisdom of Greece. For this he came to Babylon, but came thither only to die. Endless confusion ensued; province after province broke up into a separate kingdom, and the vast empire of Alexander became the prey of military adventurers. Yet though this attempt of his, like so much else that Greece accomplished, was, indeed, in appearance a disastrous failure, still it had not been in vain. The Greek mind was diffused over the East like the rays of the rising sun when it revives and awakens slumbering nature. The Greek language, the most wonderful instrument of thought ever composed by man, became common to the whole civilized world; it bound together all educated men from the Danube to the Indus. The Greek literature, poetry, history, science, philosophy, and art, was at once the common property of the empire. The brilliance, the audacity, the strength of the Greek reasoning awoke the dormant powers of thought. The idea of laws, the idea of states, the idea of citizenship, came like a revelation upon the degenerate slaves of the Eastern tyrannies. Nor was the result less important to the Greek mind itself. Now, at last, the world was open without obstacle. The philosophers poured over the new empire; they ransacked the records of primeval times; they studied the hoarded lore of the Egyptian and Chaldean priests. Old astronomical observations, old geometric problems, long concealed, were thrown open to them. They travelled over the whole continent of Asia, studying its wonders of the past, collecting its natural curiosities, examining its surface, its climates, its production, its plants, its animals, and its human races, customs, and ideas. Lastly, they gathered up and pondered over the half-remembered traditions and the half-comprehended mysteries of Asian belief, the conceptions which had risen up before the intense abstraction of Indian and Babylonian mystics, Jewish and Egyptian prophets and priests, the notion of some great principle or thought, or Being, utterly unseen and unknown, above all gods, and without material form. Thus arose the earliest germ of that spirit which, by uniting Greek logic with Asian or Jewish imaginations, prepared the way for the religious systems of Mussulman and Christian.

Such was the result of the great conquest of Alexander. Not by its utter failure as an empire are we to judge it; not by the vices and follies of its founder, or the profligate orgies of its dissolution, must we condemn it. We must value it as the means whereby the effete world of the East was renewed by the life of European thought, by which the first ideas of nature as a whole and of mankind as a whole, arose, by which the ground was first prepared for the Roman empire, and for Christian and Mahometan religion. And, now, what was the gift of Greece to the world? As a nation the Greeks had established little that was lasting. They had changed much; they had organized hardly anything. As the great Asian system had sacrificed all to permanence, so the Greek sacrificed all to movement. The Greeks had created no majestic system of law, no solid political order, no complex social system. If civilization had stopped there it would have ended in ceaseless agitation, discord, and dissolution. Their character was wanting in self-command and tenacity, and their genius was too often wasted in intellectual license. Yet if politically they were unstable, intellectually they were great. The lives of their great heroes are their rich legacy to all future ages; Solon, Pericles, Epaminondas, and Demosthenes stand forth as the types of all that is great in the noble leader of men. The story of their best days has scarcely its equal in history. In art they gave us the works of Phidias, the noblest image of the human form ever created by man. In poetry, the models of all time—Homer, the greatest and the earliest of poets; Æschylus the greatest master of the tragic art; Plato, the most eloquent of moral teachers; Pindar, the first of all in lyric art. In philosophy and in science the Greek mind laid the foundations of all knowledge, beyond which, until the last three centuries, very partial advance had been made. Building on the ground prepared by the Egyptians, they did much to perfect arithmetic, raised geometry to a science by itself, and invented that system of astronomy which served the world for fifteen centuries. In knowledge of animal life, and the art of healing they constructed a body of accurate observations and sound analysis; in physics, or the knowledge of the material earth, they advanced to the point at which little was added till the time of Bacon himself. In abstract thought their results were still more surprising. All the ideas that lie at the root of our modern abstract philosophy may be found in germ in Greece. The schools of modern metaphysics are little but developments of theirs. They analysed with perfect precision and wonderful minuteness the processes employed in language and in reasoning; they invented grammar and logic, and rhetoric, and music: they correctly analysed the human mind, the character, and the emotions, and invented the science of morality and the art of education; they correctly analysed the elements of society and political life, and invented the science of politics, or the theory of social union. Lastly, they criticized and laid bare all the existing beliefs of mankind; pierced the imposing falsehood of the old religions;
meditated on all the various answers ever given to the problem of human destiny, of the universe and its origin, and slowly worked out the conception of unity through the whole visible and invisible universe, which, in some shape or other, has been the belief of man for twenty centuries. Such were their gifts to the world. It was an intellect active, subtle, and real, marked by the true scientific character of freedom, precision, and consistency.

And, as the Greek intellect overtopped the intellect of all races of men, and combined in itself the gifts of all others, so were the great intellects of Greece all overtopped and concentrated in one great mind—the greatest, doubtless, of all human minds—the matchless Aristotle; as the poet says, "The master of those who know," who, on all branches of human knowledge, built the strong foundations of abiding truth.

Let us pause for a moment to reflect what point we have reached in the history of civilization. Asia had founded the first arts and usages of material life, begun the earliest social institutions, and taught us the rudiments of science and of thought. Greece had expanded all these in infinite variety and subtility, had instituted the free state, and given life to poetry and art, had formed fixed habits of accurate reasoning and of systematic observation. Materially and intellectually civilization existed. Yet in Greece we feel that, socially, everything is abortive. The Greeks had not grown into an united nation. They split into a multitude of jealous republics. These republics split into hostile and restless factions. All that we associate with true national existence was yet to come, but the noble race who were to find it had long been advancing towards their high destiny. Alexander, perhaps, had scarcely heard of that distant, half-educated people, who for four centuries had been slowly building up the power which was to absorb and supersede his empire. But far beyond the limits of his degenerate subjects, worthier successors of his genius were at hand—the Romans were coming upon the world. The Greeks founded the city, the Romans the nation. The Greeks were the authors of philosophy, the Romans of government, justice, and peace. The Greek type was thought, the Roman type was law. The Greeks taught us the noble lesson of individual freedom, the Romans the still nobler lesson, the sense of social duty. It is just, therefore, that to the Romans, as to the people who alone throughout all ages gave unity, peace, and order to the civilized world, who gave us the elements of our modern political life, and have left us the richest record of acts of public duty, heroism, and self-sacrifice; it is just that to them we assign the place of the noblest nation in history. That which marks the Roman with his true greatness was his devotion to the social body, his sense of self-surrender to country; a duty to which the claims of family and person were implicitly to yield, which neither death, nor agony, nor disgrace could subdue; which was the only reward, pleasure, or religion which a true citizen could need. This was the greatness, not of a few leading characters, but of an entire people. The Roman state did not give birth merely to heroes, it was formed of heroes; nor were they less marked by their sense of obedience, submission to rightful authority where the interest of the state required it, submission to order and law. They had too deeply a sense of justice. They did not war to crush the conquered; once subdued, they dealt with them as their fellows, they made equal laws and a common rule for them; they bound them all into the same service of their common country. Above all other nations in the world they believed in a mission and a destiny. They paused not century after century in one great object. No prize could beguile them, no delusion distract them. Each Roman felt the divinity of the Eternal City, destined always to march onwards in triumph: in its service every faculty of his mind was given; life, wealth, and rest were as nothing to this cause. In this faith they could plan out for the distant future, build up so as to prepare for vast extension, calculate far distant chances, and lay stone by stone the walls of an enduring structure. Hence each Roman was a statesman, for he needed to provide for the future ages of his country; each Roman was a citizen of the world, for all nations were destined to be his fellow-citizens; each Roman could command, for he had learnt to obey, and to know that he who commands and he who obeys are but the servants of one higher power—their common fatherland.

Long and stern were the efforts by which this power was built up. But deep as is the mystery which covers the origin of Rome, we can still trace dimly how, about the centre of the Italian peninsula, along the banks of the Tiber, fragments of two tribes were fused by some heroic chieftain into one; the first more intellectual, supple, and ingenious, the second more stubborn, courageous, and faithful. We see more clearly how this compound people rose through the strength of these qualities of mind and character to be the foremost of the neighbouring tribes; how they long maintained that religious order of society which the Greeks so early shook off; how it moulded all the institutions of their life, filled them with reverence for the duties of family, for their parents, their wives, for the memory and the spirit of their dead ancestors, taught them submission to judges and chiefs, devotion to their mother city, love for her commands, her laws, and her traditions, trained them to live and die for her, indeed compassed their whole existence with a sense of duty towards their fellows and each other; how this sense of social duty grew into the very fibres of their iron natures, kept the State through all dangers rooted in the imperishable trust and instinct of a massive people; then how this well-knit race advanced step by step upon their neighbouring tribes, slowly united them in one, gave them their own laws, made them their own citizens; step by step advanced upon the only civilized nation of the peninsula, the theocratic society of Etruria, took from them the arts of war and peace; how the hordes of Northern barbarians poured over the
peninsula like a flood, sweeping all the nations below its waters, and when they emerged, Rome only was left strong and confident; how, after four centuries of constant struggle, held up always by the sense of future greatness, the Romans had at length absorbed one by one the leading nations of Italy, and by one supreme effort, after thirty years of war, had crushed their noblest and strongest rivals, their equals in all but genius and fortune, and stood at last the masters of Italy, from shore to shore. And now came the great crisis of their history, the long wars of Rome and Carthage. On one side was the genius of war, empire, law, and art, on the other the genius of commerce, industry, and wealth. The subjects of Carthage were scattered over the Mediterranean, the power of Rome was compact. Carthago fought with regular mercenaries, Rome with her disciplined citizens. Carthage had consummate generals, but Rome had matchless soldiers. Long the scale trembled. Not once nor twice was Rome stricken down to the dust. Punic fleets swept the seas. African horsemen scoured the plains. Barbarian hordes were gathered up by the wealth of Carthage, and marshalled by the genius of her great captain. For her fought the greatest military genius of the ancient world, perhaps of all time. Hannibal, himself a child of the camp, training a veteran army in the wars of Spain, led his victorious troops across Gaul, crossed the Alps, poured down upon Italy, struck down army after army, and at last, by one crowning victory, scattered the last military force of Rome. Betrayed by an invincible army in the heart of Italy, her strongholds stormed, without generals or armies, without money or allies, without cavalry or ships, it seemed the last hour of Rome was come. Now, if ever, she needed that faith in her destiny, the solid strength of her slow growth, and the energy of her entire people. They did not fail her. In her worst need her people held firm, her senate never lost heart, armies grew out of the very remnants and slaves within her walls. Inch by inch the invader was driven back, watched and besieged in turn. The genius of Rome revived in Scipio. He it was who, with an eagle's sight, saw the weakness of her enemy, swooped, with an eagle's flight, upon Carthage herself, and at last, before her walls, overthrew Hannibal, and with him the hopes and power of his country and his race.

It is in these first centuries that we see the source of the greatness of Rome. Then was founded her true strength. What tales of heroism, dignity, and endurance have they not left us! There are no types of public virtue grander than those. Brutus condemning his traitor sons to death; Horatius defending the bridge against an army; Cincinnatus taken from the plough to rule the State, returning from ruling the state again to the plough; the Decii, father and son, solemnly devoting themselves to death to propitiate the gods of Rome; Regulus the prisoner going to his home only to exhort his people not to yield, and returning calmly to his prison; Cornelia offering up her children to death and shame for the cause of the people; great generals content to live like simple yeomen; old and young ever ready to march to certain death; hearts proof against eloquence, gold, or pleasure; noble matrons training their children to duty; senates ever confident in their country; generals returning from conquered nations in poverty; the leaders of triumphant armies becoming the equals of the humblest citizens.

Carthage once overcome, the conquest of the world followed rapidly. Spain and the islands of the Mediterranean Sea were the prizes of the war. Lower Gaul, Greece, and Macedon, were also within fifty years incorporated in Rome. She pushed farther. The whole empire of Alexander fell into her hands, and at length, after seven hundred years of conquest, she remained the mistress of the civilized world. But, long before this, she herself had become the prey of convulsions. The marvellous empire, so rapidly expanded, had deeply con-up ted the power which had won it. Her old heroes were no more. Her virtues failed her, and her vast dominions had long become the prize of bloody and selfish factions. The ancient republic, whose freemen had once met to consult in the Forum, broke up in the new position for which her system was utterly unfit. For nearly a century the great empire had inevitably tended towards union in a single centre. One dictator after another had possessed and misused the sovereign power. At last it passed to the worthiest, and the rule over the whole ancient world came to its greatest name, the noble Julius Caesar. In him we found more than the Roman genius for government and law, with a gentleness and grace few Romans ever had; an intellect almost Greek in its love of science, of art, in reach and subtlety of thought; and, above all this, in spite of vices and crimes which he shared with his age, a world-wide breadth of view and heart, a spirit of human fellowship and social progress peculiar to one who was the friend of men of different races, countries, and ideas—at once general, orator, poet, historian, ruler, law- giver, reformer, and philosopher; in the highest sense the statesman, magnanimous, provident, laborious, large-hearted, affable, resolute, and brave. With him the Roman empire enters on a new and better phase. He first saw and showed how this vast aggregate of men must be ruled no longer as the subjects of one conquering city, but as a real and single State governed in the interest of all, with equal rights and common laws; and Rome be no longer the mistress, but the leader only of the nations. In this spirit he broke with the old Roman temper of narrow nationality and pride; raised to power and trust new men of all ranks and of all nations; opened the old Roman privileges of citizenship to the new subjects; laboured to complete and extend the Roman law; reorganized the administration of the distant provinces; and sought to extinguish the trace of party fury and hatred. And when the selfish rage of the old Roman aristocracy had struck him down, before his work was half complete, by a wanton and senseless murder, yet his work did not perish.
with him. The Roman empire at last rose to the level which he had planned for it. For some two centuries it did succeed in maintaining an era of progress, peace, and civilization—a government, indeed, at times frightened corrupt, at times convulsed to its foundations, yet in the main in accordance with the necessities of the times, and rising in its highest types to wise, tranquil, and prudent rule, embracing all, open to all, just to all, and beloved by all. Then it was, during those two centuries, broken as they were by temporary convulsions, that the nations of Europe rose into civilized life. Then the Spaniard, the Gaul, the Briton, the German, the people that dwelt along the whole course of the Rhine and the Danube, first learnt the arts and ideas of life: law, government, society, education, industry, appeared amongst them; and over the tracts of land trodden for so many centuries by rival tribes and devastating hordes, security first appeared, turmoil gave place to repose, and there rose the notion, not forgotten for ten centuries, of the solemn Peace of Rome.

And now, what was it that the Roman had given to the world? In the first place, his law—that Roman law, the most perfect political creation of the human mind, which for one thousand years grew with one even and expanding life—the law which is the basis of all the law of Europe, including even our own. Then, the political system of towns. The actual municipal constitution of every town in Western Europe, from Gibraltar to the Baltic, from the Hebrides to Sicily, is but a development of the old Roman city, which lasted through the middle ages, and began modern industrial life. Next, all the institutions relating to administration and police which modern Europe has developed had their origin there. To them in the middle ages men turned when the age of confusion was ending. To them again men turned when the middle ages themselves were passing away. The establishment of elective assemblies, of graduated magistracies, of local and provincial justice, of public officers and public institutions, free museums, baths, theatres, libraries, and schools—all that we understand by organized society, in a word, may be traced back to Rome. Throughout all Western Europe, from that germ, civilization raised its head after the invasion of the Northern tribes. From the same source too arose the force at once monarchic and municipal, which overthrew the feudal system. It was the remnant of the old Roman ideas of provincial organization which first formed the counties and duchies which afterwards coalesced into a State. It was the memory of the Roman township which gave birth to the first free towns of Europe. It was the tradition of a Roman emperor which, by long intermediate steps, transformed the Teutonic chieftain into the modern king or emperor. London, York, Lincoln, Winchester, Gloucester, and Chester were Roman cities, and formed then, as they did for the earlier periods of our history, the pivots of our national administration. Paris, Rouen, Lyons, Marseilles, Bordeaux, in France; Constance, Basle, Coblentz, Cologne, upon the Rhine; Cadiz, Barcelona, Seville, Toledo, Lisbon, in the Spanish, Genoa, Milan, Verona, Ravenna, Rome, and Naples, in the Italian peninsula, were in Roman, as in modern times, the great national centres of their respective countries. But, above all else, they gave not the notion merely, but the reality of a state, a permanent system of free obedience to the laws on the one hand, and a temperate administration of them on the other; the constant sense of each citizen having his place in a complex whole.

The Roman's strength was in action, not in thought; but in thought he gave us something besides his special creation of universal law. It was his to discover the meaning of history. Egypt had carved on eternal rocks the pompous chronicles of kings. The Greeks wrote profound and brilliant memoirs. It was reserved to a Roman to conceive and execute the history of his people stretching over seven hundred years, and to give the first proof of the continuity and unity of national life. In art the Roman did little but develop the Greek types of architecture into stupendous and complex forms, fit for new uses, and worthy of his people's grandeur. But the great triumphs of his skill were in engineering. He invented the arch, the dome, and the viaduct. The bridges of the middle ages were studied from Roman remains. The great domes of Italian cathedrals, of which that of our own St. Paul's is but a feeble imitation, were formed directly on the model of a temple at Rome. But in thought, the great gift of Rome was in her language, which has served as an admirable instrument of religious, moral, and political reflection, and forms the base of the spoken dialects of three of the great nations of Europe. Then it was, under that Roman empire, that the stores of Greek thought became common to the world. As the empire of Alexander had shed them over the East, the empire of Rome gave them to the West. Greek language, literature, poetry, science, and art, became the common education of the civilized world; and from the Hebrides to the Euphrates, from the Atlas to the Caucasus, for the first and only time in the history of man, Europe, Asia, and Africa formed one vast whole. The union of the oriental half, indeed, was mainly external and material, but throughout the western half a common order of ideas prevailed. Their religion was the belief in many gods—a system in which each of the powers of nature, each virtue, each art, was thought to be the manifestation of some separate god. It was a system which stimulated activity, self-reliance, toleration, sociability, and art, but which left the external world a vague and unmeaning mystery, and the heart of man a prey to violent and conflicting passions. It possessed not that idea of unity which alone can sustain philosophy and science, and alone can establish in the breast a fixed and elevated moral conscience.

The Roman system had its strong points, but it had also the weak. They were in the main three. It was a system founded upon war, upon slavery, upon a false and vague belief. Now as to war, it is most true that war
was not then, as in modern times, the monstrous negation of civilization. It seems that by war alone could nations then he pressed into that union which was essential to all future progress. Whilst war was common to all the nations of antiquity, with the Romans alone it became the instrument of progress. The Romans warred only to find peace. They did not so much conquer as incorporate the nations. Not more by the strength of the Roman than by the instinctive submission in the conquered to his manifest superiority, was the great empire built up. Victors and vanquished share in the honour of the common result—law, order, peace, and government. When the Romans conquered, it was once for all. That which once became a province of the Roman empire rested thenceforth in profound tranquillity. No standing armies, no brutal soldiery, overawed the interior or the towns. Whilst all within the circle of the empire rested in peace, along its frontiers stood the disciplined veterans of Rome watching the roving hordes of barbarians, and protecting the pale of civilization.

Still, however useful in its place, it was a system of war; a system necessarily fatal in the long run to all progress, to all industry, to all the domestic virtues, to all the gentler feelings. In a State in which all great ideas and traditions originated in conquest, the dignity of labour, the arts of industry, were but slowly recognised or respected; the work of conquest over, the existence of the great Roman became in too many cases purposeless, idle, and vicious. Charity, compassion, gentleness, were not easy-virtues. The home was sacrificed. The condition of woman in the wreck of the family relations sank to the lowest ebb. In a word, the stern virtues of the old Roman private life seemed ending in inhuman ferocity and monstrous debauchery.

Secondly, the Roman was a system of slavery. It existed only for the few. True industry was impossible. The whole industrial class were degraded. The owners of wealth and its producers were alike demoralized. In the great towns were gathered a miserable crowd of poor freemen, with all the vices of the "mean whites" of America. Throughout the country the land was cultivated, not by a peasantry, not by scattered labourers, but by gangs of slaves, guarded in workhouses and watched by overseers. Hence the whole population and all civilization was gathered in the towns. The spaces between and around them were wildernesses, with pasturage and slaves in place of agriculture and men. Thirdly, it was a system based on a belief in a multitude of gods, a system without truth, or coherence, or power. There was no single belief to unite all classes in one faith. Nothing ennobling to trust in, no standard of right and wrong which could act on the moral nature. There were no recognised teachers. The moral and the material were hopelessly confused. The politicians had no system of morality, religion, or belief, and were void of moral authority. The philosophers and the moralists were hardly members of the State, and taught only to a circle of admirers, and exercised no wide social influence. The religion of the people had long ceased to be believed. It had long been without any moral purpose; it became a vague mass of meaningless traditions. With these threefold sources of corruption, war, slavery, false belief, the Roman empire so magnificent without, was, within, a rotten fabric. Politically vigorous, morally it was diseased. Never perhaps has the world witnessed cases of such stupendous moral corruption, as when immense power, boundless riches, and native energy were left as they were then without object, control, or shame. Then, from time to time, there broke forth a very orgy of wanton strength. But its hour was come. The best spirits were all filled with a sense of the hollowness and corruption around them. Statesmen, poets, and philosophers, in all these last eras were pouring forth their complaints and fears, or feebly attempting remedies. The new element had long been making its way unseen, had long been preparing the ground, and throughout the civilized world there was rising up a groan of weariness and despair.

For three centuries a belief in the existence of one God alone, in whom were concentrated all power and goodness, who cared for the moral guidance of mankind, a belief in the immortality of the soul and its existence in another state, had been growing up in the minds of the best Greek thinkers. The noble morality of their philosophers had taken strong hold of the higher consciences of Rome, and had diffused amongst the better spirits throughout the empire new and purer types. Next the great empire itself, forcing all nations in one State, had long inspired in its worthiest members a sense of the great brotherhood of mankind, had slowly mitigated the worst evils of slavery, and paved the way for a religious society. Thirdly, another and a greater cause was at work. Through Greek teachers the world had long been growing familiar with the religious ideas of Asia, its conceptions of a superhuman world, of a world of spirit, angel, demon, future state, and allcontrolling Creator, with its mystical imagery, its spiritual poetry, its intense zeal and fervent emotion. And now, partly from the contact with Greek thought and Roman civilization, a great change was taking place in the very heart of that small Jewish race, of all the races of Asia known to us, the most intense, earnest, and pure: possessing a high sense of personal morality, the truest yearnings of the heart, and the deepest capacity for spiritual fervour. In their midst arose a fellowship of true-hearted brethren, gathered around one noble and touching character, which adoration has veiled in a mystery which passes from the pale of definite history. On them had dawned the vision of a new era of their national faith, which should expand the devotion of David, the high purpose of Isaiah, and the moral excellence of Samuel, into a gentler, wider, and more loving spirit.

How this new idea grew to the height of a new religion, and brightened, and was shed over the whole earth by the strength of its intensity and its purity, is to us a familiar and enchanting tale. We know how the first
fellowship of the brethren met; how they went forth into all lands with words of mercy, love, justice, and hope; their self-denial, humility, and zeal; their heroic lives and awful deaths; their loving natures and their noble purposes; how they gathered around them wherever they came the purest and greatest; how across mountains, seas, and continents, the communion of saints joined in affectionate trust; how from the deepest corruption of the heart arose a yearning for a truer life; how the new faith, ennobling the instincts of human nature, raised up the slave, the poor, and the humble to the dignity of common manhood, and gave new meaning to the true nature of womanhood; how, by slow degrees, the church, with its rule of right, of morality, and of communion, arose; how the first founders and apostles of this faith lived and died, and all their gifts were concentrated in one, of all the characters of certain history doubtless the loftiest and purest,—the unflinching, the unselﬁsh, the great-hearted, the loving Paul.

But deeply as this story must always interest us, let us not forget that the result was due not to one man or to one people, that each people gave their share to the whole; Greece, her thought and gentleness; Rome, her social instinct, her genius for discipline; Asia, her intensity of belief and personal morality. The task that lay before the new religion was immense. It was, upon a uniform faith, to found a system of sound and common morality, to reform the deep-rooted evils of slavery; to institute a method which should educate, teach, and guide, and bring out the tenderer and higher instincts of our nature. The powers of mind and of character had been trained by Greece and Rome, to the Christian church came the loftier mission of ruling the affections and the heart.

From henceforth the history of the world shows a new character. Now and henceforward we see two elements in civilization working side by side—the practical and the moral. There is now a system to rule the State and a system to act upon the mind; a body of men to educate, to guide and elevate the spirit and the character of the individual, as well as a set of rulers to enforce the laws and direct the action of the nation. There is henceforward the State and the Church. Hitherto all had been confused; statesmen were priests and teachers; public officers pretended to order men's lives by law, and pretended in vain. Henceforward our view is ﬁxed on Europe, on Western Europe alone; we leave aside the East, we leave the half Romanized, the half Christianized East to the empire of Mohammed, to the Arab, the Mongol, and the Turk. We turn solely to the heirs of time, the West, in which is centred the progress and the future of the race. Henceforward, then, for the ten centuries of the middle ages which succeeded in Western Europe the fall of the Roman Empire, we have two movements to watch together—Feudalism and Catholicism—the system of the State and the system of the Church: let us turn now to the former.

The vast empire of Rome broke up with prolonged convulsions. Its concentration in any single hand, however necessary as a transition, became too vast as a permanent system. It wanted a rural population; it was wholly without local life. Long the awe-struck barbarians stood pausing to attack. At length they broke in. Ever bolder and more numerous tribes poured onwards. In wave after wave they swept over the whole empire, sacking cities, laying waste the strongholds, at length storming Rome itself; and laws, learning, industry, art, civilization itself, seem swallowed up in the deluge. For a moment it appeared that all that was Roman had vanished. It was submerged, but not destroyed. Slowly the waters of this overwhelming invasion abate. Slowly the old Roman towns and their institutions begin to appear above the waste like the highest points of a ﬂooded country. Slowly the old landmarks re-appear and the forms of civilized existence. Four centuries were passed in one continual ebb and ﬂow; but at length the restless movement subsided. One by one the conquering tribes settled, took root, and occupied the soil. Step by step they learned the arts of old Rome. At length they were transformed from the invaders into the defenders. King after king strove to give form to the healing mass, and put an end to this long era of confusion. One, at length, the greatest of them all, succeeded, and reared the framework of modern Europe. It was the imperial Charlemagne, the greatest name of the middle ages, who, like some Roman emperor restored to life, marshalled the various tribes which had settled in France, Germany, Italy, and the north of Spain, into a single empire, beat back, in a long life of war, the tide of invaders on the west, and north, and south, Saxon, Northman, and Saracen, and awakened anew in the memory of nations the typo of civil government and organized society. His work in itself was but a single and a temporary effort; but in its distant consequences it has left great permanent effects. It was like a desperate rally in the midst of confusion; but it gave mankind time to recover much that they had lost. In his empire may be traced the nucleus of the state system of Western Europe; by the traditions of his name, the modern monarchies were raised into power. He too gave shape and vigour to the ﬁrst efforts of public administration. But a still greater result was the indirect effect of his life and labours. It was by the spirit of his established rule that the feudal system which had been long spontaneously growing up from beneath the debris of the Roman empire, ﬁrst found strength to develope into a methodical form, received an imperial sanction to its scheme, and the type of its graduated order of rule. And now what was this feudal system, and what were its results?

In the first place, it was a system of local defence. The knight was bound to guard his fee, the baron his barony, the count his county, the duke his duchy. Then it was a system of local government. The lord of the
manor had his court of justice, the great baron his greater court, and the king his court above all. Then it was a system of local industry; the freeholder tilled his own fields, the knight was responsible for the welfare of his own lands. The lord had an interest in the prosperity of his lordship. Hence slowly arose an agricultural industry, impossible in any other way. The knight cleared the country of robbers, or beat back invaders, whilst the husbandman ploughed beneath his castle walls. The nation no longer, as under Greece and Rome, was made up of scattered towns. It had a local root, a rural population, and complete system of agricultural life. The monstrous centralization of Rome was gone, and a local government began. But the feudal system was not merely material; it was also moral; not simply political, it was social also. The whole of society was bound by it together by a long series of gradations, Bach man had his due place and rank, his rights, and his duties. The knight owed protection to his men; his men owed their services to him. Under the Roman system, there had been only citizens and slaves. Now there was none so high but had grave duties to all below; none so low, not the meanest serf, but had a claim for protection. Hence, all became, from king to serf, recognised members of one common society. Thence sprung the closest bond which has ever bound man to man. To the noble natures of the northern invaders was due the new idea of loyalty, the spirit of truth, faithfulness, devotion, and trust, the lofty sense of honour which bound the warrior to his captain, the vassal to his lord, the squire to his knight. It ripened into the finest temper which has ever ennobled the man of action, the essence of chivalry; in its true sense not dead, not destined to die,—the temper of mercy, courtesy, and truth, of fearlessness and trust, of a generous use of power and strength, of succour to the weak, comfort to the poor, reverence for age, for goodness, and for woman; which revolts against injustice, oppression, and untruth, and never listens to a call unmoved. Is it possible that this spirit is dead? This which watched the cradle of modern society, and is the source of all our poetry and art, does it not live for future service, and new beauty, transformed from a military to a peaceful society? May it not revive the seeds of trust and duty between man and man, inspire the labourer with dignity and generosity, raise the landlord to a consciousness of duty, and renew the mysterious bond which unites all those who labour in a common work?

We turn to the Church, the moral element which pervades the middle ages. Amidst the crash of the falling empire, as darker grew the storm which swept over the visible state on earth, more and more the better spirits turned their eyes towards a kingdom above the earth. They turned, as the great Latin father relates, amidst utter corruption to an entire reconstruction of morality; in the wreck of all earthly greatness, they set their hearts upon a future life, and strove amidst anarchy and bloodshed to found a moral union of society. Hence rose the Catholic Church, offering to the thoughtful a mysterious and inspiring faith; to the despairing and the corrupted a new and higher life; to the wretched comfort, fellowship, and aid; to the perplexed a grand system of belief and practice—in its creed Greek, in its worship Asiatic, in its constitution Roman. In it we see the Roman genius for organisation and law, transformed and revived. In the fall of her material greatness Rome's social greatness survived. Rome still remained the centre of the civilized world. Latin was still the language which bound men of distant lands together. From Rome went forth the edicts which were common to all Europe. The majesty of Rome was still the centre of civilization. The bishops' court took the place of that of the imperial governor. The peace of the Church took the place of the peace of Rome. The barbarian invaders who overthrew the hollow greatness of the empire, humbled themselves reverently before the ministers of religion. The Church stood between the conqueror and the conquered, and joined them both in one. She told to all—Roman and barbarian, slave or freeman, great or weak—how there was one God, one Saviour of all, one equal soul in all, one common judgment, one common life moreover. She told them how all, as children of one Father, were in His eyes equally dear; how charity, mercy, humility, devotion alone would make them worthy of His love; and at these words there rose up in the fine spirits of the new races a sense of brotherhood amongst mankind, a desire for a higher life, a zeal for all the gentler qualities and the higher duties, such as the world had not seen before. Thus was her first task accomplished, and she founded a system of morality common to all and possible to all. She spoke to the slave of his immortal soul, to the master of the guilt of slavery. Master and slave should meet alike within her walls, and lie side by side within her tomb; and thus her second task was accomplished, and she overthrew for ever the system of slavery, and raised up the labourer into the dignity of a citizen. Then she told how their common Master, of power unbounded, had loved the humble and the weak. She told of the simple lives of saints and martyrs, their tender care of the poorer brethren, their spirit of benevolence, self-sacrifice, and self-abasement; and thus the third great task was accomplished, when she placed the essence of practical religion in care for the weak, in affection for the family, in reverence for woman, in benevolence to all, and in personal self-denial. Next, she undertook to educate all alike. She provided a body of common teachers; she organized schools; she raised splendid cathedrals, where all might be brought into the presence of the beautiful, and see all forms of art in their highest perfection-architecture, and sculpture, and painting, and work in glass, in iron, and in wood, heightened by inspiring ritual and touching music. She accepted all without thought of birth or place. She gathered to herself all the knowledge of the time, though all was subordinate to religious life. The priests, so far as such were needed, were poets, historians, dramatists,
hands of kings, and at length upon the ruins of feudalism arose the great monarchies, and the feudal atoms reared. The great fiefs as they became settled, gradually gathered into masses; one by one they fell into the without any system, or regularity, or unity, or harmony. but a system in which the wisest and the best men of their day, themselves reared in a common teaching, organized on a vast scale, and directed by one general rule, devoted the whole energies of their brains and hearts in unison together, to the moral guidance of society; sought to know only that they might teach, to teach only to improve, and lived only to instruct, to raise, to humanize their fellow men. Let us think of it thus as it was at its best; and in this forget even the cruelty, the imposture, and the degradation of its fall; let horror for its vices and pity for its errors be lost in one sentiment of admiration, gratitude, and honour, for this the best and the last of all the organized systems of human society; of all the institutions of mankind, the most worthy of remembrance and cohesion.

But if we are generous in our judgment let us be just. The Catholic system ended, it is most true, in disastrous and shameful ruin. Excellent in intention and in method, it was from the first doomed to inevitable corruption from the inherent faults of its constitution. It had worthily trained and elevated the noblest side of human nature—the religious, the moral, and the social instincts of our being; and the energy with which it met this the prime want of men, upheld it through the long era of its corruption, and still upholds it in its last pitiable spasm. But with the intellectual and with the practical sphere of man's life, it was by its nature incompetent to deal. In its zeal for man's moral progress it had taken its stand upon a false and even a preposterous belief. Burning to subdue the lower passions of man's nature, it had vainly hoped to crush the practical instincts of his activity. It discarded with disdain the thoughts and labours of the ancient world. It proclaimed as the ideal of human life, a visionary and even a selfish asceticism. For a period, for a long period, its transcendent and indispensable services maintained it in spite of every defect and vice; but at last the time came when the outraged instincts reasserted their own, and showed how hopeless is any religion or system of life not based on a conception of human nature as a whole at once complete and true. The Church began in indifference towards philosophy and contempt for material improvement. Indifference and contempt passed at length into hatred and horror; and it ended in denouncing science, and in a bitter conflict with industry. At last it had become, in spite of its better self, the enemy of all progress, all thought, all industry, all freedom. It allied itself with all that was retrograde and arbitrary. It fell from bad to worse, and settled into an existence of timid repression. Hence it came that the Church, attempting to teach upon a basis of falsehood, to direct man's active life upon a merely visionary creed, to govern a society which it only half understood, succeeded only for a time. It was scarcely founded before it began to break up. It had scarcely put forth its strength before it began to decay. It stood like one of its own vast cathedrals, building for ages yet never completed; falling to ruin whilst yet unfinished; filling us with a sense of beauty and of failure; a monument of noble design and misdirected strength. It fell like the Roman empire, with prolonged convulsion and corruption, and left us a memory of cruelty, ignorance, tyranny, rapacity and vice, which we too often forget were but the symptoms and consequences of its fall.

And now we have stood beside the rise and fall of four great stages of the history of mankind. The priestly systems of Asia, the intellectual activity of Greece, the military empire of Rome, the moral government of Catholicism, each had been tried in turn, and each had been found wanting. Each had disdained the virtues of the others; each had failed to incorporate the others. With the fall of the Catholic and feudal system, we enter upon the age of modern society. It is an age of dissolution, reconstruction, variety, movement, and confusion. It is an era in which all the former elements re-assert themselves with new life, all that had ever been attempted is renewed again; an era of amazing complexity, industry, and force, in which every belief, opinion, and idea is criticised, transformed, and expanded. Every institution of society and habit of life is thoroughly unsettled and remodelled: all the sciences constructed—art, industry, policy, religion, philosophy, and morality, developed with a vigorous and constant growth; but, withal, it is an era in which all is individual, separate, and free, without any system, or regularity, or unity, or harmony.

First, the feudal system broke up under the influence of the very industry which it had itself fostered and reared. The great fiefs as they became settled, gradually gathered into masses; one by one they fell into the hands of kings, and at length upon the ruins of feudalism arose the great monarchies, and the feudal atoms
crystallized into the actual nations of Europe. The variety and dispersion of the feudal system vanished. A central monarch established one uniform order, police, and justice; and modern political society, as we know it rose. The invention of gunpowder made the knight helpless, the bullet pierced his mail, and standing armies took the place of the feudal militia. The discovery of the compass opened the ocean to commerce. The free towns expanded with a new continent, and covered the continent with infinitely varied products. The knight became the landlord, the man-at-arms became the tenant, the serf became the free labourer, and the emancipation of the worker, the first, the greatest victory of the Church was complete.

Thus, at last, the energies of men ceased to be occupied by war, to which a small section of the society was permanently devoted. Peace became in fact the natural, not the accidental state of man. Society passed into its final phase of industrial existence. Peace, industry, and wealth again gave scope to thought. The riches of the earth were ransacked, new continents were opened, intercourse increased over the whole earth. Greeks, flying from Constantinople before the Turks, spread over Europe, bringing with them books, instruments, inscriptions, gems, and sculptures; the science, the literature, and the inventions of the ancient world, long stored up and forgotten on the shores of the Bosphorus. Columbus discovered America. The Portuguese sailed round Africa to India; a host of daring adventurers penetrated untrodden seas and lands; man entered at last upon the full dominion of the earth. Copernicus and Galileo unveiled the mystery of the world, and made a revolution in all thought. Mathematics, chemistry, botany, and medicine, preserved mainly by the Arabs during the middle ages, were again taken up almost where the Greeks had left them. The elements of the material earth were eagerly explored. The system of experiment (which Bacon reduced to a method) was worked out by the common labour of philosophers and artists. For the first time the human form was dissected and explored. Physiology, as a science, began. Human history and society became the subject of regular and enlightened thought. Politics became a branch of philosophy. With all this the new knowledge was scattered by the printing-press, itself the product and the stimulus of the movement, in a word, the religious ban was raised from off the human powers. The ancient world was linked on to the modern. Science, speculation, and invention lived again after twelve centuries of trance. A fresh era of progress opened with the new-found treasures of the past.

Next, before this transformation of ideas, the Church collapsed. Its hollow dogmas were exposed, its narrow prejudices ridiculed, its corruptions probed. Mens' consciences and brains rose up against an institution which pretended to teach without knowledge, and to govern though utterly disorganized. Convulsion followed on convulsion; the struggle we call the Reformation opened, and for a century and a half shook Europe to its foundations. At the close of this long era of massacre and war, it was found that the result achieved was small indeed. Europe had been split into two religious systems, of which neither one nor the other was fit for its duty. Admiration for the noble characters of the first Reformers, for their intensity, truth, and zeal, their heroic lives and deaths, the affecting beauty of their purposes and hopes is yet possible to us, whilst we confess that the Protestant, like the Catholic faith, had failed to organize human industry, society, and thought; that both were alike hollow, bigoted, and weak, and both had failed to satisfy the wants and hopes of man. More and more has thought and knowledge grown into even fiercer conflict with authority of Book or Pope; more and more in Catholic France as in Protestant England, does the moral guidance of men pass from the hands of priests, or sect, to be assumed, if it be assumed at all, by the poet, the philosopher, the essayist, and even the journalist; more and more does Church and sect stand dumb and helpless in presence of the evils with which society is rife.

Side by side the religious and the political system tottered in ruin together. From the close of the fifteenth century, now one, now the other was furiously assailed. For the most part both were struck at once. The long religious wars of Germany and France; the heroic defence of the free Republic of Holland against the might of Spain; the glorious repulse of its Armada by England; the immortal revolution achieved by our greatest statesman, Cromwell; the struggle of his worthy successor, William of Orange, against the oppression of Louis XIV., were all but parts of one long struggle, which lasted during the whole of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, a struggle in which religion and politics both equally shared, a struggle between the old powers of Feudalism and Catholicism on the one side, with all the strength of ancient systems, against the half-formed, ill-governed force of freedom, industry, and thought; a long and varied struggle in which aristocracy, monarchy, privileged caste, arbitrary and military power, church formalism, dogmatism, superstition, narrow teaching, visionary worship, and hollow creeds, were each in turn attacked, and each in turn prostrated.

A general armistice followed this long and exhausting struggle. The principles of Protestantism, Constitutionalism, Toleration, and the balance of power, established a system of compromise, and for a century restored some order in the political and religious world. But in the world of ideas the contest grew still keener. Industry expanded to incredible proportions, and the social system was transformed before it. Thought soared into unimagined regions, and reared a new realm of science, discovery, and art. Wild social and religious visions arose and passed through the conscience of mankind. At last the forms and ideas of human life, material, social, intellectual, and moral, had all been utterly transformed, and the fabric of European society
rested in peril on the crumbling crust of the past. The great convulsion came. The gathering storm of centuries burst at length in the French Revolution. Then, indeed, it seemed that chaos was come again. It was as if an earthquake had come, blotting out all trace of what had been, engulfing the most ancient structures, destroying all former landmarks, and scattering society in confusion and dismay. It spreads from Paris through every corner of France, from France to Italy, to Spain, to Germany, to England; it pierces, like the flash from a vast storm-cloud, through every obstacle of matter, space, or form. It kindles all ideas of men, and gives wild energy to all purposes of action. For though terrible it was not deadly. It came not to destroy but to construct, not to kill but to give life. And through the darkest and bloodiest whirl of the chaos there rose up clear on high, before the bewildered eyes of men, a vision of a new and greater era yet to come—of brotherhood, of freedom, and of union, of never ending progress, of mutual help, trust, co-operation, and goodwill; an era of true knowledge, of real science, and practical discovery; but, above all, an era of active industry for all; of the dignity, and consecration of labour, of a social life, just to all, common to all, and beneficent to all.

That great revolution is not ended. The questions it proposed are not yet solved. We live still in the heavings of its shock. It yet remains with us to show how the last vestiges of the feudal, hereditary, and aristocratic systems may give place to a genuine, an orderly, and permanent republic; how the trammels of a faith long grown useless and retrograde may be removed without injury to the moral, religious, and social instincts, which are still much entangled in it; how industry may be organized, and the workman enrolled with full rights of citizenship, a free, a powerful, and, a cultivated member of the social body. Such is the task before us. The ground is all prepared, the materials are abundant and sufficient. We have a rich harvest of science, a profusion of material facilities, a vast collection of the products, ideas, and inventions of past ages. Every vein of human life is full; every faculty has been trained to fall efficiency; every want of our nature is supplied. We need now only harmony, order, union; we need only to group into a whole these powers and gifts; the task before us is to discover some complete and balanced system of life; some common basis of belief; some object for the imperishable religious instincts and aspirations of mankind; some faith to bind the existence of man to the visible universe around him; some common social end for thought, action, and feeling; some common ground for teaching, studying, or judging. We need to extract the essence of all older forms of civilization, to combine them, and harmonize them in one, a system of existence which may possess something of the calm, the completeness, and the symmetry of the earliest societies of men; the zeal for truth, knowledge, science, and improvement, which mark the Greek, with something of his grace, his life, his radiant poetry and art; the deep social spirit of Rome, its political sagacity, its genius for government, law and freedom, its noble sense of public life; above all else, the constancy, earnestness, and tenderness of the mediæval system; its sense of the surrender of self to a Power above, its undying zeal for the spiritual union of mankind;—and with all this the industry, the knowledge, the variety, the activity, of modern life.

The End.

HARRILD, Printer, LONDON.
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"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—Is. viii. 20.

G. Morrish London 24, Warwick Lane Paternoster Row, E.C.

"Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was stedfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompence of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God also bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?"—HEBREWS ii. 1—4.

Preface.

The following paper,

This introduction is, to a great extent, borrowed, and even copied, from the Preface to the work as originally published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, which (much to our regret, we must say) in the later editions has been omitted.

as expressed in the title-page, is an extract from Leslie's work, named "A SHORT AND EASY METHOD WITH
THE DEISTS,” a copy of which I have had in my possession for many years, without ever having had my attention especially directed to it, or knowing much of its value. This I now regret, because in it I find an unanswerable argument to all that a Deist might urge against scripture, and so, perhaps, may have lost some opportunities of meeting the cavils of such. I now publish this extract (having ventured, here and there, to correct it in places where I thought it needed correction), with the hope of helping God's people in meeting the attacks of the enemy, whether it be from Satan, seeking to inject infidel thoughts into their minds, or from man, casting contempt on God's word; and in so doing, I hesitate not to say that our author has supplied us with an argument quite sufficient for this—an argument so simple, and yet so profound, that no Deist could possibly meet it; treat it with scorn he might, but answer it he never could do. And as to the believer, he will rejoice in finding that the external proofs of revelation are not so abstruse and intricate as he may have imagined.

True it is, his style, we must reluctantly admit, is by no means without its defects; especially at the outset, before he fairly gets into his subject, it being, we think, both verbose and involved. This however is as nothing, when weighed in the balances, compared with the truth which he has so clearly defined and illustrated.

I now proceed, anticipating our author a little, to state what his argument is; it is this—that the truth of a matter of fact may be certainly known if it be attended with certain marks, such as no false fact can possibly have. THESE MARKS ARE FOUR. It is required, first, that the fact be a sensible fact, such as men's outward senses can judge of. Secondly, that it be notorious, performed publicly in the presence of witnesses. Thirdly that there be memorials kept up in memory of it. Fourthly, that such monuments and actions begin with the fact.

Thus our author in substance begins, and then proceeds to show how these four marks all concur, both in the Old Testament and in the New, in reference to Moses also and to Christ. And so effectually has he succeeded, that Middleton, an infidel writer of that day, feeling how necessary it was to his purpose that he should rid himself of the argument, sought for some false fact to which the four marks might apply, and this he did for twenty years, without any success.

Then, as to the origin of the work, the reader will like to know what it was; it was this—the Duke of Leeds of that day, with whom Mr. Leslie was acquainted, observed to him, in the course of conversation, that, although he was a believer in the doctrine of Christ, he was not satisfied with the common method of proving it, that the argument was long and complicated, so that some had neither leisure nor patience to follow it, and others were not able to comprehend it; that, as it was the nature of all truth to be plain and simple, if Christianity were a truth there must be some short way of showing it to be so, and he wished Mr. Leslie would turn his attention to the subject. Such a hint to such a man produced, in the space of three days, a rough draft of the "Short and Easy Method with the Deists," which he presented to the Duke, who, on looking it over, told him that he thought he was a Christian before, but that now he was sure of it; and so grateful to him did he feel for thus enlightening his mind as to the external evidences of the word, that he never afterwards met Mr. Leslie without asking his blessing. This interesting anecdote came from Captain Leslie, a son of the author, and we venture to say, that everyone who carefully and prayerfully studies his book, will agree with the Duke in feeling grateful to him for supplying him with arguments so simple and clear, and, at the same time, so pointed and cogent, on a subject which is often made so perplexing and difficult.

And now let me say a word in conclusion; it is this—that in introducing my name at the foot of this Preface, which, as I already have shown, only in part is my own, in connection with a work with which I am in no way connected, saving that of esteeming it highly, my object is not notoriety. I do it with no wish to put myself forward, and only because I seek in this way to bring it under the especial notice of my friends and acquaintances, earnestly commending it to them, and both desiring and praying that it may prove as interesting and as useful to them as it has done to myself.

Edward Denny.

May, 1874.

The Four Marks,

Meeting in the Histories of Moses and Joshua.

The Exodus of Israel Under the Conduct of Moses, followed by their forty years' wanderings in the wilderness, these being, both sensible facts, also notorious, performed publicly in the presence of witnesses. (First and second marks.)
the law and the testimony. The law evidently means the record, the books of Moses especially; the testimony, that to which the record bore witness, namely, the sacrifices, the priesthood, the pass over, the sabbath, all that pertained to the Mosaic economy. Israel crossing the Jordan enters the promised land. (First and second marks.) The twelve stones set up at Gilgal, as a memorial thereof (Third and fourth marks.) Twelve stones at Gilgal. Twelve stones at Gilgal. Forty years Israel in the wilderness. The Pentateuch written by Moses. THE BOOK OF THE LAW WRITTEN BY MOSSES, placed in the, committed in after times to the king and handed down from generation to generation. (Third and fourth marks.) THE TESTIMONY. Public monuments and observance kept up in memory of Israel's redemption out of Egypt, beginning from the time when that to which it pointed occurred (Third and fourth marks.) THE BOOK OF JOSHUA handed down, like the books of Moses, from generation to generation (Third and fourth marks.) CHRIST JESUS. THE SUBSTANCES OF THE LEVITICAL LAW.

Description of the Foregoing Diagram.

Israel, by means of the eyes glancing backward, is here represented as seeing from generation to generation, in the ordinances of the tabernacle, and in the twelve stones set up at Gilgal, two things—First, the memorials of their deliverance through the Red Sea, out of Egypt, and of their forty years in the wilderness; Secondly, that of their crossing the Jordan, and entering the land under the conduct of Joshua.

Again, by means of the eyes looking forward, they are represented as discerning in the Levitical rites the shadows of heavenly things, CHRIST being foreshown in the priesthood, the sacrifices, the sabbath, and all the other observances, both of the tabernacle and the temple.

In these cases, then, The Four Marks make it wholly impossible that the Books of Moses could have been, according to the Deists, a fabrication or an imposture. What was it that the Lord said to those two whom He met on the way to Emmaus? "O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." (Luke xxiv. 25-27.) What a wondrous word this must have been! How must it have shown the unity of purpose, the marvellous connection of one part with another that pervades the whole book of God, just what we here see, that the history of man, from beginning to end, is One Grand Event, and that all minor events, all subordinate histories, are but the links in a chain which no power can break, which is to last through eternity.

Leslie's Four Marks.

Sir,—In answer to your letter of the third instant, I much condole with you upon the unhappy circumstance of your being placed among such company, where, as you say, you continually hear the sacred Scriptures, and the histories therein contained, particularly those of Moses and of Christ, and all revealed religion, turned into ridicule by men who set up for sense and reason; and who say that there is no greater ground to believe in Christ than in Mahomet; that all these pretences to revelation are cheats, and ever have been, among Pagans, Jews, Mahometans, and Christians; that they are all alike impostures of cunning and designing men upon the credulity, at first, of simple and unthinking people, till, their numbers increasing, their delusions grew popular, and they came at last to be established by laws; and that then the force of education and custom gave a bias to the judgments of after ages, till such deceits came really to be believed, being received upon trust from the ages foregoing, without people examining into the original and bottom of them. This is what these modern men of sense (as they desire to be esteemed) say that they only do, that they only have their judgments freed from the slavish authority of precedents and laws in matters of truth, which, they say, ought only to be decided by reason.

Now, sir, that which you desire from me is some short topic of reason, if such can be found, whereby, without running to authorities, and the intricate mazes of learning, which breed long disputes, and which these men of reason deny by wholesale;—though they can give no reason for it, only supposing that authors have been imposed upon us, interpolated and corrupted, so that no stress can be laid upon them, though it cannot be shown wherein they are so corrupted; which, in reason ought to lie upon them to prove who allege it; otherwise it is not only a precarious, but a guilty plea; and the more, that they refrain not from quoting books on their side, for whose authority there are no better, or not so good, grounds. However, you say, it makes your disputes endless, and they go away boasting that there is nothing, at least nothing certain, to be said on the Christian side. Therefore you are desirous to find some one topic of reason, which should demonstrate the truth of the Christian religion, and, at the same time, distinguish it from the impostures of Mahomet and of the whole Pagan
world: that our Deists may be brought to this test, and be either obliged to renounce their reason, and the common reason of mankind, or to submit to the clear proof, from reason, of the Christian religion; which must be such a proof as no imposture can pretend to, otherwise it cannot prove the Christian religion not to be an imposture. And, whether such a proof, one single proof, to avoid confusion, is not to be found out, you desire to know from me.

And you say that you cannot imagine but that there must be such a proof, because every truth is in itself clear, and one; and, therefore, that one reason for it, if it be the true reason, must be sufficient; and if sufficient, it is better than many; for multiplicity confounds, especially weak judgments.

Sir, you have imposed a hard task upon me: I wish I could perform it. For though every truth is one, yet our sight is so feeble, that we cannot always come to it directly, but by many inferences, and laying of things together.

But I think, that in the case before us, there is such a proof as you require, and I will set it down as briefly and as plainly as I can.

First, then, I suppose that the truth of the doctrine of Christ will be sufficiently evinced, if the matters of fact which are recorded of Him in the Gospels, be true; for His miracles, if true, do vouch the truth of what He delivered.

The same is to be said as to Moses. If he brought the children of Israel through the Red Sea in that miraculous manner which is related in Exodus, and did such other wonderful things as are there told of him, it must necessarily follow that he was sent from God: these being the strongest proofs that we can desire, and which every Deist will confess he would acquiesce in, if he saw them with his eyes. Therefore the stress of this cause will depend upon the proof of these matters of fact.

And the method I will take is, First, to lay down such rules, as to the truth of matters of fact in general, that where they all meet, such matters of fact cannot be false. And then, Secondly, to show that all these rules meet in the matters of fact of Moses and of Christ; and that they do not meet in the matters of fact of Mahomet, of the heathen deities, nor can possibly meet in any imposture whatsoever.

The rules are these:—

• That the matter of fact be such as that men's outward senses, their eyes and ears, may be judges of it.
• That it may be done publicly in the face of the world.
• That not only public monuments be kept up in memory of it, but some outward actions be performed.
• That such monuments, and such actions or observances, be instituted, and do commence from the time that the matter of fact was done.

The first two rules make it impossible for any such matter of fact to be imposed upon men, at the time when it was said to be done, because every man's eyes and senses would contradict it. For example, suppose any man should pretend that yesterday he divided the Thames, in presence of all the people of London, and carried the whole city, men, women, and children, over to Southwark, on dry land, the waters standing like walls on both sides; I say, it is morally impossible that he could persuade the people of London that it was true, when every man, woman, and child, could contradict him, and say that this was a notorious falsehood; for that they had not seen the Thames so divided, nor had gone over on dry land. Therefore I take it for granted (and I suppose, with the allowance of all the Deists in the world) that no such imposition could be put upon men, at the time when such public matter of fact was said to be done.

Therefore it only remains that such matter of fact might be invented some time after, when the men of that generation, wherein the thing was said to be done, are all past and gone: and the credulity of after ages might be imposed upon so as for people to believe that things were done in former ages which were not.

And for this, the last two rules secure us as much as the first two rules, in the former case; for whenever such a matter of fact came to be invented, if not only monuments were said to remain of it, but likewise that public actions and observances were constantly used ever since the matter of fact was said to be done, the deceit must be detected by no such monuments appearing, and by the experience of every man, woman, and child, who must know that no such actions or observances were ever used by them. For example: suppose I should now invent a story of something done a thousand years ago, I might perhaps get some to believe it; but if I say, that not only such a thing was done, but that from that day to this, every man, at the age of twelve years, had a joint of his little finger cut off; and that every man in the nation did want a joint of such a finger; and that being part of my original matter of fact, must demonstrate the whole to be false.

Let us now come to the second point, to show that the matters of fact of Moses and of Christ have all these rules or marks before mentioned; and that neither the matters of fact of Mahomet, nor what is reported of the
heathen deities, have the like; and that no imposture can have them all.

As to Moses, I suppose it will be allowed me, that he could not have persuaded 600,000 men that he had brought them out of Egypt, through the Red Sea, fed them forty years, without bread, by miraculous manna, and the other matters of fact recorded in his books, if they had not been true. Because every man's senses that were then alive must have contradicted it. And, therefore, he must have imposed upon all their senses, if he could have made them believe it, when it was false, and no such things done. So that here are the First and Second of the Above-Mentioned Four Marks.

For the same reason, it was equally impossible for him to have made them receive his Five Books as truth, and not to have rejected them as a manifest imposture; which told of all these things as done before their eyes, if they had not been so done. See how positively he speaks to them in Deuteronomy xi. 2-7: "And know ye this day: for I speak not with your children which have not known, and which have not seen the chastisement of the Lord your God, his greatness, his mighty hand, and his stretched out arm, and his miracles, and his acts, which he did in the midst of Egypt unto Pharaoh the king of Egypt, and unto all his land; and what he did unto the army of Egypt, unto their horses, and to their chariots; how he made the water of the Red Sea to overflow them as they pursued after you, and how the Lord hath destroyed them unto this day; and what he did unto you in the wilderness, until ye came into this place; and what he did unto Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Eliab, the son of Reuben; how the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up, and their households, and their tents, and all the substance that was in their possession, in the midst of all Israel: but your eyes have seen all the great acts of the Lord which he did," &c.

From hence we must suppose, it is impossible that these books of Moses, if an imposture, could have been invented, and put upon the people who were then alive, when all these things were said to be done.

The utmost, therefore, that even a supposition can stretch to, is, that these books were written in some age after Moses, and put out in his name.

And to this I say, that, if it was so, it was impossible that these books should have been received as the books of Moses, in that age wherein they may have been supposed to have been first invented. Why? Because they speak of themselves as delivered by Moses, and kept In the Ark from his time. As it is written: "And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, who bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee." (Deut, xxxi. 24-26.) And again, because there was a copy of this book to be written by, and In Possession of, the King, whom the Lord in after times should choose for His people, as we read: "And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites: and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life: that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep all the words of this law and these statutes, to do them: that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not aside from the commandment, to the right hand, or to the left: to the end that he may prolong his days in his kingdom, he and his children, in the midst of Israel." (Deut, xvii. 18-20.)

Here you see that this book of the law speaks of itself, not only as a history or relation of what things were then done, but as the standing and municipal law and statutes of the nation of the Jews, binding the king as well as the people.

Now, in whatever age after Moses you will suppose this book to have been forged, it was impossible it could be received as truth; because it was not then to be found, either in the ark, or with the king, or anywhere else: for when first invented, everybody must know that they had never heard of it before. And therefore they could not by any possibility believe it to be the book of their statutes, and the standing law of the land, which they had all along received, and by which they had been governed.

Could any man now, at this day, invent a book of statutes or acts of parliament for England, and make it pass upon the nation as the only book of statutes that ever they had known? As impossible was it for the books of Moses, if they were invented in any age after Moses, to have been received for what they declare themselves to be, namely, the statutes and municipal law of the nation of the Jews: and to have persuaded the Jews that they had owned and acknowledged these books all along from the days of Moses, to that day in which they were first invented; that is, that they had owned them before they had ever so much as heard of them. Nay, more, the whole nation must, in an instant, forget their former laws and government, if they could receive these books as being their former laws. And they could not otherwise receive them, because they vouched themselves so to be. Let me ask the Deists but one short question: Was there ever a book of sham laws, which were not the laws of the nation, palmed upon any people, since the world began? If not, with what face can they say this of the book of laws of the Jews? Why will they say that of them, which they confess to be impossible in any nation, or among any people?

But they must be yet more unreasonable. For the books of Moses have a further demonstration of their truth
than even other law-books have; for they not only contain the laws, but give an historical account of their
institution, and the practice of them from that time: as of the Passover, in memory of the redemption from death
of the first-born of Israel in Egypt (Exod. xii. 21-30); of all their first-born, both of man and beast, being, by a
perpetual law, dedicated to God: and the Levites taken for all the first-born of the children of
Israel (Num. viii. 17, 18); of Aaron's Rod, which budded, which was kept in the ark, in memory of the
rebellion and wonderful destruction of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and for the confirmation of the priesthood
to the tribe of Levi (Num. xvi. xvii.); of the Pot of Manna, in memory of their having been fed with it forty
years in the wilderness (Exod. xvi. 32-36); of the Brazen Serpent, which was kept, and remained to the days of
Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii. 4), in memory of that wonderful deliverance, by only looking upon it, from the biting
of the fiery serpents. (Num. xxi. 9.)

And besides these remembrances of particular actions and occurrences, there were other solemn institutions
in memory of their deliverance out of Egypt, in the general, which included all the particulars. As of the
sabbath (Deut. v. 15); of their daily sacrifices, and yearly expiation; their new moons, and several feasts and
fasts. So that there were yearly, monthly, weekly, daily remembrances and recognitions of these things.

The Twelve Stones Set Up at Gilgal, on the banks of the Jordan, in the days of Joshua, the successor of
Moses, were commemorative of Israel's crossing the river, and entering the land, in the same way that the
passover and other Mosaic observances were memorials of their redemption and their wonderful exit from
Egypt, as it is written, "And the people came up out of Jordan on the tenth day of the first month, and encamped
in Gilgal, on the east border of Jericho; and those twelve stones, which they took out of Jordan, did Joshua pitch
in Gilgal. And he spake unto the children of Israel, saying, When your children shall ask their fathers in time to
come, saying, What mean these stones? Then ye shall let your children know, saying, Israel came over this
Jordan on dry land. For the Lord your God dried up the waters of Jordan from before you, until ye were passed
over, as the Lord your God did to the Red Sea, which he dried up from before us, until we were gone over; that
tall the people of the earth might know the hand of the Lord, that it is mighty; that ye might fear the Lord your
God for ever." (Josh. iv. 10—24.)

Another parallel case is that of the deliverance of the Jews from their enemies, in the Book of Esther, and
The two days of Purim, kept through all succeeding generations in commemoration thereof; as it is written,
"The Jews ordained, and took upon them, and upon their seed, and upon all such as joined themselves unto
them, so as it should not fail, that they would keep these two days, according to their writing, and according to
their appointed time, every year: and that these days should be remembered and kept throughout every
generation, every family, every province, and every city, and that these days of Purim should not fail from
among the Jews, nor the memorial of them perish from their seed." (Esther ix. 27, 28.)

And not only so, but the books of the same Moses tell us, that the Tribe Of Levi was chosen by God to
serve in His tabernacle, that His Priests belonged to this tribe, by whose hands, and none other, the sacrifices
of the people were to be offered, and these solemn institutions to be celebrated. That it was death for any other
to approach the altar. That their High-Priest wore a glorious mitre, and magnificent robes of God's own
contrivance, with the miraculous Úrim and Thummim in his breast-plate, whence the divine responses were
given. (Exod. xxviii. 30; Num. xxvii. 21.) That, at his word the king and all the people were to go out and to
come in. That these Levites were likewise the chief judges even in all civil causes, and that it was death to resist
their sentence. (Dent. xvii. 8-13.) Now, whenever it can be supposed that these books of Moses were forged, in
some ages after Moses, it is impossible they could have been received as true, unless the forgers could have
made the whole nation believe that they had received these books from their fathers, had been instructed in
them when they were children, and had taught them to their children; moreover, that they had all been
circumcised, and did circumcise their children, in pursuance of what was commanded in these books: that they
had observed the yearly passover, the weekly sabbath, the new moons, and all these several feasts, fasts, and
ceremonies, commanded in these books: that they had never eaten any swine's flesh, or other meats prohibited
in these books: that they had a magnificent tabernacle, with a visible priesthood to administer in it, which was
confined to the tribe of Levi, over whom was placed a glorious High-Priest, clothed with great and mighty
prerogatives; whose death only could deliver those that fled to the cities of refuge (Num. xxxv. 25-28); and that
these priests were their ordinary judges, even in civil matters. I say, was it possible to have persuaded a whole
nation of men, that they had known and practised all these things, if they had not done so? or, secondly, to have
received a book for truth, which said that they had practised them, and appealed to that practice? So that here
are The Third and Fourth of the Marks Above Mentioned.

Thus, having spoken of the matters of fact of Moses, and of the four marks in connection with them, I
come now, in the next place, to show how these four marks appear in conjunction with that which is recorded of
Our Blessed Lord In the Gospels, and my work herein will be the shorter, because all that is said before of
Moses and his books is every way as applicable to Christ and His gospel. His works and miracles are there said
to be done publicly in the face of the world, as He argued to His accusers: "I spake openly to the world; I ever
taught in the synagogue, and in the temple, whither the Jews always resort; and in secret have I said nothing." (John xviii. 20.) Then, in Acts ii. 41, it is said that "about three thousand" at one time; and in Acts iv. 4, "about five thousand" at another, were converted upon conviction of what they themselves had seen, what had been clone publicly before their eyes, wherein it was impossible to have imposed upon them. Therefore here were The Two First of the Rules Before Mentioned.

Then for the second two: **BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER were instituted as perpetual memorials of these things;** and they were not instituted in after ages, but at the very time when these things were said to be done; and have been observed without interruption, in all ages wherever Christianity has been professed, from that time to this.

As we do not agree with certain statements which our esteemed author has made at this point, we omit them. Had he, instead of speaking of the *professing church* as he has done, brought forward the existence of the **true church of God** in the world, in proof of Christ's mission; had he said that the presence of every Christian on earth is an evidence that Christ has been here; and that He now is in heaven, waiting, at the right hand of God, to take us home to Himself, we should have accepted this as the brightest and happiest possible proof that the heart could desire that the whole thing is true.

* * * * *

And now, having before spoken of Mahomet and the heathen deities, we turn to say a word as to them, and to show that they all want some, if not all, of the aforesaid four rules, whereby the certainty of matters of fact is demonstrated.

First, as to Mahomet. He pretended to no miracles, as he tells us in his Alcoran, c. 6, &c., and those which are commonly told of him pass among the Mahometans themselves but as legendary fables; and, as such, are rejected by the wise and learned among them; as the legends of their saints are by those who belong to the church of Rome. See Dr. Prideaux's "Life of Mahomet."

But, in the next place, those which are told of him do all want the First Two Rules before mentioned. For his pretended converse with the moon; his Mersa, or night-journey from Mecca to Jerusalem, and thence to heaven, &c., were not performed before anybody. We have only his own word for them. The same is to be said (in the second place) of the fables of the heathen gods, of Mercury's stealing sheep, Jupiter's turning himself into a bull, and the like; besides the folly and unworthiness of such senseless pretended miracles. And, moreover, the wise among the heathen did reckon no otherwise of these but as fables, which had a mythology, or mystical meaning, in them, of which several of them have given us the rationale or explication. And it is plain enough that Ovid meant no other by all his Metamorphoses.

It is true the heathen deities had their priests: they had likewise feasts, games, and other public institutions in memory of them; but all these want the Fourth Mark, namely, that such priesthood and institutions should commence from the time that such things as they commemorate were said to be done; otherwise they cannot secure after ages from the imposture, by detecting it at the time when first invented, as hath been argued before. But the Bacchanalia, and other heathen feasts, were instituted many ages after what was reported of these gods was said to be done, and therefore can be no proof of them. And the priests of Bacchus, Apollo, &c., were not ordained by these supposed gods, but were appointed by others in after ages only in honour to them. And, therefore, these orders of priests are no evidence to the truth of the matters of fact which are reported of their gods.

Now, to apply what has been said. You may challenge all the Deists in the world to show any action that is fabulous which has all the four rules or marks before mentioned. No; it is impossible. And (to resume a little what we have before said,) the histories of the Exodus and the Gospel could never have been received, if they had not been true; because the institution of the priesthood of Levi, of the sabbath, the passover, of circumcision, under the past dispensation, of baptism and the Lord's supper, under the present, are there related, as descending all the way down from those times, without interruption. And it is fully as impossible to persuade men that they had been circumcised, had celebrated passovers, sabbaths, &c., had been baptized, and partaken of the Lord's supper, if they had done none of these things, as to make them believe that they had gone through seas upon dry land, seen the dead raised, &c. And without believing these it was impossible that either the law or the gospel could have been received.

And the truth of the matters of fact of Exodus and the gospel being no otherwise pressed upon men than as they have practised such public institutions, it is appealing to the senses of mankind for the truth of them; and makes it impossible for any to have invented such stories in after ages, without a palpable detection of the cheat when first invented; as impossible as to have imposed upon the senses of mankind at the time when such public matters of fact were said to be done.

I do not say that everything which apparently wants these four marks is false, but that Nothing can be False Which has Them all.

I have no manner of doubt that there was such a man as Julius Cæsar, that he fought at Pharsalia, was killed
in the senate-house; and many other matters of fact of ancient times, though we keep no public observances in memory of them.

But this shows that the matters of fact of MOSES and of CHRIST have come down to us better guarded than any other matters of fact, how true soever.

In secular matters there are no such memorials as we find in the Bible. The proofs in this case are of a different character. History, ancient records, tombs, buildings, coins, customs, are evidences that such and such persons have lived, that such and such events have occurred.

And this, we must not forget, equally applies to the facts recorded in scripture as to mere secular facts. Christianity is so interwoven with the history of the world, that it is impossible for any one with the slightest pretension to candour to deny the existence of Christ, or the truth of His miracles.

And yet our Deists, who would laugh at any man that should offer to deny Caesar or Alexander, Homer or Virgil, their public works and actions, do, at the same time, value themselves as men of free, generous, and unbiased judgments, for ridiculing the histories of Moses and Christ, that are infinitely better attested, and guarded with infallible marks which the others want.

Besides that, the importance of the subject would oblige all men to inquire more narrowly into the one than the other; for what consequence is it to me, or to anyone else, viewing ourselves as immortal responsible beings having to do with God and His truth, whether there was such a man as Caesar, whether he beat, or was beaten, at Pharsalia, whether Homer or Virgil wrote such books, and whether what is related in the Iliad or Æneid be true or false? It is of no moment whatever in this view of the subject, to any man in the world. And, therefore, it is worth no man's while to inquire into it, either to oppose or justify the truth of these relations.

But OUR very SOULS AND BODIES, OUR HAPPINESS, BOTH IN THIS LIFE AND THE NEXT, BEING CONCERNED IN THE TRUTH OF WHAT IS RELATED IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, men are naturally more inquisitive to search into the truth of these, than of any other matters of fact, more disposed to examine and sift them narrowly, and find out the deceit, if any such can be found; for it concerns them nearly, and is of the last importance to them.

How unreasonable, then, is it to reject these matters of fact, so sifted, so examined, and so attested, as no other matters of fact in the world ever were; and yet to think it most highly unreasonable, even to madness, to deny other matters of fact which have not the thousandth part of their evidence, and are of no consequence at all to us, comparatively speaking, whether true or false.

There are several other topics from whence the truth of the Christian religion is evinced to all who will judge by reason, and give themselves leave to consider:—as the improbability that ten or twelve poor illiterate fishermen should form a design of converting the whole world to believe their delusions, and the impossibility of their effecting it, without force of arms, learning, oratory, or any one visible thing that could recommend them! And to impose a doctrine quite opposite to the lusts and pleasures of men, and all worldly advantages or enjoyments! And this in an age of so great learning and sagacity as that wherein the gospel was first preached! That these apostles should not only undergo all the scorn and contempt, but the severest persecutions and most cruel deaths that could be inflicted, in attestation to what themselves knew to be a mere deceit and forgery of their own contriving! Some have suffered for errors which, they thought to be truth, but never any for what themselves knew to be lies. And the apostles must know what they taught to be lies, if it was so, because they spoke of those things which, they said, they had both seen and heard, had looked upon, and handled with their hands. (Acts iv. 20; 1 John i. 1.)

Neither can it be said that they, perhaps, might have proposed some temporal advantages to themselves, but missed of them, and met with sufferings instead of them: for, if it had been so, it is more than probable that, when they saw their disappointment, they would have discovered their conspiracy; especially when they might have not only saved their lives, but got great rewards for so doing.

But this is not all: for they tell us that their Master bid them expect nothing but sufferings in this world. For all that were converted through them, were converted upon the certain expectation of suffering, and bidden to prepare for it. Christ commanded His disciples to take up their cross daily, and follow Him; and told them that in the world they should have tribulation; that whoever did not forsake father, mother, wife, children, lands, and their very lives, could not be His disciples.

Now, that this despised doctrine of the cross should prevail so universally against the allurements of flesh and blood, and all the blandishments of this world, against the rage and persecution of all the kings and powers of the earth, must show its original to be Divine, and its Protector Almighty.

We may add to all this the testimonies of the most bitter enemies and persecutors of Christianity, both Jews and Gentiles, to the truth of the matter of fact of Christ, such as Josephus and Tacitus; of whom the first flourished about forty years after the death of Christ, and the other about seventy years after; so that they were capable of examining into the truth, and wanted not prejudice and malice sufficient to have inclined them to
deny the matter of fact itself of Christ; but their confessing to it, as likewise Lucian, Celsius, Porphyry, and Julian the apostate, the Mahometans since, and all other enemies of Christianity, that have arisen in the world, is an undeniable attestation to the truth of the matter of fact.

And now, in the next place, I turn to consider a common argument of the Deists, who, when they are not able to stand out against the evidence of fact, that such and such miracles have been done, then turn about and deny such things to be miracles, asserting that we can never be sure whether any wonderful thing that is shown to us be a true or false miracle.

And the great argument they go upon is this, that a miracle being that which exceeds the power of nature, we cannot know what exceeds it unless we knew the utmost extent of the power of nature; and no man pretends to know that; therefore, that no man can certainly know whether any event be miraculous: and, consequently, he may be cheated in his judgment between true and false miracles.

To which I answer, that men may be so cheated, and there are many examples of it.

But that though we may not always know when we are cheated, yet we can certainly tell, in many cases, when we are not cheated.

For though we do not know the utmost extent of the power of nature, perhaps, in any one thing; yet it does not follow that we know not the nature of anything in some measure, and that certainly too. For example, though I do not know the utmost extent of the power of fire, yet I certainly know it is the nature of fire to burn; and that when proper fuel is administered to it, it is contrary to the nature of fire not to consume it. Therefore, if I see three men taken out of the street, in their common wearing apparel, and, without any preparation, cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace, and that the flame was so fierce that it burnt up those men that threw them in, and yet that these who were thrown in should walk up and down in the bottom of the furnace, and I should see a fourth person with them of glorious appearance, like the Son of God; and that these men should come up again out of the furnace without any harm, or so much as the smell of fire upon themselves or their clothes; I could not be deceived in thinking there was a stop put to the nature of fire, as to these men; and that it had its effect upon the men whom it burned, at the same time.

Again: though I cannot tell how wonderful and sudden an increase of corn might be produced by the concurrence of many causes, as a warm climate, the fertility of the soil, &c., yet this I can certainly know, that there is not that natural force in the breath of two or three words spoken, to multiply one small loaf of bread so fast, in the breaking of it, as truly and really, not only in appearance and show to the eye, but in very deed to satisfy the hunger of several thousand persons; and that the fragments should be much more than the bread was at first. So neither in a word spoken, to raise the dead, cure diseases, &c.

Therefore, though we know not the utmost extent of the power of nature; yet we can certainly know what is contrary to the nature of several such things as we do know.

And therefore, though we may be cheated, and imposed upon in many seeming miracles and wonders; yet there are some things wherein we may be certain.

And though it is true that we cannot see what was done before our time, yet, by the marks which I have laid down concerning the certainty of matters of fact done before our time, we may be as much assured of the truth of them as if we had lived in those days, and were ourselves eye-witnesses of the truth of that which we now know to be true, because we find it in scripture.

Mr. Leslie, speaking of the supposed infallibility of the church of Rome, which, of course, he denies, goes on to say: "But there is an infallibility in the church, not personal in any one, or all Christians put together; for millions of fallibles can never make an infallible. But the infallibility consists in the nature of the evidence, which, having all the four marks mentioned in the 'Short Method with the Deists,' cannot possibly be false. As you and I believe that there is such a city as Constantinople, that there was such a man as Henry the Eighth, as much as if we had seen them with our eyes; not from the credit of any historian or traveller, all of whom are fallible, but from the nature of the evidence, wherein it is impossible for men to have conspired, and carried it on, without contradiction, if it were false."

Thus far I have quoted what Mr. Leslie has written on this subject, to the edification and comfort of many, I trust, into whose hands this little work may fall.

And here I would add a thought of my own, which I confess has interested me much—it is this; that the four marks, in proving the truth of the facts recorded in the Book of Exodus, do the same as to those related in Genesis. The argument is this: if Moses did what is imputed to him—if he led the children of Israel through the Red Sea and the wilderness, he had, there can be no question about it, a commission from heaven; he was, as our author has shown, emphatically a man of God, and also a prophet, and not only so, but all that we have of his writings was inspired; and in this way the history of man, as given in Genesis, of which he was the writer, is proved to be true, the great events from Adam down to his time, such as the creation, the fall of man, the flood, the building of Babel, the lives of the patriarchs, are incontestably verified. Again, all that he taught as to Christ, whether by types or through prophecy, is established as truth. The tabernacle is shown by him to be the
figure of Him who is the true tabernacle of God, in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily; while the sacrifices, according to Moses, represent the true sacrifice, the offering up of that Blessed One, whose blood cleanses the sinner, whose hope is in Him, from every defilement. Hence the redemption of Israel out of Egypt, bears in a wonderful way on the whole history of man, from the creation down to the end, and then onward still, into the far depths of eternity.

The Exodus, according to this, is, in truth, The One Grand Central Event on Which the Whole of the Divine History Hinges from Beginning to End, as will be evident to those who have followed our author through the foregoing pages.

If I were asked—as I sometimes have been—for a proof that the Book of Genesis was written by Moses, I should point to Luke xxiv. 27, where it is written of Christ, in His interview with His two disciples going to Emmaus, that, "beginning At MOSES AND ALL THE PROPHETS, he expounded unto them In all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." This is surely conclusive; Moses, in this wondrous discourse of the risen Scriptures, is given his place as the first of the prophets, at the head of God's look, and hence, as the author of Genesis, of which the Book of Exodus is but the continuation.

As to Mr. Leslie, how much do we, like the Duke of Leeds of past times, feel indebted to him—so much so, that we are ready to subscribe to what the author of the Preface to his book, as originally published, expressed, when he said that "the world affords nothing so effectual on the Christian evidences" as what he has brought out. Whether this be too much to say, seeing that this subject has been handled by so many gifted and competent writers, we do not undertake to determine. But the more we consider the way in which he has treated his subject, the more do we wonder at the simplicity with which he, by means of the four marks, of which he never loses sight for a moment, has enabled us at a glance to review the whole purpose of God, as presented in scripture, both in the Old Testament and in the New; so much so, that no sceptic who honestly faces the subject could answer him. Treat it with scorn he might, but meet him in argument he never could do. And so thought the writer of the Preface before-named, when he said, "The argument is so short and clear, that the meanest capacity may understand it; and so forcible, that no man has yet been found able to resist it." When it was first published, some attempts were made, but they soon came to nothing. The argument, in brief, is this: the Christian religion consists of facts and doctrines, each depending on each other; so that, if the facts are true, the doctrines must be true.

Thus, for example, The Resurrection of JESUS CHRIST IS A FACT; OUR RESURRECTION IS A DOCTRINE. Admit the fact, and the doctrine cannot be denied. The ascension of Jesus Christ is another fact; His return to judge the world is a doctrine; if the fact be true, the doctrine must be so likewise. For, argues the apostle, if the doctrine be not true, the fact must be false: If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised. (1 Cor. xv. 16.)

And now let me add a word in conclusion. Some Christians, I find, are impatient, if you venture to press on them the need of considering the external evidences of scripture, as though you meant to set aside that which is internal and spiritual. But there is surely no wisdom in this, because to what does the Spirit within us bear witness? Not merely that we are born of God, washed in the blood of the Lamb, sealed by the Spirit, but likewise to the facts of the Bible, to those very facts which the four marks unite in confirming. And let me say that no Christian is wise in supposing himself to be in any way independent of these, because, let the enemy only come in with his fiery darts, with his evil suggestions that the Bible is perhaps a fable, and he will be constrained to fall back, among other things, on these very proofs, to reassure his wavering heart. If not, of what value to us are the ordinances of God under the past dispensation? what that of the ordinances of the Lord's supper and of baptism under the present?

Then, again, let him have to encounter a sceptic, and how happy is it for him to have a brief and simple argument of this kind at his command, by which he may answer him! It is not enough to declare that he possesses within him the evidence that he himself is redeemed by the blood of the Lamb, and that he is assured of the truth of the Scriptures. In this there is little love, as regards his opponent. If he cares for his soul, he must of necessity wish for something more convincing than this—something whereby he may hope at least to silence his infidel reasonings, and lead him, it may be, to see what exists as a fixed truth in his own mind, and in the mind, we may assuredly add, of every Christian. True it is, he may not be able to define it, either to himself or to others, but there it is, the truth, the very truth, to which Mr. Leslie has given "a local habitation and a name;" so much so, that when tangibly presented to him he finds, as in the interesting case of the Duke of Leeds, that there is within him an echo, a response, to it all—that it is in reality that with which his heart has been already familiar.

A Comparison
Between the True and the False, Between that Which has, and that Which has not, the Four Marks.

No such individual as Moses—No such event as the Exodus—Figure 1. No prossover, or commemorative ordinances whatever: NO BOOKS OF MOSES. ISRAEL'S HISTORY, in no way agreeing with the record in the supposed books of the Moses THE PENTATEUCH SO-CALLED, an invention, a forgery, according to the deists, purporting to have been written by Moses, and recording events which never occurred. FALSE. Here the fourth and last mark being wanting, the others are of necessity also deficient. Moses, Israel's deliverer—The exodus of Israel out of Egypt—Figure 2. The Pentateuch really written by Moses. THE TESTIMONY observances in memory of Israel's redemption from Egypt. THE LAW WRITTEN BY MOSES, preserved from generation to generation, in the ark TRUE. Here the four marks coming together, the whole is proved to be both true and consistent

Description of the Foregoing Diagram.

Figure 1. The object of this is to illustrate what our author has said, namely, that if the PENTATEUCH, according to the Deists, be an Invention, a Forgery, written and put forth in comparatively the later times of Israel's history, this does away altogether with the five books of Moses, written by him, as we know, during the forty years in the wilderness, the record of Israel's deliverance from Egypt.

According to this, there was no such individual as Moses—no such event as the Exodus—no law—no memorials of God's ways with His people.

The whole, in short, is A Fable, and thus man is left in hopeless despair, without any light or revelation from God.

Figure 2 is the happy reverse of all this, showing these books to have been no forgery at all, but really written by Moses, every word of them proceeding out of the mouth of the Lord, the record of that which really happened, of the Exodus, of the Levitical ordinances in commemoration thereof, beginning, be it remembered, from the time of Israel's deliverance out of the hand of their oppressors. In the First of these cases no marks whatever are found, showing it all to be false and untenable; in the Second, the four marks are apparent, proving the whole to be true, and of God.
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To the Reader.

This inspirational writing having appeared in successive issues of THE MEDIUM is now published in a separate form, at the request of friends who feel at one with the spirit and aim of the sentiments contained therein. I trust that others may receive good from its perusal, and that their spiritual vision may be opened to see the Lord Jesus as Stephen saw him in the midst of his persecutors.

Any church, or congregation, in sympathy with the contents of this treatise, and desiring my services to discourse to them on these truths may communicate with me, care of the Publisher, 15, Southampton Row, London, W.C.
C. P. B. Alsop.

The Atonement.

The subject of the Atonement is, I suppose, one of the deepest themes that can interest the mind of man,
and has been the cause of much controversy for ages past, all, I think, arising from misconception of what the Atonement of Christ really does mean.

The common idea entertained on this subject is, that in consequence of our first parents eating of the forbidden fruit, or, in other words, committing sin, they incurred the displeasure of God, and thus brought down upon themselves and all their posterity, the curse of the Almighty, who, for that sin, doomed them to eternal death. But we are told that God in his mercy devised a plan whereby this curse could be averted; namely, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and that in the fulness of time the promised seed did come, which was the child born, and the son given, whose name should be called Jesus, who was to save his people from their sins; that he should offer himself up as a sacrifice on the cross for the sins of the world, and thus satisfy the demands of divine justice in dying in the sinner's stead; bearing all the thunderbolts of divine wrath against the sinner, and thus quench the flames of an eternal hell that was waiting to swallow up the human race. The sinner is thus set free, and all who believe in him are saved, on account of Jesus' blood being shed, which was offered as an atonement for our sins. All who do not believe in this saviour are doomed, it is said, to everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.

The Atonement, as we understand it, does not mean anything like what we have just named.

The word atonement signifies at-one-ment, or as Cruden has it, reconciliation. The words imply that man is not "at one" with God, but that God and man are two, are at variance, are not in agreement, are not on terms of peace and friendship, but are antagonistic one towards the other. This comes to pass in the same manner that something comes between two persons and separates them, and until that is removed there cannot be reconciliation or at-one-ment. Two children may be happy together, but something that brings discord steps between them; they separate for awhile; they are no longer one, but twain; and before they can be happy together again that which caused the offence must be removed. The offending one will say, "I am sorry; I did not intend to give offence; I will not do it any more; kiss and make it up." Here is the effect of atonement; they are no longer at variance, no longer two, but one, clasped in each other's arms.

All the grievances of life are removed by atonement, but it costs more in some cases than in others, according to the conditions upon which the injured party is willing to be reconciled or come to oneness. A simple kiss is not always sufficient. There must be penitence on the part of the offender, there must be tokens of sorrow and contrition for having transgressed the law before reconciliation can take place, and a promise of amendment must be given before atonement can be made.

Is your sin against your better self? Then before you can have peace within you must make atonement with your conscience, by putting away that sin which makes conscience cry out: "Away with this vile spot, it stains my garments; I can no longer live with you while you degrade me so." The angel within will not let you rest whilst indulging in any known sin. How can two walk together except they agree? The man of sorrow, acquainted with grief, is within, and when you see that all sins you commit are committed against the Christ within, and that the chastisement of your sins is laid upon him, it is thus, by his stripes, you are healed.

When you see that it is your sin that causes the Son of God within you to bear your sorrow;—when you realize that it is the sin principle that aims its deadly dart at the Christ being born within your soul,—yes, sin, holding council to take away the child's life, the holy child within you that is to grow to manhood, and that can only be your Saviour—that without him you are lost, and that he stands at the door of your heart knocking for admission: there is no less a personage than God your Saviour seeking admission, making atonement with you, and not you with him—making reconciliation with you, and not you with him. It is God in the Christ within you, reconciling you unto himself, not imputing your trespasses unto you, not charging you with sin, but as you lie a condemned sinner at his feet, he says: "Go, sin no more."

God never was at variance with any of his children; it is sin in them that is at variance with him. He never alters, he never changes. He is love, perfect love, and cannot be anything else. The atonement on God's part is always made; he is always reconciled to have the poor sinner come home. No sooner does the prodigal say, "I will arise and go to my Father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight am no more worthy to be called thy son, make me as one of thy hired servants," than, when he is yet a great way off, his Father sees him, has compassion, and runs and falls on his neck and kisses him. The atonement is made: they are no longer twain, but one. When Jesus on the cross said: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" he only expressed the sentiments of the Father's heart. No sooner does the prodigal but penitent world come to itself—and its true self is relationship with the Father of our spirits—that it recognises that the Father is waiting and looking for each individual prodigal to come to himself, and as they approach, he runs out to meet them by his spirit, saying: This, my son, was dead, but is alive again; was lost, but now is found. Here is the at-one-ment, here is reconciliation.

Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sin. Blood represents the life, for the life is in the blood; so as each prodigal finds that his true life is in his Father's heart, in his Father's house, in his Father's presence, and under his Father's care, he is willing to give up, to sacrifice all his animal life—that which resides
in the animal blood. He is willing to sacrifice this animal part for the spiritual, for he knows that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.

Here, then, is the true atonement, and not as some say that Jesus died to pacify the Father's wrath. Nothing of the kind; it was the Father's love from first to last that prompted the work, as is manifest in all the prophets calling upon mankind to come to him; as God our Father is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance, accept at-one-ment, come to reconciliation with his better self and with his God, and come to a knowledge of the truth.

Men perish in so far as they do not live up to those higher principles that are latent within them. The treasure is hid in the field; deep down in the human heart is the pearl of great price. Yes, the lost piece of silver is there; search diligently and thou wilt find it, and when found thou shalt rejoice, for it will show to thee that that piece of silver is the true coin stamped with the impress divine, which will prove thy true relationship, having the true image and superscription on it. Written on that silver coin of thy soul is, "Now are we the sons of God." Yes, now. Although clothed in mortality, yet the time will come that mortality shall be swallowed up of life. You may say it doth not yet appear. No, indeed, for we see through a glass darkly at present—darkened by sin, darkened by wrong education, darkened by all earthly surroundings. But when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is, and not as we imagine or have been taught that he is—a God of vengeance or a God of retaliation, demanding an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth; a God who is only waiting till death shall terminate our existence here, and then he will cast us into a lake of fire if we do not believe a certain creed.

How can any atonement be effected with such a God? How can there be reconciliation to such a God, who shocks all our better feelings? No wonder men keep away from such a God, who will not be satisfied with anything short of the blood of his own beloved son, which alone will pacify his divine wrath. The thunderbolt of his justice is made to fall upon the head of the innocent that the guilty might go free. But where is the justice in such a procedure? Justice is violated—outraged to the very extreme in condemning the innocent in place of the guilty, Even Charles Peace, the notorious burglar, was obliged to confess to the truth that he committed a crime for which another man was imprisoned. He could not go to the gallows until he confessed that he was the perpetrator of the crime and therefore the man who was imprisoned in his stead ought to be released. God is not such a one as is represented by the churches of the present day; there is no passage in the Bible that will bear such interpretation when seen with an enlightened eye. Let us take a few illustrations of what the Atonement of Christ does signify.

Bear in mind that it is not God who is at variance with the sinner, but the sinner is at variance with God. Hence all the prophets give witness to this fact, which is patent to all but to the most wilfully blind. "Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, for why will ye die," is God's language. "Let the wicked forsake his way and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him turn unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon." "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly before thy God." "Fear God and keep his commandments; for in this is the whole duty of man!"

The Atonement consists in removing out of the way that which separates you from God; and there is nothing can separate you from him but sin. Jesus showed this in his own person, who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth, and this constituted the at-one-ment; hence he could say, my Father and I are one, or at-one-ment, for I always do those things that please him. True fellowship can only exist where there is agreement. Husband and wife to live in harmony must be one—one in purpose and aim; what is the interest of one is also the interest of the ether. If the husband should be given to drink and the wife abhors it, there cannot be oneness until that husband sees his error, gives it up, and becomes a sober man. Then the at-one-ment is made. If a man gives way to any vice, and thus becomes the pest of the neighbourhood in which he lives, before he can be looked upon with respect, and received into the bosom of society with confidence, he must give up those vices that were the cause of his being separated from respectable society; soon as the sin is removed confidence is regained, the atonement is made, reconciliation accomplished. When a person has been insulted, and it is found that the offended and offender have come together again, and you enquire "How is this?" you are informed that the offender made atonement—he apologised, which was sufficient in this case, and thus the at-one-ment was made. When a traveller has received an injury on the railway, damages have to be paid to him according to the amount of injury received before atonement or reconciliation can take place in the public mind; when this is done all parties are satisfied. When a nation infringes upon the rights of another nation, war and bloodshed are likely to take place, unless the rights of the aggrieved nation be respected, and atonement be made, either by arbitration or otherwise. Does England infringe upon the rights of America? The Alabama claims must be met, before at-one-ment can be accomplished, or reconciliation be made. And so we might go on with illustrations of atonement on an external plane, as touching the affairs of life between men.

But now you want to know in what sense did Jesus make atonement for us. Well, I wish to make the matter
as clear as possible, that he who runs may read and understand what he reads. Reconciliation cannot take place between God and the human soul until all sin be put away. Jesus put that sin away in his own person. Every temptation to sin he withstood. As sin presented itself in that body, which he had from Mary, he repulsed every such intruder, drove back every sin, conquered all temptation, and thus overcame all. He was tempted in all points, as we are, yet without sin; he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth. Thus, he was at-one-ing or reconciling that nature he had from Mary unto God; yea more, God was, in Christ, reconciling that very humanity to himself. Hence, said Jesus; the father and I are one, for I do his will. Herein consisted the at-one-ment between Jesus and the Father; and if we would be like him, and be his disciples, we also must follow in his footsteps, for no man, said ho, can be my disciple except he take up his cross daily and follow me. It is all couched in these two words: "follow me;" so if we would be "at one" with him we must put away sin from us: it must be hated, forsaken, conquered, overcome. Immediately there is the slightest desire to flee from sin, help is sent by his holy spirit: his angels are sent to minister unto us, to help us in this work of at-one-ment, this work of reconciliation.

All power is given unto the Son both in heaven and on earth, and as a son he learned obedience by the things which he suffered in the ascent, or upward march through the animal plane, gaining all power over the earthly nature taken from his mother, and all power in the heaven of his spiritual mind, so that his thoughts were always spiritual and heavenly. So as we begin to realise our relationship as sons of the Lord God Almighty, so shall we begin to have all power over earth, our material nature in which we live, putting sin away from us as we would any deadly thing, and thus make at-one-ment.

Paul tells us Jesus "took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore, in all things, it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." (Heb. ii., 16-18.)

Mark, Jesus did not come to reconcile God unto us, but he came in our nature to reconcile that nature unto God—to take that nature in union with the Divine, and thus show the possibility of our arriving at the same communion and oneness with God; and only on this ground can atonement be made, thereby reconciling the nature that sinned, subduing and bringing that nature into obedience to the divine within.

God has various methods of bringing the soul into this at-one-ment with himself. Some are atoning for their sin, and in the prison cell promising both God and their soul that when they get their liberty they will live at one with law, and thus prevent their being subjected to further suffering and disgrace in the future. Some there are on beds of affliction, and in solitude, making atonement with God and their souls, resolving that if God, only spare them to recover their health they will henceforth be more careful than ever to walk at one with nature’s laws, and thus prevent sorrow to their friends and pain to themselves. In all the varied scenes of sorrow and suffering human nature is passing through may be seen by the discerning eye that at-one-ment—reconciliation—is aimed at by an all-wise providence. The crosses here and the lessons there are all to bring us nearer to our Father God. Behind the dark cloud is the silver lining of the at-one-ment, or reconciling power that makes every prodigal say, I will arise and go—where? To the great and unknowable Spirit of God? No. But I will arise and go to my Father. There cannot be at-one-ment where there is not this recognition.

It is opposed to the truth to represent God at a great distance—as unknowable and unapproachable; as the Great Spirit that sits on some mighty throne, regulating all the affairs of life by abstract law, without any regard to our relationship to him—only as a king would rule his subjects, demanding implicit obedience in all things, without impressing upon the soul the reasonableness of that obedience, and inspiring within its inmost nature that delight spoken of by the Psalmist when he said, "I delight to do thy will, O my God. Yea, thy law is within my heart." The deep-rooted feeling within the heart of the Psalmist was that God was not only the God of Nature—of which he says, "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth forth his handiwork"—but also that this God is our Father, and that like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear him, and for why? Because he knoweth our frame, and remembereth that we are dust. And, let me ask, who is more likely to know our frames than the Maker of our frames? and who can have more sympathy for our nature than he who became incarnate in that very nature in which we live—God manifest in the flesh.

I know of no book that gives so clear a definition of God as the Father of mankind as is contained in the Bible. God, according to some teachers, is incomprehensible, unknowable, and unknown,—never was seen, never will be seen. Of course I shall be reminded that Jesus said, "No man hath seen God at any time. The only begotten which is in the bosom of the Father he hath declared him;" and yet Jesus also says, "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father," implying that God can only be seen by manifestation or by revealment, as he says, "No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him."

The Jews could only see the son of the carpenter, or what people term in these enlightened days, "the gentle Nazarene." If we look at the external relationship we shall never realise the true Christ, the true Messiah, the
true Man, the true God. It was the true manhood he came to evolve; the true God and Father he came to express or reveal. Every tender word, every tender look, every gracious act,—in all the varied lineaments of that beautiful and incomparable life was embodied the personal and impersonal character of God. When you behold any outward act of kindness of a friend, you see in that act the welling up of the impersonal nature of that friend which you cannot see, nor for what I know ever will see; yet you can behold from the act brought forth that kindly nature that dwells within the sanctum sanctorum, or Holy of Holies, the Divine light that no man can approach unto, only as it is veiled by the undulating waves of spiritual ether that soften it down, as it were, to our poor capacities, as their receptive faculties are fit to receive it.

Yes, it is a truth, the natural man discerneth not the things of God, neither can he know them for they are spiritually discerned. Man, according to his animal, or, as I would say, perverted nature, is separated from God, but that separation is by wicked works. It is not in the law of the unrenewed man to be subject unto the higher law of God, until quickened by the spirit; for that which is flesh is flesh, of which we must all have better experience more or less. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? All animal wants and all animal desires are one, on the animal plane, and may be all right as far as they go, so long as they are kept within due bounds or subordination. The animal instincts in man must be controlled, governed, subdued, and conquered, and finally must die, for mortality must be swallowed up of life; the animal man must give place to the true man, which is the Lord from heaven; the first Adam in us, which life consists of, the animal soul, must give place to the last Adam, which is a quickening spirit: so that what was done by us from the animal plane may give place to the spiritual man who works from a spiritual plane, having spiritual principles and spiritual laws to guide him in all the future career of his existence.

The Saviour came to supply a want that man by nature had not; or, in other words, he came to show man his true relationship, and what latent principles lay hid within his breast. At the time Jesus appeared on the earth darkness covered the earth, and gross darkness the minds of the people. Prejudice, superstition and, priestcraft were everywhere, and true godliness nowhere. The Book of Prophecy had been closed for four or five hundred years. There was no prophet, no medium of communication between the mind of God and the people, until the fulness of time had come when God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law of rites and ceremonies, to redeem them that were under that law; to bring them out of this bondage of sacrifices, this Babylon of blood and slaughter; to show them by a holy life that the sacrifices of God were a pure and spotless life,—to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and to love God with all thy heart and thy neighbour as thyself.

We say that Jesus came to impart life to the dead carcass of the Jewish religion; nay, more than that, he came to abolish the old system of the sacrificial blood of bulls and goats, which could never take away sin; he came to offer himself a living sacrifice, to give his very life, his very blood, to redeem mankind from the darkness, and ignorance, and sin, in which they were steeped. He knew from the first what it would cost him, hence he said: "I have a baptism to be baptised with, and how am I straitened [unclear: till] it be accomplished." How can I, without it, embrace all humanity? My body is too small for my soul. I am "straitened" until this baptism of blood be accomplished, until the shedding of my blood shall tell to nations yet unborn that I died for all, that I died for humanity as a whole; and thus dying, my arms of love shall be infinitely stretched out, shall be seen and felt in the realm of mind and in the realm of spirit,—clasping all, embracing all, and they shall have redemption through my act. My blood shall be shed; I am willing to give it for the life of the world. Yes, that sacred body was broken that it might become the bread of life to a famished world.

Yes, he gave his flesh for the life of the world, but it was the Divine flesh, the Divine that comes alone from the Divine man within; the outward man perisheth, but the inward man is renewed day by day. But how can it be renewed if it be not fed with divine spiritual substance? You may be unconscious of the fact for a time, as you are ignorant of the process of the involuntary operation of digestion and assimilation. You have no control over the assimilating properties of food: that is God's work. The divine properties, the divine life-giving qualities are hid in the food you eat, hid away from mortal eye, and this is the "Flesh" that Christ spoke of when he said, "My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." It was the Divinity within that spoke these words, and speaks them still to every soul of man, though all may not have grown to the consciousness of it; like the babe in the mother's arms unconscious of the mother's love, all it can do at present is to feed and nestle in her bosom. While she says to her child, clasping it to that bosom: drink of me, eat of me, for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed; the mother's substance is transubstantiated into the form of nutritive milk, and thus the child lives and grows. So humanity hangs upon the material breast of God, in Nature, for all the various kinds of food for the sustenance of life, while God says, through these things, My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. And as it is in a literal sense that we feed on God in these hidden elements, contained in the food that can only support life, so in a spiritual sense our spiritual man—the inner man—feeds on divine food incarnated in the physical frame, given by the Divine Humanity that visits us in the silent hours of meditation when we hear the still small voice of the Holy Spirit speaking in words of love and sympathy.
unto us, causing the tears to flow, and joy to bound in the heart, thrilling our very nature from head to foot, making us say, like Jacob, "God is in this place, and I knew it not." It is after the visitor has left that we look back and say, oh that I had known! like the disciples; they wist not that it was the Lord. He comes in a stranger's garb at times.

Look out my brother, my sister, He is not far from thee, for when thou sittest down to thy daily meal, look at the bread, though it be but bread. It is not bread only, for, within that humble meal, the Stranger is there; for thou could'st not have a more constant visitor, all the strangeness is on thy own part, not discerning the Lord's Body—the Divine substance within that humble meal. Only once discern this glorious truth, and it shall make the most humble meal the richest repast. It shall make every meal a sacrament, in which thou shalt partake of Divine substance, and thus build up thy spiritual nature within. Thou need'st not wait for meal time; this is meal time here and now. Whilst thou readest these words, if they find a place in thy inner-self, thou mayest discern the Lord's Body, the Divine substance. Transmitted through thought and brain, into these very pages, the life-giving element inheres, and thou mayest eat and live, for "he that receiveth my sayings receiveth me, and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me."

As "Adam" was the federal head of all the physical or human race, so "Christ" is the head of all the spiritual race. "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. How be it that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth earthy; the second man is the Lord from Heaven."

Now, in order that our Lord might become a quickening spirit to our humanity, it was necessary that he should assume our nature, and in that nature be tempted in every possible way that we are, yet in that nature conquer sin, mooting sin upon the open battle-field of human passion, and thus, by constant denial of the animal and entire obedience to the Divine within him, evolve a spiritual body. That is to say, that body taken from Mary became transformed day by day, until at last it was swallowed up, or reconstructed; the old particles being taken away, and new ones put in their place.

The spiritual particles which made up the "resurrection body" were being constructed, or built up, during the earth-life of Jesus, until the final work was accomplished. When this was done, he took Peter, James, and John upon the Mount, and was transfigured before them, fulfilling his promise when be said, "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the kingdom of God." which I take to mean that in the kingdom of God we shall have a body like unto the Lord. As it is said: "Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." And in this consists the at-one-ment. In that kingdom we shall be able to materialise and dematerialise at will; as he on the Mount, as it were, dematerialised his earthly form for the time being, that his disciples might see the true Son of God, the true Messiah, the true Christ. When that was accomplished, he took back again the material elements, which remained in abeyance for the time being, and there stood before them once more the Man of Sorrows in his seamless coat, for we are told "They saw no man save Jesus only."

So we long for the time to arrive when our powers shall be such that, like Jesus, we shall be able, at will, to retire to the mount of communion, and draw the vail on one side, which shall not only introduce us to Moses and Elias, but unto all those who were near and dear to us on earth—our loved ones who are gone before. Not only so, but we shall be able to say, like Peter, "There came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased. And this voice, which came from Heaven, we heard when we were with him in the Holy Mount."

Yes, that body he had from Mary was put off day by day. The earthly house dissolved, and was clothed upon with a house from above. He could not be put to death by man; it was a voluntary act on his own part to submit or allow his enemies to crucify him. As he said, "No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again." In all this he was atoning or reconciling us to God in his own humanity. As one grand link in the chain of humanity, he was welding that humanity to his divinity, and thus he took with him from the cross a glorified humanity by the law of evolution. He had changed every particle, every molecule of that humanity until it was transformed into the new and incorruptable man—death swallowed up in victory. Here was the prayer fulfilled: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades, neither wilt Thou suffer Thine holy one to see corruption;" and that body did not see corruption, for it was a glorified body, a resurrection body.

When he cried, "It is finished" on the cross, the last pang given, the last indignity suffered from the hands, not of his Father, but from the hands of undeveloped man, from the ignorant animal man, with the patience of a lamb praying for his enemies, he established the law of non-resistance in his humanity, and thus was at-one-ment with his Father, who causeth his sun to shine upon the evil and the good, and his rain to descend upon the just and upon the unjust. God himself was in that very humanity of Christ, pulling, as it were, drawing mankind unto himself, atoning, reconciling man, displaying how much love was in his heart for mankind. Jesus brought that nature he had from Mary into one-ness with God, and thus as our representative, is a prophesy of
what all the human race shall be. For we are told he "hath made of one blood all nations of men;" and Paul says: "Feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood—all the blood of tortured humanity on gibbets, on crosses, on stakes, and in the flames of Smithfield—all this innocent blood shed for truth, for principle—this was God's precious blood, shed for future ages. This precious blood in humanity has purchased for us the liberty we enjoy to-day. It was God, in the men and women of the past, that has atoned for us to-day, and made us thus far one with God, that we are determined, God helping us, the fires in Smithfield shall be lit no more to burn humanity. We are at one to fight for truth, for liberty, for love—but not with the carnal sword, but with the two-edged sword of truth. The tears and sufferings of our forefathers make us pray for the time to come when the sword shall be beat into the ploughshare, and the spear into the pruning-hook; when man shall not lift up the sword against his fellow-man, neither shall they learn war any more.

The blood of Inkermann, Balaclava, and Alma has reconciled us to this prayer: Peace be within thy walls, O England, and prosperity be in thy palaces.

All things are being subdued unto him; now the process is going on in the mineral, vegetable, animal, and human kingdoms. All are slowly working upwards from the lowest scale of being up to the present altitude at which man has arrived; the process of reconciling all things to himself may be slow, but is is, nevertheless, certain in its fulfilment: the only perfect divine man has gone to his Father, to his God and to our God. He is the first fruits from the dead, and he stands as a representative of perfected humanity.

The spirit of Christ is in every breast, by the very same law that the properties which are in one grain of corn are in all grains of corn; and as God has given that corn to have life in itself, so has he given the son to have life in himself. So whatever there is of the Divine in you, must come from the Divine mind, and he who has most of the Divine within him, exerts the grandest and divinest ends; hence it is that the life of Jesus has been and still is the most potent lever to raise mankind from the lowest depths of misery and sin, to the highest position of virtue and of love.

Jesus was and is the survival of the fittest. We have in him a spiritual generation. "He was in the world, and the world knew him not; he came unto his own, and his own received him not. But to as many as received him, to them gave he power to become sons of God, even to as many as believed on his name, which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt amongst us (and we beheld his glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth." Yes, this was the grand departure from nature's generally-received rule—Christ the spiritual taking a body that was prepared.

The saving principle that is now atoning, reconciling all things unto himself, is in the world to-day, and may be seen extending itself not only to the redemption of man's soul, but to the redemption of his body also. Nor is this the full scope of the work, but it extends itself into every department of art and science, as is plainly seen from the advances these are making on all hands.

If you will not receive the Christ as seen in Jesus, then how will you receive him? Will you receive him in the revelations of nature? For "The heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard." And this inspiring spirit is bringing into oneness all the knowledge of the planetary worlds to a grand focus, and within the grasp of the mind of man reconciling all knowledge in this department unto himself, that man, with his godlike powers, shall count the stars, tell their names, sound their laws, and go out into the vast fields of space on exploring expeditions for ages yet unborn. The inspiration of God is manifest everywhere in humanity, gathering all unto himself in humanity. All power in heaven and on earth is given unto the Son. As it is required that fresh knowledge be imparted to the sons of men, so is that knowledge given through the Son of God, as the grand representative of the human race, to the persons most receptive of the particular branch required. Whatever science and art have done for us has been achieved by the one grand spirit of inquiry, the spirit of research, the spirit of inspiration, which is the Spirit of God in the Son, and that Son in the aggregate is humanity as a whole. As Christ was the perfect and rounded-out Son of God, so shall all humanity as a whole be perfected and rounded-out in the ages to come.

We may not see perfection in any one individual man, but go through all the varied virtues and qualities presented in man, collect them together, and place them in one individual, and we shall have a perfect man. But that which is at present spread, as it were, throughout humanity shall, by the Holy Spirit,—the spirit of redemption that is now working in the hearts of men,—ultimately perfect each individual, and thus shall the atonement be made, the reconciliation be completed. When all things are subdued unto the Son, then shall the Son also be subject unto him who put all things under him, that God may be all in all.

Yes, in all the grand improvements of man we can see redemptive work going on. It is the saving spirit in all,—in the learning of the scholar, in the researches of science, in the discovery of worlds, in suns and systems far out in space, in the book of nature, in the geological strata of the earth, in its chemical proportions, in the wonders of the deep, in the power of steam, in the printing of books, in the electric telegraph—annihilating, as
it were, time and space—in the telephone, in the microphone, in photography, taking likenesses by the sun's rays, and in all the inventions expressed in mechanics and the brandies of science too numerous to mention. Everywhere the love of God, the wisdom of God is revealed—in the flower of the field, in the tender blade of grass, in the daisy and the buttercup, in the lily and the bluebell, in forest and glen, in the lark that warbles in the sky, in the robin that perches on the window-sill—in all, in all the Spirit of God inheres, exclaiming with a silent voice to the spirit of man, "I am the Lord, and beside me there is no Saviour." In all these things the Spirit of God is expressing itself unto the spirit of man. God's Book is everywhere. Our picture-galleries are like so many books of God, in which may be seen the Spirit of God, as portrayed from the realm of mind, in words that live and thoughts that burn. Our museums, with all their various collections of curiosities, of antiquity, are also books compiled for our wonder and education, and are all the product of the Spirit of God in the individuals inspired to bring those various collections together for our redemption from the ignorance and superstition not only, of the past, but also of the present, age. And when we look at these things with an intelligent eye, can we not see that, as God was in Christ in the objective form reconciling all humanity to himself by the power of love, as exhibited in his life, and now extended in the life of others who live the Christ-life, so also, in proportion as they live that true, devoted life to truth and principle, is God manifest in the flesh now in an objective form; for there is not a grander sight on earth than to look upon a truly great, good, and virtuous man.

Our libraries are all of them various books of God, where the product of mind is seen struggling after Truth in many forms So also in the Bible we have a grand collection of spiritual heroes. Here we come to the higher form of God in humanity. Only let us realise the fact that God is, as it were, extending himself unto us in the voice of Christ—God vailed in humanity, just as God is vailed in the flower in its innocence and beauty; and throughout the whole realm of Nature is God vailed; in all and behind all. From this consideration many derive great comfort, and from Nature many worship Nature's God. But in humanity God comes near unto us, extends himself, as it were, vailed in human flesh; God finited, that we may gaze, and wonder, and adore, Here we may take hold of him by the hand, and, in that pierced hand of love see the hand of our Father and our God.

God has linked himself unto us; become one with us on purpose to raise us up to himself. And what is himself? Does not humanity belong to him? Is he not our father? Has he not made us the children, who being "par-takers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same"? Yes, the truth stands thus,—"We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones." What is there objectionable in all this? Where does flesh and bone come from if they do not come from God? Perhaps it may be said this is bringing God too low, to place ourselves on that plane of equality with him. But let me say, we do not place ourselves on that plane; it is God's work from first to last. He it was who gave us our existence; gave us these coats of skin covering over the bone, and muscle, and nerve, and artery; enshrining the spiritual man, which is the offspring of God. And if the doctrine be true that God commenced his work of creation from initial points, commenced at the lowest form—the first rung of the ladder of creation, upwards to Man,—then the order of Nature's selection has always been the true order, and the fittest to survive—the highest form—has always taken the lead; and we say man has been, and is, the highest form of created intelligence. But it was the Man Christ Jesus who took that departure from the natural order of carnal generation, and, therefore, had only a mother as to his natural or human body. But God was his Father, as we are informed; "He is made not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life," our great Melchisedec "having neither beginning of days nor end of life." Hence he said to the Jews: "Ye are from beneath, I am from above," and "he that cometh from above is above all." He could well say, "Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, the glory I had with thee before the world was."

From the bosom of the Father came that Christ. Wouldst thou know that Christ, dear reader? He is not far from thee; he is in thy heart; yea, he is the very life of thy being. Open thy soul to his reception; let him have the chief place in thy affections, and he shall prove to thee life from the dead,—joy in thy sorrow, strength in thy weakness, light in thy darkness, the star of hope in thy despair, thy pillar of cloud by day and thy pillar of fire by night, thy bright and morning star, thy son of righteousness, with healing in his wings. This Christ says: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me, and I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hands;" and a good reason why, because we are his hands, his feet.

Humanity, viewed as a whole, redeemed, saved, purified by the life-blood of Christ, the innocent lamb of God, made thug, partakers of the divine nature, our flesh becomes fresher than a child's; it is all tender and full of love—new born. But before this new birth takes place, before we are made new creatures in Christ, the pangs of being brought forth must be felt; the breaking away from old customs, old prejudices, old sins, and besetments; the breaking up of all the idols, all the false gods within. This causes much bewilderment, much confusion. Oh, the dreadful pangs of having old-cherished views and teachings torn from the soul that had grown with our growth and strengthened with our strength! I suppose, dear reader, thou feel lest like poor Laban,
who said, "Wherefore hast thou stolen my gods?" or like Mary, when she said, "They have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him!" Her affection was laid on the outward form, and therefore was she disconsolate, forgetting that he had said, "It is expedient for you that I go away, for if I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you;") and that Comforter was the Christ-spirit, which said, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Although her Lord and Master stood close by her she did not know Him; she supposed it was the gardener, and said, "If thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away." Ah, poor Mary, what couldst thou do with a dead body? Poor soul, that would not give thee lasting comfort. Nothing but a living Lord, nothing short of a living Christ, can soothe the troubled breast. "Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou?" Did he not know, did he not see the anguish of her heart? Then why delay, why not relieve all her fears at once? It was only to bring out the real sentiment of her soul: "Tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away." And so she did take him away, and in a way she never dreamt of. She took the Christ away with her in her heart. When he said to her, "Mary! Mary!" I fancy I see her start, with arms open, wide, ready to clasp him to her heart, saying, "Master! Master!" when she was suddenly, but gently repulsed. Why repulsed? Surely it was quite natural she should run and embrace his feet, with her tears. But no, she must wait, for she is to carry news, the glad news, "Go and tell my brethren, and say unto them I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God." And so she did carry the news unto the disciples, saying, "The Lord has risen, indeed." But they believed her not, and went to see for themselves. The angels said, "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen;" and so they had to learn to look within for the subjective Christ, rather than the objective form without. "Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more." It was Christ in the spirit that was now to live and reign with each one of them.

This tearing away of all outward props was severe discipline for them, but after the pangs were once endured, and the descent of the Paraclete come into their souls, they could go to prison or to death, knowing they had a better inheritance beyond the grave. The Saviour sympathised with them in all their sorrow, as he did also for the dying thief on the cross. He did not cry out, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me?" until the dying thief had confessed his sin, and said, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." When Jesus cried out, "Why hast thou forsaken me?" he then entered into that man's state and condition. The thief represented a lost world on the cross, suffering for just deserts, and bearing witness to the blamelessness of Jesus, saying, "This man hath done nothing amiss!" and having said so immediately he received inner light of the character of Christ, he cried out, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom."

It was the Christ within that bore the sin of,—not sins—but sin of the world. He entered into sympathy with humanity, as a father entereth into sympathy with his own son upon the scaffold. He cannot alter the circumstances that sin has brought us into. The suffering is a natural consequence of sin, and a necessary discipline to rid us of our sin and the love of it. The father does forgive the sin of his son, and would gladly die or suffer in his stead. It is the love in the father's heart that hurts the son more than the sight of the scaffold. He says, "Death is nothing to me—hanging is too good for me: but what hurts me most is unrequited love, love trampled on;" and the soul of the world on the cross of suffering is born again to a higher life, crying, Lord, remember me!

So we say Christ entered into that man's state, and into all other mens' states of a similar kind. It was not Christ in one individual only, but Christ in humanity; he is so related to all, that he cannot help but to feel for all. If one member suffers by the law of sympathy, which runs through humanity, all members suffer with it. He feels for all as one long chain of cause and effect. Take hold only of one end of the chain, the other end will vibrate according to the amount of oscillation whether it be great or small.

Humanity is linked to God in Christ, in one unbroken chain, all related by the very deepest love and sympathy. Does the 'Princess Alice' go down with her cargo of souls? All England feels the shock, the news is telegraphed to the ends of the world, and all the world feels the shock. So when Christ went down into the abyss of our sin, Nature, we are told, felt the shock. The sun was darkened, the dead arose, and the vail of the temple was rent in twain. Though he did no sin himself, neither was guile found in his mouth, yet by the law of sympathetic relationship he went down for all; and although he was submerged by our sins (for, mind, it was our sin that crucified him, and not God), he bore all the sin put upon him. But it was man that put it on him: he bore our sins in his own body on the tree, he took the scars with him; hence, when he arose again he shewed his hands and his feet, and said unto Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side, and be not faithless, but believing. Yes, this Christ allowed himself to be maltreated, spit upon, crowned with thorns, scourged, crucified, nailed to the cross. He was truly led as a lamb to the slaughter; and as a sheep is dumb before her shearsers, so opened he not his mouth. He trod the winewash of sorrow and suffering alone, and of the people there was none with him. As the prophet, foreseeing all this, said by the spirit of Christ: "Is it nothing, to you, all ye that pass by?" Have pity upon me, O ye my friends, "and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow." And yet amidst all his sufferings he offers no
resistance, no law of retaliation; but on the contrary, he seems lost to his own sufferings tending to the prayer of a dying thief and comforting him with a promise of accompanying him to his kingdom: "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Amidst all the deepest sufferings caused by his murderers, he exclaimed, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." If this was not God-like, tell me what is? If this was not God manifest in the flesh, what is God manifest in the flesh? His very enemies were compelled to say, "Truly this is the son of God." Peter said at one time, under control, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." Jesus replied, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee, but my father which is in heaven."

The Christ was only seen once before his crucifixion, and that was only by three persons, namely, Peter, James, and John, when on the Mount of Transfiguration. Plenty could see the Jesus of Nazareth, or the Carpenter's Son, the Son of Mary; and plenty can see in these days what they term the Gentle Nazarene or the Historical Jesus; but few, comparatively speaking, can see him as the Christ, the Son of the living God. And for this we do not blame them, for no man can receive anything except it be given him of God; and what have any of us that we have not received? God forbid that we should boast as though we had not received it; for as the Christ said, "No man can come unto me, except the Father which sent me draw him; neither can any man come unto the Father but by me. All that hath learned of the father cometh unto me, and him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out."

The time is fast approaching when the True Light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world shall be made manifest. That is, at present it may not appear that every man has this True Light: it is hidden within many by animality. Yet the stripping time is coming near when the axe must be laid to the root of the tree, and man's true spiritual condition will be revealed. It will not be then, How many seances have we attended? or, how much phenomena have we seen? but, what use have we made of them all? Are we any better spiritually? Has it made our lives more useful? Have we, as it were, done the hundred-and-one things, and yet left the One Thing Needful undone, namely, learned of the Master who was meek and lowly in heart who went about doing good, who made himself of no reputation, but being found in form of a servant, became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross?

Paul tells us our "old man" was crucified with him on the cross; he represented humanity as a whole. It was in this sense we were crucified with him. Human woe is felt everywhere by human hearts. If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it; if any indignity be done to humanity it is done against you, as you form a part of that humanity. A proof of this is easily seen when you behold a person unjustly illtreating another. Does not your very soul rise up against such treatment? all proving you are related to the injured one.

When the news came to England that Chicago was burnt down, and that one hundred thousand of our fellow creatures were turned adrift without home and without food, many provisions, and clothes, and wealth were poured in from every quarter to help in that time of need: proving our relationship and that all the world's akin. But where does all this sympathy come from, if not from a deeper sense still, namely, the inner relationship we bear one towards the other, spirit sympathising with spirit and soul with soul? The fountain of Sympathy alone comes from within, and in its objective form was seen in train-load after train-load of provisions for the hungry and clothes for the naked, all along the lines of railroad for miles round Chicago, help sent from all parts.

No man can feel his sins to be a burden, and Christ not feel for that man. Why, we ourselves cannot help but feel for any poor unfortunate fellow who has got himself into trouble and sorrow, especially if we see that the man is a true penitent. So Christ said, "Come unto me all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." God's spirit in Christ goes right through Humanity in every pore and fibre. Christ-love threads its way like great feelers, entwined into the very network of humanity. How can it be otherwise when in him alone we live, and move, and have our being? Humanity came from God, came from Christ; all things were made by him, and for him and by him do all things exist. We are his offspring, he made us and not we ourselves, and therefore we have as much of the divine, in a finite form, as we can bear, or are capable of receiving. Of his fulness have we received, and grace for grace. Behold, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not appear what we shall be. But when he shall appear, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is.

This is the at-one-ment, bringing home the sublime consciousness of our relationship to the Divine. It stands thus: "I ascend to my Father, and to your Father, to my God and to your God." Does not a realization of this fact prove that the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head? which signifies the lower nature to be under our feet, all inordinate animal passions subdued: when the spiritual seed within shall assert its pre-eminence, take its seat, and rule the whole man. This promised seed, in its subjective form, was in the hearts of the Patriarchs and Prophets of old. As Paul says: "I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that all our fathers were under the cloud, and were all baptised in the cloud and in the sea, and they all did eat of the same spiritual meat, and did all drink of the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that Rock which followed them, and that Rock was Christ."
A rock represents firmness, stability, durability. Put all the weight on it in the world, and it will bear it up. So God in Christ bears up all things. The stability of the rock represents the firmness of his life: no shifting or moving. He loved us before we had an objective form on this plane; he loves us now we are here. In all our ignorance and sin he loves us, like the mother that loves her child, although it is in the dirt and in the gutter of the streets. She does not love the dirt, but she loves the child. She washes it many a time in the day, and puts it on clean clothes, but still it goes into the dirt, tumbles in the mud, and comes in crying it may be, and again she washes it and puts on a change of clothes, and waits patiently many a long year with no abatement of love, still hoping and waiting until her children have grown into manhood and womanhood, and have learned to walk in harmony with Nature's laws.

So God in Christ is waiting in humanity for His infantile children to grow up into manhood and womanhood, but the law of growth necessitates obstacles to be overcome and difficulties to be removed. We have many a fall and stumble during growth; we may get sadly bruised with the bad conditions inherited from our progenitors, and also from our surroundings. But as the earthly parent says: "Oh, my son will come out all right by-and-bye; he will make a bright man yet." The parent waits patiently for the rough edge of his son's nature to be rounded off, and he prays for divine influence from God and his angel-guides to surround his child; and that prayer is not in vain, for all those divine aspirations fall like gentle dew upon the interior nature of his child, imperceptible to the natural eye. Yet those throbs of soul for the child's welfare fall upon the inner spirit, which makes the God-element within put forth aspiration for power to overcome.

As a rock also represents durability, so the durability of the love of God, the love of Christ, is from everlasting to everlasting. He saw us ruined in the Fall, yet loved us notwithstanding all. It is no good saying man has never fallen, for many of us, if not most of us, have fallen from the innocence of our childhood. We have each taken to ourselves our own way, if we have had to pay for taking our own way by bitter experience. But there is no doubt that all the falls will be found, in the end, a falling, as it were, upwards: learning by mistakes, doing things wrong first, and learning from that the way to do them right. Our Heavenly Father is very patient, and as it is said in the good old Book, "He waits to be gracious," that is, it shows how good and gracious he is in waiting for us to learn how to live in harmony with Nature's laws, and also to learn how to live in harmony with those divine and spiritual laws within.

We have all very much to learn, and I have no doubt that many who have denied the divinity of Christ will yet learn, and come to see that God was in Christ atoning the world unto himself.

The human form, from all knowledge yet received, both from the spirits of the departed and from whatever other source, is proved to be the highest form of created intelligence. All angels that have ever appeared to prophets or seers on earth or in the spirit-sphere, all have appeared in the human form. Now, if we admit this fact, that God inheres in everything in Nature around us, why deny the possibility, nay, the probability, of him appearing as a God-Man, or as God in Christ, as the highest form of the Divine mind on the physical plane: the embodiment of love in an external form, the form of man being the fittest vehicle through which God could manifest the love of his heart, that it might flow through the mind and soul of a real human being like unto ourselves. For how can we have any idea of sound without ears? How can we have any idea of colour without eyes to see? How can we have any idea of the scent of a rose without the sense of smell? Or how is it possible to feel the firm earth beneath our feet without the sense of touch? Or how could we discern different flavours without the sense of taste? All these external organs are exactly in accordance with the inner organs of the spiritual man within us. Hearing, seeing, smelling, tasting, touching, are all senses interwoven in our physical frame by the finer texture of the real spiritual man that stands inside. If that spiritual man wishes to express himself in acts of kindness and love on this physical plane, then he guides the feet on errands of mercy. He leads the hand to raise the fallen, he goes about doing good, and wherever there is a work of commiseration or benevolence, there the spiritual within him leads this external organism to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and do good to all, irrespective of their faith, belief, or creed. These are questions never asked by the spiritual man within; but the question uppermost is, Do you want me? Can I do you any good? If so, I am your servant. So our blessed Lord made himself of no repute, but took upon him the form of a servant, and being formed after the fashion of a man, humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. He said, "I come not to be ministered unto, but to minister unto others," and was it not truly so? It is said Jesus, knowing that his father had given all things into his hands, and that he had come from God, and went to God: knowing all this, conscious of the power the Father had vested him with, yet he rose from the supper, and laid aside his garments, and took a towel and girded himself. After that he poured water into a basin, and began to wash the disciples' feet and wipe them with the towel wherewith he was girded. This was not the first time he laid aside his garments, for before he took upon himself our earthly nature he had to lay aside the glory he had with the Father before the world was. As Paul says, "Ye know the grace or love of our Lord Jesus Christ, who was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich."

God is very practical in all his works, both in Nature and in grace. You say there is no use in theorising.
Practice practice! Jesus knew Peter would deny him; he knew he would curse, and swear he never knew him. He also knew that they would all forsake him. But this did not prevent him setting them a practical example by taking the lowest place, and becoming servant to them all. And is not this like God in Nature? Is not God in Nature our servant? Everywhere he is working for us. He sends his rain to refresh the earth, and his sun to shine to give light and warmth, beautifying the whole face of Nature. Everything in heaven above and in earth beneath is our servant, all working, ministering to our comfort and our good.

How can I know the love of God if not embodied in some external form on this external plane where man is found? I know his love is written on every blade of grass, which says, to the cattle grazing there in the pastures clothed in green, 'I am your servant and your life.' The water that rolls along in the stream says to the fish in sportive play, 'I am your servant and your life.' The ocean's mighty waves bearing on her breast the freight of immortal souls says unto man, 'I am your servant.' God our Father by his spirit inhere in all inorganic forms with mute voices speaking only to the inner soul of man. Nature is dumb, and speaks not with an audible voice to the outward ear. The inner soul may listen to her silent speech, and interpret from that inner soul what Nature doth reveal. Man has to be the mouthpiece for her, as God becomes the mouthpiece for man in the incarnate son of God, revealing by word of mouth to man what was in the Father's heart. How else could we know of love Divine but in this practical form? If you would know of love, then let that love be put in the very best condition for its display. The grandeur and glory of love could only be seen and fully displayed by its very reverse, and where could there be a grander display of that love than God manifest in the flesh? Coming in contact with darkness to give us light; coming in contact with death in us to give us life; coming in contact with ignorance to give us wisdom; coming in contact with impurity to give us purity: like light that gives light, which benefits the darkest and filthiest scenes of earth, yet itself is uncontaminated. So his spirit is now going about from heart to heart in the form of spiritual manifestations,—God manifest in the flesh,—and through the lips of trance mediums is here and now manifesting himself upon that plane of life where man most needs him. God is continually commending his love towards us in different ways to meet every grade of experience in man. What is the trance mediumship of the present day but "God manifest in the flesh"—the incarnation of the spirits of the departed, who, coming back, for the time being are the manifestation of God in the flesh of the medium. These high and noble self-sacrificing spirits who constantly come, and with the gentleness and patience of angels listen to all our hard questions, doubts, and superstitions, answering them with a meekness and love which bespeaks the origin from which they come: it is through them God speaks with man as man would speak to his friend.

And yet, strange to say, this grand and inestimable blessing is looked upon as being from the devil, and those who embrace these truths and propagate the same are stigmatised with having dealings with Diabolus himself, and therefore are not fit to live. But we can afford to wait as God waits, saying: we know in whom we have believed, and are ready, God helping us, to die for those truths so dear to our souls, for we know in every act of kindness and love done by us or by anyone else that it is God's love extending itself through the human heart and human hand, and we also know that if a person be persecuted, burnt in the flames, put to death for the truth's sake, that it is God put to death in that very form. It is God in the individual or order of things that bleeds and dies. When any individual is executed for truth, for principle, it is not the individual they wish so much to exterminate, but the God whom that individual represents.

We know that Deity in his eternal essence cannot die, but it was the God element in the martyrs that laid down the outward life for the love of truth. Truth must be established in this earth, and love must triumph, but it can only do so through death, for it is the very enmity in man as a dark background that shows up the super abounding love of God in non-resistance on the cross.

It is the truth he enunciates they wish to destroy, and therefore would destroy the very God of those truths so dear to him. But when the body of the martyr is burned to a black cinder, the soul stands erect and radiant, calmly looking over the black and parched remains, triumphing in the consciousness of eternal life beyond the power of sword or flame.

So with the dear Saviour, the same principle which crucified him would, if it could, have followed him beyond the grave' and have exterminated him altogether. But, thank God, he lives—he lives who once was dead; he lives, my everlasting Head. As Paul says, "He is head over all things in his Church, which is his body—the fullness of him that filleth all in all." Every blow lifted against his followers is lifted against him, as head and members go together. When Saul of Tarsus was on his way to Damascus with letters of authority to take all to prison who were believers in Jesus, he breathing out threatening and slaughter, Jesus met him on the way. So he tells us, the spirit-light, brighter than the sun at noonday, overshadowed him, and the spirit-voice came to him, saying, "Saul! Saul! Why persecutest thou me?" And Saul said, "Who art thou, Lord?" And the Lord said, "I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." The sufferings of Christ's followers are felt by Christ himself, by the same law that the mother feels for her daughter in the flames, or the father feels for his son who is about to be executed.
God alone knows the pangs in the father's heart. The father lives in the son by the potency he has transmitted to his off-spring; so God lives in all by the potency of the life principle imparted to his offspring, and injury done to those who believe in Jesus he takes as done unto himself. An earthly parent who sees the child being ill-treated in the streets will run between the two, and say, "If you want to fight, then fight me, but let my child alone." So Christ stands as sentinel between sin and the holy seed within; the incorruptible seed, which liveth and abideth for ever; our life hid with Christ in God, where sin can never find nor hurt it. He says of those who love him, "He that toucheth you toucheth the apple of my eye. Take care that you do not injure one of these little ones that believe in me, for it were better for that man that a mill-stone were tied round his neck, and that he were cast into the middle of the sea than he should wilfully injure one of the little ones that believe in my name." So must all persons find who wilfully persecute and try to put down God's work, in whatever shape or form that work may be, for in fighting against that work of truth they are fighting against God, against law, and as the car of progress goes on, if persecutors do not get out of the way, they will most certainly be ground to powder by this car of truth.

All who are now fighting against this spiritualism at the present day are aiming all their shafts against the God of the Spiritualists—God once more manifest in the flesh through mediumship; God expressing himself through writing mediums, clairvoyant mediums, physical mediums, prophetic mediums, inspirational mediums, trance mediums; by spirit-hands, spirit-faces, spirit-forms. Perhaps you say, Much of this is perverted. Granted; we believe all that, but that does not alter the fact of spirit-communion. God has opened the gates, and as he has opened, no man can shut. Jesus says, "I am he that liveth and was dead; and behold I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of Hades and of death: I open, and no man can shut; I shut, and no man can open." If spirits make bad use of this gate being opened, and if mankind make a bad use of this gate being opened, that is their fault, and not God's. God opens the gate that we may make the best use of these means both for ourselves and the spirit-friends who may communicate with us.

In everything God is doing the very best for each individual that can be done: atoning, reconciling us to himself as he did in the days of old in the case of the three Hebrew children. God was manifest there in the flesh when they answered the king who wished them to bow down to his god. They said, "We are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so that our God, whom we serve, is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee that we will not serve thy gods, neither will we worship the golden image which thou hast set up." And so these Hebrew children were delivered out of the furnace without a hair of their heads being singed, or the smell of fire being found upon them. And why? Because there was One with them of whom it is said, "The form of the fourth was like unto the Son of God." Have this Son of God with you, my brother Spiritualists, and you shall go through floods and flames without the smell of the orthodox fire to be found upon you.

Let me give another example of God being manifest in the flesh, and that was as God was seen in the martyr Stephen. When under his inspirational address he said to the Jews: "Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which have showed before of the coming of the Just One: of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers; who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it. When they heard these things they were cut to the heart, and they gnashed on him with their teeth. But he being full of the Holy Ghost, looked up steadfastly into heaven and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God. Then they cried out with a loud voice and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city and stoned him: and the witnesses laid down their clothes at a young man's feet whose name was Saul. And they stoned Stephen, calling upon God and saying, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.' And he kneeled down and cried with a loud voice, 'Lord, lay not this sin to their charge.' And when he said this he fell asleep." Was not this God-like? Was not this "God manifest in the flesh?" This was God in Stephen, atoning, reconciling them to God, trying to bring them to love him by this example of love, the same law that Jesus carried out on the cross: "Father, forgive them." No sooner did Stephen tell them what he saw by clairvoyance than they set on him with one accord, and stoned him to death, because the spirit-world was open to him, and he told the truth of what he saw. So there are plenty nowadays who would, if they dared, exterminate both Spiritualism and Spiritualists from the land.

Now, if a man reject the teachings of Christ, if he reject those holy precepts which he has laid down, and shut out the light wilfully, then he shuts himself out from the only thing that can redeem him and save him; as in those teachings are the very elements of the Saviour himself. If a man receive those words of Christ as the very words of God, which they are; if he receive them in his very soul, then he receives in the words Christ himself, just as a man who writes a book imparts to that book a part of himself. He gives you his thoughts, thoughts that come from his very soul, magnetised with his life-elements. While you read you can feel there is life in the very words that make your soul all of a glow as you peruse the pages: the man lives in his book. So Christ lived in the prophets; they thought about him, lived for him, preached for him, prophesied of him, wrote about him, suffered and died for him. So through the four gospels you will find the matchless beauty of the
Saviour's character, both in word and deed. The more you read of him the more you love and admire, and your love becomes more intense towards him. Though he did not write the literal gospels himself, yet he wrote those gospels on the men's hearts, who wrote them in their lives, and they, as writing mediums, transferred them to pen and parchment: and though the gospels may have been mutilated and passed through much trouble and sorrow in many translations, yet thank God that after all the blood that has been shed and the fires that have burned, the opposing powers have not been able to deprive us of one of the greatest and noblest mediumistic books the world has ever produced. Thanks to our God and his Christ for it; thanks to the legion of angels whom Jesus said he could command. No doubt angels, friends, apostles, prophets, and martyrs have had a hand in pre-serving the Book of God. Yes, there is life in the Book, and how else could it be? for it talks more of angels' visits than any other book of ancient times.

Thank God we are having other books published at this present day which are also Books of God. All books that contain spiritual truths are Books of God. It is true, in those books that are published, there are many things that seem to militate against the mediums of the present day, as there are also things in the Bible that seem to militate against both the writers and the book itself. But are we therefore on that account to say we are better without the book? Where is there a Spiritualist in the world who would wish to destroy all our spiritualistic literature because we have had mixed up with it the faults and failings of some of our mediums? In the Bible we have the faults of the mediums of the past penned down to show us they were men of like passions with ourselves, that we might not be discouraged. We have also the good qualities of others written down that we may be inspired to emulate them in every good word and work. And so also with all the researches of science and art. As far as they go to ennoble and raise man and lead him unto the admiration and love of God in all his work—in so far as they do this they also are Books of God, atoning, reconciling, bringing man unto God, bringing him at-one-ment. In every instance, in the Bible and in all things around us, to the spiritual discerning eye we can see that man is the unreconciled, and not God. All through the Bible it is God inviting, suiting, entreating man to come to the at-one-ment, to be reconciled. God is going out after man, and man running away from God. In all the printing of religious books, in all the preaching in-doors and out-of-doors, although it is mixed with much error, yet is God going after the sinner saying, "Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?" Yet God is patient, waiting, watching for the prodigal world to come home.

And now is come in these last times, or later times, the sign or the Son of Man in the heavens; not the Son of Man himself, but the sign of his coming. He shall come with ten thousand of his saints and all his holy myriads with him. The sign is come first: the angel friends are here,—they are here now right amongst us, and the religious world rejects this coming. When the Son of Man comes, shall he find faith on the earth? Faith in what?—faith in his coming. Think me not fanatical, dear reader, if, in the fulness of my soul, I exclaim: "Bless his name, Amen. Come, Lord Jesus, and come quickly." Can you not discern the signs of the times? The fields are white for harvest, the Master hath sent his angels to gather out of his kingdom all tilings that offend. and the controls of trance mediums are about to take a higher tone. They are taking out of the kingdom those offensive doctrines that have hindered the progress of the Gospel of Peace.

In every possible way is our glorious Christ atoning, reconciling man unto himself. Is not God appearing on earth amongst us again by the spirit of the departed? Is he not rolling away the stone from the mouth of the sepulchre, yet Humanity and the Church reject the act? Well did he say, "Publicans and harlots shall go into the kingdom of God before you"—that is, those who are looked upon as publicans and harlots—the very lowest, as the Spiritualists are looked upon by the Church,—these very outsiders, who go to no church, own no creed, enter into this very kingdom, while the churches are thrust out. But they thrust themselves out; the churches are saying, Where is the sign of his coming?—like the Jews of old, while he stood and preached in their very streets, and they know him not, because he did not come and set up a temporal kingdom. The churches of the present day are making the same mistake, for they are expecting him to come and establish a kingdom on the earth for them, and send the rest of mankind to hell.

The atoning blood of Christ was not to pacify an angry God, but to pacify angry man; it was not to satisfy the justice of God, but to satisfy man's injustice. Yes, his blood was shed to satisfy us that God loved us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us; that by that very death of suffering on the cross he tried to find a way to our heart, to prove in every possible way that he had nothing against us but everything for us: arms of love open wide ready to receive us and not impute even our trespasses against us, not one rebuke. Only—Come Home, is the message of all the dear angel-bands that are now overshadowing the earth. There is nothing in heaven above or on earth beneath to prevent us from coming home to our Father's House, our Father's Arms, only sin. Immediately you say, "I will arise,"—nay, before you have done that, while you are yet a great way off, he sends out his angel-messengers, inviting you to the feast; and if invitation be not sufficient, he has authorised his angels to go out into the highways and hedges and compel them to come in, "that My House may be filled." Come Home! Come Home! Weary Soul, Come Home!
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Pictures we have Seen of "the Unknown God."

By A Pharisee.

"THE PHARISEES THEY FOLLOW THE CONDUCT OF REASON."

Josephus Antiquities of the Jews.—Book XVIII., Chap. I.

---

We read that a Roman Governor asked "What is Truth?" but we do not read that he was answered. A very, very large majority of our race accept as truth, and without question, whatever they have been taught by their parents and teachers, and whatever passes fashionably current as truth in the time in which they live. But above this social surface of uniformity frequently appears a few erratic spirits, blessed, or as you may take it, cursed with an enquiring disposition, and who are constantly prying and repeating the question of Pilate "What is truth?"

History informs us that in one age the people embraced and were industriously indoctrinated with one set of views, which their descendents in a succeeding age cast aside and repudiated; so it is a matter of much doubt whether mankind will ever possess absolute truth. Pope wrote of happiness, "Man never is, but always to be, blessed," and of truth we may say, truth never is, but always to be, found. But whether found or not, there is no pursuit which furnishes the mind with so healthful, agreeable, and satisfactory exercise as the pursuit of truth. The man who boasts he has found the infallible truth is either a bigot or a braggart, most probably both; the earnest enquirer is neither, but merely a modest searcher, in whose mind truth is deified, and who, as he casts aside one after another the errors which have been woven into his mind, and the yet indistinct lines of his Deity begin to appear, can with perfect appropriateness repeat the words "Nearer my God to thee."

The most painful experiences of the inquiring mind are the unclosing of the wraps with which it has been enveloped—the unlearning what it has learnt. The process is to some extent disintegration. Long-seated error is like a cancer; it has many far-reaching fibrous roots closely interwoven with all there is in us of mind and feeling, and the rooting of it out cannot be done without much laceration and pain. But when rooted out, what a relief; what a nightmare has been broken, what a cloud dispersed, and the peace and quiet that follows—no perplexing questionings, no anxious doubts, no maddening terrors, but peace of mind from the consciousness of having been loyal to truth, and of having earnestly strained to approach it.

The man who abandons a life of crime or dissipation is justly regarded as a man morally and socially reformed, and the man who has seen his way to cast aside errors of opinion and belief must also stand in the same honourable and reformed position. Enquirers after truth are the world's reformers, those who follow them are the reformed, and those who cling to error are the unreformed.

When a man discards a long cherished error be generally does it with feeling—with a very distinct aversion, as if it were some poisonous reptile he had carried in his bosom and had only just discovered the fact. This avowed and initiating hostility is likely to remain with him for years, but time, the great softner of the asperities of life, at length brings quiet, and he is able to handle and study with a gratified, and even amused curiosity, the anatomy of the reptile he spurned from him—to him it no longer lives.

It is in such a frame of mind that I essay to glance at some of the pictures that have been sketched, and ideas that have been held and that are still held of God. Of God itself I shall not presume to speak. That is a subject far beyond my capacity, and of any other man's. But a little of what men have conceived of God, and believed of God, and written of God I shall allude to and remark upon; and in illustration, the Bible and other writings, wherein a knowledge of what God is, is professed to be given, will supply the pictures.

Ideas of God have very much expanded since Genesis was written; indeed very much since some of us went to school. Almost all intelligent theists now believe that God pervades all matter and all space, and they carefully refrain from naming any locality as His special place of abode. This thestic idea is vast, and the small, simple and homely notions given of God in the first books of the Bible contrast strongly and even humourously with it. You cannot impose on any person who views this subject rationally by attempting to invest the ludicrous with solemnity, and if now the contemplation of some of these ancient pictures amuse, and fail to strike with awe, the change is due to the superior enlightenment of the age in which we live.

The ideas presented to us in these old pictures of God are nearly characteristics of humanity, and of a very plain kind of humanity too—I had written they are destitute of divinity, but what is divinity? They represent God as a kind of master man, who sometimes took care of men as if they were his property; sometimes felt
pleased with them and promised them great things? sometimes was displeased with them and punished them; visited them, ate and drank with them; had His pet children whom He loved and favoured, and His step children whom He hated and tried to destroy. Altogether, the sketches are in many respects but the pictures of a boss man in a rude age, and the simplicity of the descriptions is often amusing.

Holbein, in one of his Bible cuts, represents the making of Eve. Adam is lying down and God stooping over him and lifting Eve out of Adam's side, while beasts, birds, reptiles, and even fish, crowd round to witness the operation. God is represented as an aged man, with a long beard, wearing a robe, a mantle, and kind of clerical crown. Holbein was no freethinking caricaturist, but no doubt a pious artist sketching what was considered a solemn subject, and believed then to be a literal fact; but now the description in Genesis of how woman was made we are to understand figuratively. Just so. How convenient! After Adam and Eve eat the forbidden fruit they heard God walking in the garden in the cool of the day. Just think of the God who made the universe walking in a garden. Just think of the God who made the sun waiting till the afternoon before He took His walk, because the sun He had made made it too hot a midday for outdoor exercise. Think, and then ask your-selves the question, is not this a man the writer is sketching? Then we read of God calling to Adam, learning the offence committed, cursing the serpent, cursing the ground, and afterwards softening a little, "Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of skins and clothed them." Then we find the relation that God had sons who inter-married with the daughters of men, just as a squire's son will sometimes marry the daughter of a tenant. We read "the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they choose . . . . . .There were giants in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men and they bare children to them, the same became mighty men, which were of old, men of renown." The idea that superior and famous men were begotten by the gods, is thus we see a very old one, and the assumption that Jesus was so begot is not an originality.

God is afterwards sketched as a disappointed man, thus:"And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved Him to the heart, and He said I will destroy man," —. These are but the feelings and language of a man—a man fretting over and disappointed at his own work. Immediately thereafter he is sketched as a naval architect instructing Noah how to build the ark; giving him the length, breadth, height, number of stories, and also the measurements of the window and door of the structure, just as the contractor for a large ship would give instructions to his foreman in the laying out of the work. The close familiarity represented as subsisting between God and man in these olden times is so human that it is often pleasing to read, even though we cannot read it without smiling. God was the influential friend of the family, and when he called he was a very welcome guest. We read Genesis chapter 18 "And the Lord appeared unto him (Abraham) on the plains of Mamre; and He sat in the tent door in the heat of the day, and He lift up His eyes and looked and, lo, three men stood by him; and when He saw them, He ran to meet them from the tent door, and bowed himself toward the ground, and said, 'My Lord, if now I have found favour in Thy sight, pass not away, I pray thee from thy servant. Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree; and I will fetch a morsel of bread and comfort ye your hearts; after that ye shall pass on; for therefore are ye come to your servant.' And they said, 'So do as thou hast said.' And Abraham hastened into the tent to Sarah and said, 'Make ready quickly three measures of fine meal, knead it, and make cakes upon the hearth.' And Abraham ran into the herd and fetched a calf, tender and good, and gave it unto a young man, and he hasted to dress it. And he took butter and milk and the calf which he had dressed, and set it before them; and he stood by them under the tree and they did eat. And they said unto him, 'Where is Sarah, thy wife?' And he said, 'Behold, in the tent.' And he said, 'I will certainly return unto thee according to the time of life; and, lo, Sarah thy wife shall have a son. And Sarah heard it, in the tent door which was behind Him." Passing over the irregularity of the writer in representing the Lord sometimes as one and sometimes as three, there is much fidelity to human nature in this sketch. Abraham humbly obsequious says, "My Lord if now I have found favour in thy sight, pass not away," and with kind and delicate attention he fetches the Lord water to wash his feet. And his hospitality is large; he speaks only of a morsel of bread, but he orders three measures of fine meal to be made into cakes, kills a calf, which, when dressed, he with butter and milk places before his guest under the tree and waits upon Him while he eats. The Lord with courtly condescension enquires of Abraham for his wife, who, having been baking the cakes and getting up the repast, is not presentable. The Lord telling Abraham that he should return and Sarah should have a son seems rather out of the way, yet an announcement that would flatter the old man. Sarah listening and hearing the whole conversation is so womanlike and her sceptical laughter at the idea of her bearing a son after she was ninety years of age was quite excusable. This tale shows the very neighbourly terms on which God is represented their to have lived with men; reveals also another leading characteristic of the God of that age—namely, the interest he took in childless wives, and there are several other instances recorded in which He took pity on such and blessed them with children. This is one grand healthy feeling which crops out frequently in these writings—the ardent desire for children—the strong belief in the blessings of population. Children were not then regarded as incumbrances either to the family or
the State. Almost a reverse feeling has been growing in society since Malthus published his fears. I think the old feeling the more natural, and the new philosophy a deformed production of the artificial life we live.

This God of Genesis was also like man in having partialities. He had his favourites as most men have, but he did not show a high moral taste in His selection. In Jacob particularly there is hardly a good point, yet Paul writes he was chosen by God before his birth. David was bad enough. He had a habit of falling in love with other men's wives, and getting the men put out of the way that he might possess their wives; but he slew Goliath, was a good soldier, and a fair musician; whereas Jacob was a weak, fraudulent, cowardly scoundrel, and, after the wrestling match we read he had with God, a limping one. This wrestling match some would interpret in a figurative or spiritual sense, but it is plainly enough physical wrestling. Here is the passage, Genesis 38 and 24, "And Jacob was left alone, and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day. And when God saw that he prevailed not against him, He touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh, and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint as he wrestled with Him. And God said, 'Let me go, for the day breaketh.' And Jacob said, 'I will not let thee go except thou bless me.' And God said, 'What is thy name?' And he said Jacob. And God said, 'Thy name shall be no more called Jacob but Israel, for as a Prince hast thou power with God and with men thou hast prevailed.'" And verse 32, "Therefore the children of Israel eat not of the sinews which shrank .... because God touched the hollow of Jacob's thigh in the sinew that shrank." This last verse confirms the literalness of the wrestling. In the quotations I have put proper nouns where there are pronouns in the text, to make the sense more clear. It seems Jacob was getting the best in the encounter until his antagonist touched his thigh and put it out of joint. I confess I do not see the point here, but guess that this proceeding on the part of Jacob's opponent was not fair in wrestling. Then God asks to be let go, because the day breaketh. Now the story takes a spiritual aspect. It is generally understood that ghosts and other spirits cannot put in an appearance in sunlight. The ghost in Hamlet "faded on the crowing of the cock." and I think that generally there is no well authenticated story of a spirit having been seen by daylight. But to return to the wrestling story, it shows that the writer had no conception of God as being more than human when he represented him as engaged in wrestling, and what a blunder the writer makes in representing God as beaten in the match.

The story in Exodus of how God acted with Pharaoh, if it is not a burlesque, depicts God as a very unreasonable sort of person. Pharaoh is repeatedly punished with plagues to compel him to consent to let the Israelites go, he repeatedly consents and God as repeatedly hardens Pharaoh's heart and causes him to withdraw his consent, and this farce is gone through over and over again, till Pharaoh and his host are drowned in the Red Sea. Pharaoh is held up throughout this prolonged drama as a very wicked person for refusing to let the people go, the writer at the same time stating that God hardened Pharaoh's heart that he should not let the people go. How any writer could write, or translator pass over, such moral incongruities seems astonishing. Throughout this business Moses is represented on very intimate terms with God. When God first appears to him from the burning bush, Moses is not alarmed, but says, "I will now turn aside and see this great sight why the bush is not burnt." He did not prostrate himself, nor was he overwhelmed with awe; indeed God had to caution him, "Draw not nigh hither, put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground." Then God makes a great many promises of what he will do for the Israelites. How prolific in promises and in threats, in blessings and in cursings these writers represent God to have been, but how very deficient in performance. The Israelites may have routed a few tribes, but what nations did they ever conquer? What territory did they ever conquer? Were they not several times thoroughly conquered and made slaves of? As a nation have they not long been extinct? Only existing as a race. What a fulfilment of promises!

Moses and Aaron go to Pharaoh and demand that he should let the Israelites go three days journey into the desert to sacrifice to God Pharaoh thought they had been too leniently dealt with seeing they were asking holidays, and ordered that their tasks should be made heavier; and then the people grumbled against Moses for having made their condition worse than it had been. Then we read, "And Moses returned unto the Lord, and said, 'Lord, wherefore hast thou so evil entreated this people? Why is it that thou hast sent me . . . . . . For since I came to Pharaoh to speak in thy name he hath done evil to this people, neither hast thou delivered thy people at all.'" This is plain indignant talk, such as one man would address to another by whom he had been humbugged; but with our modern ideas of God it would be impiety to address God in that manner.

At Sinai, the holy mount as it is called, the pictures of God become invested with very imposing terrors. There are thunders and lightnings, and earthquakes, and smoke, and fire, and a thick cloud, and the voice of a trumpet sounding long and waxing louder and louder. This is the record of the first trumpet, and we are promised a last one. No one is to go "up into the mount or touch the border of it. . . . Whosoever toucheth the mount shall surely be put to death. . . . Let not the priests break through to come up unto the Lord lest he break through upon them." "Lest he break through upon them!!" God is here likened to a wild and dangerous animal. The old and pleasing relations of intimacy between God and man are now rubbed out. God is no longer the friend of the family with whom they ate, and drank, and talked, and argued, and wrestled, but some terrible thing enveloped in cloud, and smoke, and fire, and speaking long and loud with a trumpet.
It is after the drowning of Pharoah and his host that we first hear God called a man of war. Moses, in his song of triumph, sings, "The Lord is a man of war, the Lord is His name." From that time we read that the Israelites engaged in wars of extermination at the command of God, but these horrible pictures I do not intend here to exhibit.

Associated with nearly all religions is the idea that God requires a house to dwell in. Men have always pictured God like themselves, and when they so far advanced as to construct houses and experience the comfort of houses, it dawned on them that it was their duty to provide God with the comforts of a dwelling also; and hence we find that ponderous and costly temples, mosques, cathedrals, churches, synagogues, —, have been erected for His accommodation. It was in the wilderness we read the Israelites made their first essay in this direction. First, they enclosed an oblong space, 150 feet by 75 feet, with linen curtains about eight feet high. Towards one end of this enclosure was another enclosure 45 feet by 15 feet and 15 feet high. The two sides and one end of this were of boards, and the front or entrance was curtained. This enclosure was covered in with cloth, and divided into two with a screen, and in the inner apartment was kept what was called the ark, a wooden gilded box about the size of an emigrants chest. This box contained the two slabs of stone on which were written the Ten Commandments, Aaron's Rod, and a pot of Manna. It is not clear whether God dwelt inside this box, or rested over it, but it seems to have been a settled belief that God resided about the box somewhere. From the description given, the whole arrangement seems to have been very portable, and as easily moved about as the properties of a circus. We read in 1st Samuel that the Philistines had an engagement with the Israelites; the Israelites had lost 4,000 men and were getting the worst of it, when the elders bethought them to carry the ark out into the camp, and when it reached the camp all Isreal shouted, and the Philistines heard the shouting and were afraid, and said, "God is come into the camp," but they plucked up courage and smote of the Israelites thirty thousand footmen, and took the ark of God and carried it away and placed it in the house of Dagon their god, and by the side of Dagon; but in the morning Dagon was found fallen down and broken to pieces. The men of Ashdod, where this is stated to have occurred, were smitten with disease, so they carried the ark to Gath, the men of Gath, also smitten, removed it to Ekron, and they were also smitten. Then the Philistines yoked two milk cows into a new cart and carted the pestential box back to the Israelites with a lot of golden presents. The Levites took charge of both, and placed the ark on a great stone, but some of the men of that place—Bethshemish—looked into the ark of the Lord, and he smote of the people fifty thousand and three score and ten men. This was for being of an enquiring turn of mind. The dangerous box was then put into the house of Abinadob where it remained for twenty years, when David took to move it on another new cart, this one drawn by oxen. The oxen, or the roughness of the road shook it, and a man named Uzza, very considerably to prevent it from being upset, "put forth his hand to the ark of the Lord and took hold of it, and the anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzza, and God smote him there for his error, and there he died by the ark of God. . . . And David was displeased, because the Lord had made a breach upon Uzza." "Made a breach upon Uzza!" The same idea as was expressed when prohibiting the people from crowding upon Mount Sinai, "lest he break through upon them," representing God as a caged or restrained dangerous monster. In consequence of Uzza having been killed "David was afraid of the Lord that day" and would not remove the ark unto him in the City of David, but carried it aside into the house of Obed-edom the Gittite." The ark brought a blessing to the house of Obed-edom, and when David heard of that he brought the box to his own city. We read that shortly after this David had rest from all his enemies, and dwelling comfortably in a a house of cedar he thought the Lord should be better lodged than in a tent. He had formed the intention of building a house or temple for the Lord. But the Lord, by Nathan a prophet, sends him the following message, "Shalt thou build me a house to dwell in. . . . I a word. . . . saying, why build ye not me a house of cedar?" This is an exceedingly simple and amusing communication, and the writer who gave it as a communication from God must have had a very humble idea of God. It in effect says, since I left Egypt, though I have only lived in a tent, have I ever grumbled about the accommodation. The result was that David was not to build a house for God, but his son was.

When Soloman built this house, and it was finished, the ark was carried into the holy place, and when the priests had returned from it, a cloud filled the house of the Lord, and Soloman said, "The Lord said he would dwell in the thick darkness." Did Soloman mean that the subject of God is one thoroughly shrouded and obscure? He goes on to say, "I have surely built thee a house to dwell in, a settled place for thee to abide in for ever." Here his expressions become childish, but further on his intellect rising above puerile notions he writes these remarkable words, "And will God indeed dwell on the earth? Behold the heaven and heaven of heavens cannot contain thee, how much less this house that I have builded." The book of Job contains some grander notions of God than are commonly found in the Bible; and the grandest of these is where the writer confesses how little can be known of God. "Canst thou by searching find out God, canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection. It is high as heaven what canst thou do, deeper than
hell what canst thou know." This is a lofty rebuke to all who pretend to know or even conjecture God's nature and attributes.

Isaiah, who is sometimes poetical, represents God as of a tender and pitying disposition, and as engaged in an humble occupation. "He shall feed his flock like a shepherd, He shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in His bosom, and gently lead those that are with young." With Evangelical Christians in our day this passage is a favourite, while the exterminating mandates issued by the God of the book of Joshua are kept in the shade. It is pleasant to note that it is so, and it is an evidence of progress. But in the next verse Isaiah describes God as an immense giant. "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of His hand, and meted the heaven out with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance." A few verses further on, "It is He that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in." This is what is called poetry. The imagery is extravagant enough, but some of the feats ascribed to God have been done by the scientists of our day. They have not only weighed the mountains, but they have weighed the earth itself. They have weighed also the other planets, and they have weighed the sun, and, what is more, they have placed before the world the comparative weights.

There is a description of the person of God in the book of Revelations, which, though more impious than any other, I cannot omit. St. John, as he is called, reports that he saw in a vision, "One like unto the Son of man, clothed in a garment down to the foot, and girt about the hips with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow, and His eyes were as a flame of fire, and his feet like unto fine brass as if they burned in a furnace, and His voice as the sound of many waters. And He had in His right hand seven stars, and out of His mouth went a two-edged sword, and His countenance was as the sun shining in his strength." Whatever instruction might have been in the long ago extracted from such a vision or dream I know not, but were I to dream such I should conclude I had been lying on my back and had nightmare, and would immediately turn on my side and seek refreshing sleep.

God is always spoken of in the Bible as of the male sex, and excepting in the patriarchal times He is generally represented as exciting terror. The heathen nations, as they are called, had occasionally female gods such as Diana, who were held in great favour by the male sex; and may not the strength of the Roman Catholic Church be somewhat due to the deified position Mary, called the Virgin, occupies in that Church. A picture of a beautiful Madona, with an innocent babe in her arms, is much more likely to draw and fix the attention and sympathies of men, and of women also, than the picture of a stern-looking, white-haired king sitting on a throne. The Madona is the Roman Catholic picture, the King the Presbyterian one. No doubt the Madona is the more attractive. Byron writes of one of his characters:—

"That even when he prayed,  
He turned from grisly saints and martyrs hairy,  
To the sweet portraits of the Virgin Mary."

The current Christian idea of God is that it is a spirit which manages and directs all the infinity of details in the universe. The uninformed Christians believe that God personally superintends everything as a foreman does the operations in a workshop, and makes such alterations in the manipulation and progress of events, as he finds desirable. And full of this idea, these simple people keep constantly crying and praying to God to alter His treatment of human affairs, and adopt another treatment which they press upon Him. Nor is this all, they believe that God does frequently alter His plans and adopt theirs at their solicitation. If there were not such a belief there would be no plausability in prayer. We read "Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find; for every one that asketh receiveth, and every one that seeketh findeth." It is believed that God knows every one's individual affairs and what each stands in need of; but it is also held, that He must be asked to supply these needs, when, if he sees fit, they are supplied. We have all read of the poor family without a morsel of bread for breakfast—the one pious boy in the family who knelt and prayed for bread—the well-to-do neighbour sitting down to a good breakfast being struck with the thought that the poor people over the way might not have a bit of bread, her sending her little girl over with a loaf in her apron, and knocking at the poor people's door, delivering the loaf just as the pious boy rises from his knees. We are asked to believe in this story first, that God personally heard the pious boy's prayer, and next, that God put it into the head of the good neighbour to send the loaf.

There would be good common sense in praying if prayers were so answered, but they are not so answered, every one knows that; and if you complain that your prayers are not granted, you are told you may not have prayed properly, that God in His inscrutable wisdom has seen fit to reject your petition, or that you should, besides praying, have used some practical means to obtain the object. This last relieves God from all
responsibility in human affairs, and intimates that man is his own providence. In cases of pent up grief, piety, joy, anger, or other emotions, no doubt prayer may be a great relief; just as a good fit of crying is to some women, and an outburst of swearing to some men, but otherwise it is of no practical value whatever. Voltaire has the following remarks on prayer:—"The designs of God exist from all eternity. If the object prayed for be conformable to His immutable will it must be perfectly useless to request of Him the very thing which He has determined to do. If He is prayed for the reverse of what He has determined to do, He is prayed to be weak, fickle, and inconstant; such a prayer implies that this is thought to be His character and is nothing better than ridicule or mocking of Him. You either request of Him what is just and right, in which case He ought to do it, and it will actually be done, without any solicitation, which in fact shows distrust of His rectitude; or what you ask is unjust and then you insult Him. You are either worthy or unworthy of the favour you implore; if worthy, He knows it better than you do yourself, if unworthy you commit an additional crime by requesting that which you do not merit." These are grand ideas of God compared with which the ideas commonly held are mean and despicable. And these are the ideas and works of Voltaire, on whose name and character ignorant Sunday School teachers, and also ignorant budding local preachers, have been in the habit of throwing dirt, and thinking with a gratified conscience that they have thus been doing God a service.

There is one little word of six letters in association with which are grouped several of the prevailing ideas of God. That word is s-p-a-r-e-d—spared. Persons congratulating themselves with being still in life say, "We are still spared." Persons purposing to do something on a future day add, "If we are spared." Persons recovering from an illness say, "We have been spared," and those escaped with life from some disaster in which others have been drowned or killed, say also with the same pious unction, and the same thorough selfishness, "We have been spared." The leading idea which underlies this expression is that God is a destroyer. That destruction is what we have most reason to expect from Him, and that we desire that fate. Those who have so far escaped, or been treated leniently by this ruthless destroyer, conclude they are His especial favourites, and that He has without any reason whatever taken quite a fancy to them. In Watt's hymns we find the following:—

"Not more than others I deserve,  
But God hath given me more,  
For I have food while others starve,  
Or beg from door to door."  

And again:—

"Lord I ascribe it to Thy grace,  
And not to chance, as others do,  
That I was born of Christian race,  
And not a heathen, nor a Jew."  

These productions are called, "Songs divine and moral for the use of children." Every one has read of Elisha cursing in the name of the Lord the children who cried after him, "Bald head," and how the Lord sent two she-bears out of the wood who tore to pieces forty-two of the children. Of course the story is a fable, but Watt's must immortalise it with his ready verse, thus:—

"God quickly stopped their wicked breath,  
And sent two raging bears,  
Who tore them limb from limb to death,  
With blood and groans and tears.  
Great God how terrible art Thou.—"

These songs may be "divine," for we have seen that the character of the Divine is very uncertain, but they are not "moral," and whoever recommends them "for the use of children" is utterly unworthy to be entrusted with the care of children. Yet these songs are useful in the illustration of this subject, conveying as they do in plain language the ideas now commonly held upon God, the Devil, Heaven, Hell, and kindred subjects.

There is another idea of God as the manager of the affairs of universal nature, which has lately been gaining ground and is now accepted by many intelligent professing Christians. The idea is that God does not manage by personal superintendence and inspection, but by means of law or laws. That He has fixed upon the nature of
things certain inflexible and immutable conditions or laws, and upon these conditions or laws the whole details of life and motion operate, and that He has committed and left the universe to the operation of these laws and virtually abdicated. For all practical purposes this idea of God is simply Atheism. When we come thoroughly to believe that God does not personally manage the world we cease to regard Him personally. We cease to fear Him, love Him, importune Him with prayers, or flatter Him with praises. He is removed, set back into the thick darkness, the court of mystery. We now feel the necessity of consulting the laws and obeying the laws. Life becomes a matter of patientful care and practical work. Laws will neither be moved with prayers nor flattered into partiality with praise; they are cold, pitiless and insensible. You may be young, pure, beautiful, intelligent and good, and yet by the unintentional violation of some law you are swept away. The violation may not even have been yours, but that of some progenitor, generations before you. Nature's laws or God's laws in nature—the meanings are the same—have no partiality, no mercy, no forgiveness. It is an old idea, no doubt it is in Watt's songs, that God keeps a book in which all breaches of His laws are recorded against the culprit. Nature also keeps a faithful record, never winks at any offence, never rubs out a crime. If you want inflexible, impartial, unvarying justice Nature administers it. If you break a law of health, a law of morals, a law of good taste, the punishment is just as certain as the offence. There is no escaping it, no whitewashing, no absolution, no substitution, no cleansing in the blood of the Lamb. The offence has been committed and retribution will most inevitably follow.

But it does not follow because there is no forgiveness there is no hope; because the past cannot be called back and purged from error, the future cannot be bright and pure; because we cannot undo the evil we have done, we cannot henceforth do the good. Such a doctrine would drive humanity to despair. Vitality in nature is eternal, so also is hope. "While there is life there is hope." They are a pair, the one supports the other. The misused opportunities of the past are for ever gone, and we suffer for their misuse, but we are not shut out from using the opportunities now and to come. And though in "turning a new leaf," and making the best of a remnant of life, the harvest may not be large, it is much better than adding to an already long calendar of error and sorrow. This is one grand point in Christianity, no one is regarded as too debased but that he may be lifted, or too far gone but that he may be cured. Still though it is of the utmost importance to preach hope to the erring when they shall cease to err, we must keep before the minds of all the rettributive character of the laws of nature.

We have heard much of the fear of God, the fear of hell, the fear of the policeman and the civil law as incentives to good life, but the fear of Nature's laws is by far the most thorough and wholesome check against erring. These laws look down upon us, and into us, with a thousand eyes; note every thought, word, disposition and action, and reward or punish accordingly. This idea thoroughly grounded in the mind is the grand, "Thou God seest me," attends us closely in every walk in life; is with us when we rise from bed in the morning until we return to it in the evening; and we feel that the thousand conditions on which happiness depends exist within us and surround us, and that the business of life is carefully to study these, and intelligently navigate our way.

Some thinkers who accept the supremacy of law in the universe as a solution of the principle which governs things, profess to discover in the administration the qualities of a loving father towards our race. This quality I have failed to discover. If we consider God as the author of the laws of Nature then certainly we must admit that generatively He is our father, but there is no evidence that He has shown any regard or affection for man over the rest of the universe animate or inanimate. The conditions of existence are just as favourable to one animal as to another—as favourable to animals which prey upon man as to those which contribute to his comfort. Man has the instinct of self-preservation, and all experience proves that that is his only providence. What is this instinct, but that force with which every animal, every plant, every atom, and every globule is endowed; and under the influence of which, each struggles to repel what is hostile and assimilate what is friendly to existence. Man obeys the same instinct; if he is stronger than the existences he has to contend with, he lives and flourishes, if weaker he succumbs and dies.

Some who have adopted the law idea of God may commiserate those who can only entertain the purely personal one, yet they may be, and no doubt many are, very happy in their superstitions. The inoculation and growth of a new branch of thought amongst the people is generally slow. Thought in many respects resembles water. Sometimes it is as a running stream hurrying on to the wide ocean, at others it lingers serenely in a quiet bay, at others again it settles into a stagnant pool, and once or again in an age or a century it moves like a tidal wave and sweeps all obstructions before it. It is a matter very little of our determining which of these conditions of thought has us in possession; whether like the serene surface of the sheltered bay we merely reflect the landscape by day and the stars by night; whether like the green scum on the stagnant pool we merely vegetate; whether like the moving river we press onward to the boundless ocean of truth, or like the tidal wave produce devastation and radical change. In any case we are but the creatures of the circumstances upon which our lives have been cast, our own individualities being also circumstances amongst the others. It is something to be even a circumstance, and it is surely better to be a circumstance of the river kind of thought than to be a circumstance.
of the stagnant pool, and is better even to be a drop of that moving river than merely a chip or a straw carried along with it. It is only honesty that those whose thoughts belong to the living moving stream should no longer linger about the margins of the stagnant pools, but paddle out into the current. The man or woman, who by the habit of attending church, or by any other act, makes a profession of believing what he or she does not believe, is a professional lie; and, alas! it is too true that in this boasted day of freedom many an excellent and intelligent man, over-burdened with caution and timidity, feels that he cannot without sacrifice and pecuniary martyrdom profess what he believes. Our churches and chapels, by intolerance in many forms, offer a handsome worldly premium for insincere profession—a reward for belying conscientious convictions—a bribe for lying.

Many speculations and opinions may be entertained of God. It may be held that an intelligent power controls matter, or that matter possesses intelligence of itself; or it may be held, that the universe does not exhibit intelligence. It may be held that harmony exists in nature, and that such proves that a one paramount force governs all, or it may be held that there is a constant conflict between forces, and that the government of the universe is not a despotic unity, but a representative government determined by the balance of power. It may be held that God is a kind and sympathetic father, or that He is as unimpressible as the silent stars and as destitute of feeling as an iceberg. And if a man holds any of these views, who is the man who should hinder him from expressing it. If a man has a thought and that thought has taken shape, form, and the dress of language, one of the sweetest privileges of life is the liberty to express it, and express it without moral or social prejudice. The liberty to publish our thoughts is the protector and guardian of every other liberty. Thought is a mental growth which should be allowed to grow—throw out its leaves and unfold its blossoms in its own manner. If we only possessed fairness and charity enough the many varieties of speculative thought would add to the charm and interest of mixing in the speculative world, just as a walk through a garden of many coloured and many perfumed flowers is more pleasing than to pass through a field of plants of one flower.

The point of supreme interest of every man and woman is the life he or she lives. If we would be happy we must not trifle with but attend strictly to the conditions of health. If we would be happy we must fulfil our family and social duties with considerate attention and cheerful and affectionate kindness. If we would be happy we must preserve an unblemished reputation for honesty, industry and civility, and in short must harmonise our conduct with those ideas of moral rectitude and enlightened beneficence our minds have deified. Beliefs are not now esteemed of so much importance as they were in past times. It is confessed that creeds do not exercise that influence on conduct it was once thought they did. Many men are now good in spite of their creeds—contrary to the logical inferences from their creeds. The men are better than their creeds. May it continue so and improve.

"For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right."
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"Jesus Who is Called Christ."

I ENTER upon this subject, not with hesitation, but with some amount of tenderness; I do not desire to cause pain, yet I fear I shall. No doubt Jesus caused pain when he condemned some of his day as "vipers" and "hypocrites;" and, though I shall not give way to any such personalities, yet, I shall feel it my duty to pronounce as sweeping condemnations of the popular ideas held of Jesus. I know what ideas of Jesus are; I have held them, I have cherished them; he was once the subject of my daily thoughts, and even of my dreams; but he is
Nathan, another son of David, and in which, with David the first name, and Jesus the last, there are forty-three
line of descent. The writer of Matthew gives the descent through Solomon, David's son; in which, with David
Jesus from David, was considered a very important matter; two of the gospel writers with apparent care give the
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My devotion is towards the subject, not the idol; I crave it as my right, and it is also my ambition, to stand
face to face with the truth, the reality, the fact. I do not want to do business through any agency, interpreter or
medium, but direct with principals. I want to enjoy the benefits of the sun's light; but not from those weak,
scanty rays of his reflected by the moon; No! I want them full, pure, and straight from the great luminary itself.
Idols are barriers in the path; stumbling blocks over which intellect falls and breaks its knees: they give no
light, but eclipse much. It is our duty to take them from their sacred pedestals, remove them from where they
stand between us and the light, and place them carefully in the grey quiet of the historical museum, where
future generations may study and be warned by them from the follies of their ancestors. I purpose here to take
the idol "Jesus" from its pedestal. This idol is one which to the European race looms large, and obscures much;
but, when removed from its sacred stand and taken to pieces, you will be surprised to find how very little there
is of it.

"Jesus who is called Christ." These words are from the gospel of Matthew. How very cautious and
non-assertive the writer is: he does not say Jesus is Christ, but only, that he "is called" Christ; writers and
preachers now, are much more positive. Although voluminous lives of Jesus have been written, yet all the
information in the Apocryphal gospels is so marvellous, and even ludicrous, that to introduce it would hinder the serious consideration of the subject; and the small paragraph in the 13th Chap, 18th Book Josephus Antiquities is so plainly a clumsy interpolation, that the credence once given to it has been withdrawn. We are therefore limited to the four gospels for information on the subject; the fact that no other books upon the life of Jesus have been canonized or authorised, points clearly that we need not leave these books for any others.

The name Jesus, among the Jews, was a common one; but it is very uncertain whether there ever was the
person of that name, even regarded merely as a man, whose actions and sayings are reported in the gospels. The circumstantial information of him in the gospels is very scanty, and very contradictory; and the Jews, from whose royal seed we read he came, the people whom he called his "own," to whom he was specially sent, and came specially to save, have from the first, and consistently throughout, unto this day, rejected him either as a prophet or messiah. Here we have a standing denial,—a denial by a whole race,—a denial by the race of which Jesus is said to have been a member, and who therefore ought to have understood him best, and appreciated him most,—an unflinching denial, not beaten down by long continued persecution,—a persistent denial throughout eighteen centuries, and now as decided as ever. With such a, not loud, but firm, continuous and far-reaching No! before us, we might well dismiss the subject, as unworthy of further investigation. The great fact we have pointed out, would long ago have proved sufficient to destroy any credulity but a religious one. Christians may well be solicitous for the conversion of the Jews, and spend their hundreds of thousands to bribe them to change their faith.

"What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he?" And they say unto him, "The son of David" The descent of Jesus from David, was considered a very important matter; two of the gospel writers with apparent care give the line of descent. The writer of Matthew gives the descent through Solomon, David's son; in which, with David the first, and Jesus the last name, there are twenty-eight persons. The writer of Luke gives the descent through Nathan, another son of David, and in which, with David the first name, and Jesus the last, there are forty-three
persons; that is, fifteen persons, fifteen generations more than in Matthew. Fifteen generations of, say, thirty years each, make 450 years, and consequently, the Jesus of Luke must have been born 450 years later than the Jesus of Matthew, and could not be the same person. Were any one to attempt to establish his claim to a quarter-acre allotment of land, on the evidence of two such genealogies, he would be laughed out of court; yet we are gravely and pathetically told, that "the salvation of our never-dying souls" hangs upon the testimony of writers who make such a mess of a mere professed matter-of-fact line of pedigree; and the most surprising matter is, that after ten years spent in revising these books, those pedigrees are left as they were before. But after all, neither of these genealogies prove Jesus the son of David, for the simple reason, that in the same writings, it is alleged that Joseph was not his father.

What sort of a man was David, that it was esteemed an honour to be descended from him? I shall not drag you over his life, but merely take you to his deathbed. Here he charges Solomon, his son and successor, with regard to Joab, the faithful captain of his host, and says, "Let not his hoar head go down to the grave in peace." Afterwards he says also to Solomon: "And behold thou hast with thee, Shimei, the son of Gera . . . which cursed me with a grievous curse in the day when I went to Mahanaim; but he came down to me at Jordan, and I swear to him by the Lord, I will not put thee to the death with the sword; now therefore hold him not guiltless, . . . but his hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood. So David slept with his fathers, and was buried." We have heard much of the awful death-beds of infidels, and of their awful last words, but never can we have a more awful death-bed, nor more awful last words than these: "His hoar head bring thou down to the grave with blood." The last injunction of a savage heathen could not be more unforgiving, more bloody; and this is the dying, the last injunction, of the "divine psalmist," "the sweet singer of Israel," "the man according to God's own heart," the royal progenitor of Jesus.

The immaculate conception, as it is called, or to speak more correctly, the miraculous conception, is a pagan idea, a myth, a fable; it came from India, there is no truth in it; the whole experience of mankind and all medical science is against it: if Jesus was, and Mary was his mother, and Joseph was not his father, then another man was. Mary may have told the story we read, but if she did, it must have been under some aberration of intellect, or to conceal her faithlessness to Joseph; and we may be certain, she was no more believed by her neighbours then, than any woman would be, who under the same circumstances, would invent a similar story now.

When Jesus was born, wise men came from the east to see the baby, and a star guided them on their way "till it came and stood over where the young child was." While on their way, these wise men, though guided by the star, foolishly call on Herod the king, at Jerusalem, and ask him, "Where is he that is born King of the Jews?" Herod pricks his ears, scents a rival, and inwardly resolving to cut the rival's throat, asks the wise men to search carefully, and when they have found the child, to bring him word, that he also may go and worship it. The wise men would have fallen into Herod's trap, but are warned by God in a dream; and having seen the child, return to their own country another way. Joseph, also warned in a dream, flies with his wife and child into Egypt, and Herod, balked in his intentions, is so enraged, that he slaughters all the male children in the village, from two years old and under. By this story, the birth of Jesus causes the slaughter of a whole village-full of infants. Why were their parents not warned as Joseph was? or why was not the heart of Herod turned aside from his bloody intention? But do not affict your minds, it never happened; neither Herod nor any other Roman deputy ever perpetrated such a butchery; it is a Hindoo legend altered. In Jacollint's "Bible in India," Chrishna and his virgin mother fly in like manner from the reigning king, who pursues with bloody purpose. As to the star and the wise men, what nonsense! the Dog-star for instance, taken from his sphere in the heavens and sent before these old fools, like a boy with a lantern to shew them the dwelling of a lying-in woman; men about the bed of a woman in that condition could not be wise men, any doctor or nurse now-a-days, would soon pack them off; the husband, on such occasions, is scarcely tolerated. Wise men indeed! why it was their stupidity, according to the account, which caused the slaughter of all the male children of the village.

The family affections exercise an important function in binding society; Moses issued the injunction, "Honour thy father and thy mother." In the rudest society filial feeling is strong, and also the fraternal; the attachment is frequently undemonstrative, but it is firm and steady, and of the character of social duty. Jesus, in his own life, treated the family affections with neglect, and in his teaching, set them altogether aside. When a boy of twelve, his parents took him to Jerusalem on the occasion of a religious festival, and, when a day's journey on their way back, they missed him, and returning to Jerusalem, they, after three days search, found him in the temple talking with the doctors. His mother, evidently annoyed, said, "Son, why hast thou thus dealt with us behold thy father and I sought thee sorrowing!" Did he say he was sorry for having given them pain and trouble? Not he. He replies, "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be in my father's house? They did not reply to his double question, but I do. First, his parents sought him because of parental affection; and second, they "wist" not that he must be in his father's house—the temple, or they would not have searched three days for him; and, I add, that had he had a proper sense of duty to his parents, and any tenderness for their
feelings, he would have asked and obtained leave to remain behind, before he did so. He cannot be allowed to escape from the duties of a son by assuming that he was God. If men are neglectful of social duties, and consequently, bad members of society, when they are also Gods, then the fewer men we have that are Gods the better. Jesus returns with his parents, and "was subject unto them." This remark, coming so shortly after the reproof his mother gave him, seems to indicate an amendment in conduct; but after he had entered public life, he speaks even more irreverently to his mother. On the occasion of his alleged changing water into wine, and before he performed the feat, his mother remarked to him, "They have no wine." and he replies, "Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come." On another occasion while addressing an audience, he is told that his mother and brethren are standing outside, wishing to speak to him; he neither passes out to speak to them, nor asks the crowd to allow them to pass in to where he was; but stretches forth his hand towards his discipless, and says, "Behold my mother and my brethren." It is plain then, that he had quite cut himself adrift from family sympathies and family duties, and, what is more, he demanded that those who followed him should do the same. To one who determines to follow him he refuses the permission to go first and bury his father, and to another he refuses leave to go and bid farewell to those at his house. In Matthew, when sending out his disciples, he says, "He that loveth father or mother, . . . son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me;" and in Luke, he says, "If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father and mother, and wife and children and brethren and sisters, ... he cannot be my disciple."

On one occasion, while on the cross, he does exhibit filial feeling. His mother and a disciple are standing by, and he says to his mother, "Behold thy sou," and to the disciple, "Behold thy mother," and the disciple took her to his own home. This is as it should be, and creditable alike to Jesus and the disciple. To Jesus for thinking of his mother's necessities when he was in great suffering, and to the disciple for his prompt and practical attention to the hint. But wait, we will consider; from Jesus thus directing the attention of the disciple to his mother, and that disciple taking her at once to his home, we must infer that she was in needy, if not destitute circumstances; but have we any reason to believe that? The family consisted of, Joseph the father, Mary the mother, Jesus the eldest son, four other sons and some daughters; Joseph and Jesus (his son,) were carpenters, what occupations the other four sons followed is not stated. We are not informed that Joseph had died, or that his other four sons had died, or that any calamity had befallen the family, whereby it was broken up and the mother left destitute and homeless; so we are quite without a reason for believing that the disciple took her to his home, and, consequently, the rest of the incident must also fall to the ground.

Jesus was a disciple and pupil of John the Baptist; John baptized him; and, when Jesus began to preach, he took the same subject as the Baptist: "Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." John uses the epithet: "offspring of vipers," Jesus, "generation of vipers." John says, "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." Jesus repeats the same words. John says, "He that hath two coats let him impart to him that hath none, and he that hath food let him do likewise." Jesus says, "If any man would go to law with thee and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also;" this is John's precept repeated and spoiled. John was an abstemious man, Jesus was not,—John fasted, Jesus feasted; John was hardy and ascetic, dispensing with the society of women; Jesus was soft, and waited on by women. John was resolute, and reproved Herod; Jesus was irresolute, and incapable of such boldness. John, we read, was imprisoned and afterwards, without trial, beheaded; not for any crime, but for expressing an opinion upon Herod's marriage. If Jesus had had affection for his old master, and the spirit of a public man, he would then have expressed to the people his indignation at the tyranny of Herod. Here was a worthy theme for invective and denunciation; much higher game than the Scribes and Pharisees; but he had no desire to improve the opportunity. When the disciples of John, after having buried his body, come and tell Jesus what has been their master's fate, Jesus "withdraws from thence in a boat to a desert place apart," evidently bent upon his own safety; and, not throughout his whole ministry, as it is called, does he utter one word against this deed of Herod's.

That Jesus was not abstemious like John, listen to his own words: "John the Baptist is come, eating no bread nor drinking wine, and ye say, 'He hath a devil:' the Son of Man is come eating and drinking, and ye say, 'Behold a gluttonous man and a wine-bibbler.'" We read also that he attended a feast Levi made when called to be a disciple, that he dined with a Pharisee, attended a marriage feast and made a fresh supply of wine for the guests when the original stock "gave out." That he was "soft" the following will prove: "There was at the table, reclining in Jesus's bosom, one of his disciples whom Jesus loved" He asks Peter, until Peter is annoyed, this one question: "Simon, son of John, Lovest thou me?" He preferred Mary, who "sat at his feet and heard his word," to her sister, Martha, who bustled about, cooked for him and served him. When dining with a Pharisee, he allowed a woman to wet his feet with her tears, wipe them with her hair, kiss them and anoint them; his host, the Pharisee, felt scandalized, and Jesus addresses him thus: "I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet, but she hath wetted my feet with her tears and wiped them with her hair; thou gavest me no kiss, but she, since the time I came in, hath not ceased to kiss my feet; my head with oil thou didst not anoint, but she hath anointed my feet with ointment."
Jesus was evasive and irresolute; he does not meet his questioners with direct replies, but quibbles, to baffle them; and the compilers of these veracious writings always report him the victor in these word squabbles. After his driving the money-changers out of the temple, as reported, the chief priests, scribes and elders come to him and civilly ask: "By what authority doest thou these things, and who is he that gave thee this authority?" (Were any carpenter in our day to enter a stock exchange, or even a church bazaar, and act as he had done, he would not have such consideration shown him, but would soon be in the lock-up.) He replies, "I also will ask you a question: The baptism of John, was it from heaven or from men?" And they reasoned with themselves: "If we shall say from heaven, he will say, 'Why did ye not believe him?' but if we shall say, from men, all the people will stone us, for they be persuaded that John was a prophet; and they answered that they knew not whence it was; and Jesus said unto them: "Neither tell I you by what authority I do these things."

Another time he is asked, "Is it lawful for us to give tribute to Caesar or not?" But he perceived their craftiness, and said unto them, "Shew me a penny; whose image and superscription hath it? (as if he did not know.) And they said, "Caesar's." And he said unto them, "Then render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." The Jews were then a conquered people, and the question actually was: Ought they to pay tribute to their conquerors? but Jesus evades the question. When before the elders and chief priests, they say to him: "If thou art the Christ, tell us." He replies: "If I tell you ye will not believe." He is again asked: "Art thou the son of God?" and replies: "Ye say that I am!" Pilate asks him: "Art thou the King of the Jews?" He replies: "Thou sayest!" He is also sometimes sullen, giving no answer when questioned; when accused before Pilate, "he answered nothing;" when before Herod, "Herod was exceedingly glad, for he was of a long time desirous to see him, . . . and he questioned him in many words, but he answered him nothing."

The most cursory reader of the gospels, if not an implicit believer, must observe the strong bias with which the writers write in favour of Jesus, and against anyone who differs from him: they who question him, are represented as doing so with "craftiness," or "tempting him," or "laying in wait to catch him." They receive no credit for honesty of purpose, and they are represented as so completely floored with his replies, that "they durst not any more ask him any question," and the multitude are described as "amazed," and "astonished" with his utterances. The writers of the gospels are the most glaring ex parte writers met with.

The most resolute of the acts of Jesus we read of, was clearing the money changers out of the temple, and that requires verification. When he expected to be arrested, he contemplated resistance, and told his disciples to buy swords; they reply they have two, which he says is enough. At the arrest, Peter valourously draws one of the swords and cuts an ear from the servant of the high priest, Jesus orders him to put up his sword, and reproves him for using it; and thus ends the resistance. Jesus also shewed resolution in attacking the Pharisees, and vigour in denouncing them. I am always nauseated with those sickly, painful faces artists give of Jesus, and would like to see a representation of him standing with animated countenance and uplifted arm, like a world's reformer, and as we may suppose he stood when he thundered out: "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites." I suppose such a picture has never been done; it might not be orthodox; but the bold out-spokenness attributed to Jesus in the case of the Scribes and Pharisees is so unlike his usual character we must enquire into it.

Much of the feud between Jesus and the Pharisees was upon cleanliness. We read that "The Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands diligently, eat not, . . . and when they come from the market, except they wash themselves, they eat not; and many other things there be which they have received to hold: washings of cups and pots and brazen vessels." To us, these cleanly habits of the Pharisees seem quite proper, but the disciples of Jesus did not wash their hands before they sat down to eat, and the Pharisees found fault with them for this dirty habit. And they did quite right, particularly when we remember that some of the disciples were fishermen; for everyone knows that fish are such slimy, scaly things, that after handling them, as fishermen must, one wants a good deal of washing. But Jesus rages against the Pharisees, says they cleanse the outside of their crockery while "the inward part is full of extortion and excess;" and utters many other charges, abusive remarks and ominous woes, but gives not a solitary instance of fact in proof. Here is the testimony of Josephus regarding the Pharisees: "They live meanly and despise delicacies in diet, and they follow the conduct of Reason; and what that prescribes as good for them they do; and they think they ought earnestly to strive to observe Reason's dictates for practice. They also pay respect to such as are in years." And again in the same paragraph: "The cities gave great attestations to them on account of their entire virtuous conduct, both in the actions of their lives and their discourses." With this most unexceptional testimony of Josephus to the moral character of the Pharisees, and the testimony of the writer of Mark to their cleanly habits, we may consider their reputation completely cleared from the imputations which have so long rested on it.

The Pharisees followed the conduct of Reason and did not believe in Jesus, that was their double offence, and why he hurled his invectives at them. Was this the beginning of the enmity between Reason and the Church? Is this the earliest tradition of that feud between Rationalism and Christianity? which has been handed down to us with such awful fidelity through all the mutations in society and manners in these long nineteen
Jesus had no fortitude. He could not endure hunger patiently, and quailed at the approach of death. One morning, returning from Bethany to Jerusalem hungry, he made for a fig tree he saw, in the hope of getting a few figs, but the tree was only in leaf, as the fig season was not in. He did not know that, though every boy about did, and was so disappointed and enraged at not getting any figs, that he cursed the tree, and, the writer of Matthew adds, "immediately the fig tree withered away." Of course we do not believe that, but the rest is quite possible with an absent-minded and petulant person. We are told that Jesus was born for the long pre-meditated and express purpose of dying to save us. A benevolent-minded person, if convinced that by his death he would deliver millions from misery, would be elated at the approach of death, and meet it cheerfully. Many a patriot, many a martyr, who for the deliverance of his fellows from some wrong has lived a harassed and persecuted life, has also at the end met a violent death firmly, cheerfully, and even glorying that he suffered in his noble cause. Not so Jesus. The anticipation crushes him from the first. Before he performs his first miracle it weighs on him, and he remarks, "Mine hour is not yet come." On several occasions he alarms his disciples, telling them, "The son of man shall be delivered up." Later, he says, "The hour cometh." Then, "The hour is come." And on the night preceding his execution he is most abjectly prostrated and broken down; prays three times to avoid the fate; and, although the account says there was "an angel from heaven strengthening him," he sweat terribly, and it was the winter season, when they had to make fires; and, to close this painful picture of absence of manly fortitude, next day as he dies he utters the awful and God-accusing cry : "My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" Neither the death-bed injunctions of David nor the death-cry of Jesus are enviable. Lying Christians may cease to waste their talents fabricating infidel death-beds. They can never surpass these two death-scenes, the one for unforgiving malignity, and the other for soul-harrowing despair. If God forsook Jesus at his death, what guarantee has the believer that He will remain by him. The writer of John does not record this death-cry against Jesus, but merely says, "He bowed his head and gave up the ghost." This is more in accordance with human observation, and the version we would rather believe. The testimony of physicians, nurses and mothers is, that agony and violent expression in the hour of death is of very rare occurrence. The patient usually fades from life like a dying candle, like the last feeble beats of a clock run down, like the wearied passing into sleep. Jesus did hot die on his bed, certainly, but neither do they who die from wounds, on the battle field, and they do not cry out at the last with a "loud voice." It is not the violence, but the stillness of death that appals our ignorance. The fear of death is the last enemy to be destroyed. It sears the heart into selfishness, terrifies the intellect with goblins, and the sooner everyone who means well to the race begins to destroy this fear and foster manly courage and cheerful resignation the better for the race.

Jesus was not popular like John the Baptist. We read that when John came preaching there "went out to him all Jerusalem and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan, and they were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." We read that "Herod feared John" and also that "when he (Herod) would have put him to death he feared the multitude." When Jesus questioned the priests, scribes and elders regarding the baptism of John, they say, If we shall say his baptism was from man "All the people will stone us, for they be persuaded that John was a prophet." How different was the case when the priests and elders resolved to put down Jesus. When under arrest, Pilate would gladly have released him, but the people cried out: "Not this man, but Barabbas," and Barabbas was a robber. Pilate persisted for his release, but the multitude "cried out exceedingly, saying, 'Let him be crucified.'" Pilate washed his hands before the people to clear himself of any participation in the death; and the people said, "His blood be on us and on our children." How is this? How is it that in these writings it is represented that Jesus, who is alleged to have cured multitudes of sick, lame, blind, palsied, leprous, and possessed of devils, fed the people four and five thousand at a time, and called the dead back to life; how is it I ask, that the same people are furious for his blood, will not listen to the suggestion of the governor to release the prisoner, are not touched by the governor's most significant, public act of washing his hands, but cry out: "His blood be on us and and on our children," and John the Baptist, who cured no diseases, fed no thousands, raised none from the dead, is so popular with the people that the scribes are afraid to express an opinion on his baptism, and Herod is afraid to kill him? These relations and representations are too self-contradictory to deserve any belief.

About the alleged resurrection of Jesus little need be said. We have read of criminals who have suffered the extreme penalty of the law having been resuscitated by their friends and lived afterwards for years. The story of the resurrection of Jesus may have such a foundation, but it is not within the whole range of human experience that ever a dead person was brought to life. There have been many cases in which the functions of life have been restored to activity in persons who have been apparently dead, but the fact that these functions were so restored is proof that the persons were not dead. If Jesus was dead when laid in the tomb, he never rose.

We read that Jesus "went about doing good" How? By miracle. But there is no miracle. It is a sound scientific fact that there can be none. The universe is one unbroken connection or web, of cause and effect, in which there is not an unoccupied point or crevice where such a foriegn, unnatural, and purely imaginary thing
as a miracle could be placed. Health is such an invaluable blessing, and disease such a blighting curse, that, if Jesus possessed the power of healing as written, and could communicate the same power to others, or instruct them how to acquire it, he is deeply culpable for having left the world without inoculating mankind with, or instructing them in this healing power. Common humanity is better disposed than that: every year thousands of our cleverest young men, and now young women also, enter our colleges and commence the study and practice of the art of healing, and give their whole lives to the laborious task. Every year we have hospitals built and extended for the lodgment, comfort and cure of the sick, blind, dumb, maimed and insane; and here we read in the New Testament, there was a man, who by a word or touch, or touch of his clothing, cured multitudes of every description of disease and insanity. He dies, and this immense boon to diseased and suffering humanity he conceals, does not leave it with any depositary, does not contribute one idea, one fact, one prescription towards the noble art of healing, and we are left to toil along in the tedious, but it appears, only course of study, erection of hospitals, and the application of nursing and the best remedies we can discover towards the cure or alleviation of sickness.

If anyone had possessed the power of healing as we read of Jesus having had, and could have made the power or art common property, and died without doing so, there is no epithet strong enough in language to apply to him; but Jesus never had such power, the cures ascribed to him are merely traditional legends the editors of the gospels have incorporated for the sake of embellishment and effect. It is the same with the feeding of the five thousand and the four thousand. If Jesus had left us this power of feeding thousands with a few loaves, how many thousand times since he is said to have so fed the hungry, could it have been applied; but he had no such secret to leave, and the only course for us is to impose assessments, erect poor-houses and hospitals, and in emergency cases collect subscriptions. The "doing good" by miracle is beyond our imitation, and therefore the alleged example of Jesus in this matter is of no practical use to us, nor is it instructive. There would be no merit in doing good by supernatural power, the merit would belong to the supernatural power. A good man with the power of doing good by miracle would require no urging. It would be impossible to restrain him. Take from the life of Jesus the cures he performed by miracle, and the hungry he fed by miracle, and what good acts of his are left. We do not read that he ever gave alms to the poor, that he ever housed and fed them, that he ever helped to pull an ox or an ass out of a slough, that he ever rescued a person from drowning, that he ever helped to extinguish a fire. "Went about doing good" indeed. Let us have some instances not miraculous; these are shut out of court. We know that Cook, Franklin, Livingstone and others spent their lives in the cause of exploration and have done good. We know that Faraday and others spent their lives in scientific investigation and have done good. We know that those who have so far perfected the steam-engine, and applied it to manufacturing and carrying purposes, have done good. We know that those who have studied the human body and the art of healing, walked the hospitals, and waited amidst infectious disease by the bedsides of the sick and the dying have done good. We know many a life-boat's crew has faced without fear the dangers of a boiling surf, rescued the drowning from many an ill-fated vessel, and done good. We know that our firemen have, often and again, rushed through smoke and flames, saved helpless women and children from a horrible death, and done good. We know that the Victoria Cross decorates the breast of many a hero, who, at imminent peril to his own life, has carried oft' his wounded fellow soldier from a bloody field, and done good. And we know there is a society called "The London Humane Society," which has issued thousands of medals to men, and even to dogs, who have gallantly, and at the risk of their own lives, saved the lives of others. And let me ask you, in a whisper, What did Jesus do? Alas! for this idolised ideal: what there is of it human is not superior, and that of it which is superhuman we cannot believe and cannot imitate.

We have seen that Jesus contemned family relationships, yet, with an inconsistency, not strange, but common in these gospels, he is represented as fond of the society of women, they are often with him, and he is also represented as fond of children. Yet he does not marry. It would surely have been more in keeping with social usage, and kept down scandal, had he done so, and been waited on by his own wife rather than by strange women. No one need be shocked at the idea of Jesus marrying. If he was, he was only a man, and to marry is a man's duty. He often refers to himself as the bridegroom, which is very near to marrying. But the point with which I am more concerned is, that though he said that the man who "hateth not his own children cannot be my disciple," yet he is represented as fond of children, and said, so we read: "Suffer little children to come unto me . . . and he took them up in his arms and blessed them." If we understand Jesus to be the Church, this fondness for children is explained. Children are the stay, the hope of the Church. If the Church has them for the first fourteen years of their lives, it is certain of nineteen of every twenty of them as men and women afterwards. That is why the Church is so wroth with state education and secular education. It would still manipulate the growth of ideas, and keep society clinging to its skirts as the only guide, "the light of the world—the good shepherd—the comforter." Yes, the Church is fond of little children! it likes their submission, their believing capacity, their pliability, their convertibleness. These are just the materials upon which a church can operate with credit, and fashion into the desired shape. After securing the children, the next thing for a church is men
and women with the same docile and believing dispositions. Jesus said, "Whosoever shall not receive the
kingdom of God as a little child shall in no wise enter therein." Men and women who ask questions, who want
it to be explained how this is, and why that was, are an abomination and a pestilence in any church. Therefore it
was necessary that in the gospels Jesus should be represented as fond of children, and that his followers should
be required to become as children. These gospels, and many more, were edited by literary artists in the Church,
and for the Church, and the four we have are the Church, after deliberation, commended and accredited.
Sheep and the Shepherd—the Church, are truthfully suggestive figures of speech. Sheep are so docile: they
allow themselves to be led and driven and folded and fleeced without resistance, without an expression of their
own will in the matter; the figure befits the church and its human flocks well! But the goats, they are fond of
exercising their own judgment, of rambling where they choose, exploring brambly defiles, scaling rocky
acclivities and dizzy heights. They must be the Freethinkers. The Church, through the gospels gives a forecast
of the last judgment, in which the sheep are placed at the right hand, and the goats at the left of the judge, who,
addressing the sheep, says, "Come unto me ye blessed," and unto the goats, "Depart from me ye cursed." The primary
qualifications for admission into the Church are blind faith and docility.

Fallen women were in favour with Jesus. He tells the priests and elders; "The harlots go into the kingdom
of God before you." Mary Magdalen was often with him. He permits, nay, approves that a woman who "is a
sinner," a woman of no character, shall kiss and do sundry other things to his feet. He engages in a long
conversation with a woman of Samaria, a woman living in a state of adultery or fornication, cohabiting with a
man who is not her husband. When another woman, caught in the act of adultery, is brought to him, he says he
does not condemn her. In none of these instances did he make any remark disapproving of the life these women
had led or were leading. In his conversation with the woman of Samaria a good opportunity occurs, but he
makes no use of it: the woman tells him she has no husband, and he replies she has had five, and the one she
now has is not her husband. The woman admits such to be the fact and changes the subject of conversation.
Jesus does not reprove her for living with one who is not her husband, does not even say her conduct is wrong,
but they pass on to another subject in the most beautiful innocence and unconcern, as if Jesus had merely asked
her, "How many children have you?" and she had replied, "Five: three boys and two girls." It is held that
amourousness was not an element in the character of Jesus, that he was incapable of entertaining the passion. If
he had such misfortune, it must have arisen from a defective organization, but it enabled him to associate with
these women with impunity. The women were decidedly infatuated with him. If he went amongst fallen women
to reclaim them it was a good work, but we have just seen he did nothing in it. I would advise any young man
of thirty not to imitate Jesus in this matter, but rather to avoid women who would toy about him as the woman
with the ointment did about Jesus.

In the gospel narratives of the life of Jesus, what variations, what contradictions we find! One writer relates
incidents of which the other three are silent, two, of which the other two are silent, and three, of which one says
nothing! and in quite a multitude of instances where an incident is related by more than one, the relations are
circumstantially different, often very seriously so. The inscription on the cross, few though the words are, is not
given in the same words in any two gospels. To anyone believing in Jesus as a literal fact, and believing also
that the gospels are inspired, it would be a painful task to attempt conscientiously to reconcile the narratives. I
can only see two possible issues to such an attempt. If he who took the task were thoroughly honest and held to
his faith his reason must give way, if he held to his reason his faith must yield. The difficulty about a writing
for which inspiration is claimed is, you cannot help the writer out by suggestion; you cannot say he may have
omitted something here, or overstated something there; he has not known much about this, or has got a wrong
version of that; or, if he had used certain words, instead of those he has used, he would have conveyed the
meaning better. No! you must take an inspired book as it is; just as you buy a horse at auction—with all its
faults. But who said the gospels were inspired? The writers make no such claim, and they should have known
better. The Church said so. Sacerdotalism said so. The same priestly impudence which consecrates allotments of
the ground we tread on, buildings, water, candles and crosses, consecrated the gospels; and, although
Protestants repudiate the church which consecrated the gospels, they hold to the consecration.

The Jesus of the Church is more easily comprehended than the Jesus of the gospels. Yet there is more than
one Jesus in the Church: each section of the Church has its own Jesus, in which there are peculiar and
prominent features; which though they may be present, are not prominent in other ideals. The leading features of
the Jesus of the Roman Catholic Church are suffering and submission. You all have seen the pictures of Jesus
by the great artists, or copies of them: he is wearing a crown of thorns; the thorns have been beaten into his
scalp, and the blood is trickling over his brow and down his agonized and tearful face. This is the suffering. His
hands are crossed on his breast and his eyes turned upwards; that is the submission. What painfully typical truth
there is in these pictures. How real they are! How the touches of the artists describe what has been the teaching
of the Church and the fate of Christians during these tedious Christian centuries. Suffering and Submission!
what melancholy words, but how true. The history of Europe shows how true shows how full a cup of suffering
the nations have drunk; and what palliative did the Church offer?—Submission.

The Church taught the people that they had inherited suffering, that on their own account they deserved suffering, that this world is a place of suffering, that God sent famine and pestilence that they might have suffering, that He handed them over to tyrants and spoilers that they might have more suffering, that the religious duty of the people was submission, and the Church quoted the words of Jesus: "I say unto you that ye resist not evil," and many more of his sayings enjoining the same submissive conduct. The ideal of the sympathising Virgin must have been a great comfort to those plundered, down-trodden Catholics. They made their prayers to her, and, although never a prayer was answered, it was some consolation to their torn hearts and wearied lives to look into those sad and affectionate eyes and pour their sorrows into her bosom.

The Jesus of the Episcopalian Church does not show so much suffering. The blood and tears have been washed from the face, which now wears the expression of sadness, helplessness and resignation. Submission is a prominent trait, and faithfully preached. This church is one of insipid symbols, dresses, routine and ready-made prayers. There are no pulsations of the human heart in it. It is not the church of the people, but the church of the bishops for the people. The wills of the bishops, and not the hearts of the people, give it the life it shows, such as that is. Toryism and it are sworn friends, and also friends by blood. It cares little for the Virgin, but is deeply enamoured of the twin goddesses, Place and Property.

With the Presbyterian church, the Virgin is simply an abomination. The suffering of Jesus is recognised, but the Presbyterian ideal of Jesus is as a solicitor. He is supposed to be seated at the right hand of God, and constantly pleading the cause of sinner clients. The submission half of Jesus is not so fully recognised as by the two preceding sections of the Church. "Be ye subject to the higher powers" is, as in the Episcopal church, a pulpit theme; but there seems to be concealed somewhere in Presbyterianism the heresies of impatience under suffering and insubordination to tyranny, which have more than once burst forth and placed beyond a doubt the fact of their existence.

We have also the Quaker Jesus, a man of peace, a non-swearer, of few words, but those plain, true, and to the point. A most excellent ideal. But the Quakers very sensibly reject the injunction of Jesus: "Take no thought for the morrow," and, with admirable prudence and thrift, take much thought.

There is another ideal of Jesus, the sensuous one. This ideal does not address itself to the intellect, but to the feeling. It is the ideal of Wesleyans, Baptists, Revivalists, and such as endeavour to develop religion emotionally. In this ideal the suffering of Jesus is not so conspicuous as his compassion and love; and the argument is, that his love for us should cause us to return the affection. The horrors and danger of hell are not presented so vividly as by the Presbyterians, but Jesus is represented as a passionate lover, craving and pleading for returned affection, and the repentant sinner as returning that affection. The food upon which this ideal feeds is sweet sensuous imagery, suitable to minds that revel in emotions. This food contains neither philosophy, intellectuality nor facts. It is the language and emotions of lovers. "The old, old story" of young love which never becomes stale, but is fresh and warm to every succeeding generation. The lover says—

"Tell me the story slowly, that I may take it in.  
Tell me the story softly, with earnest tones and grave."
And, when the story is told, the emotion is—
"I am so glad that Jesus loves me."
If the lover is harassed and worn, he or she hears—
"The voice of Jesus say:  
'Come unto me and rest; lay down thou weary one,  
Lay down thy head upon my breast.'"
Lovers bent on marriage anticipate on their union a paradise; it may be on a retired farm, in a suburban villa or a quiet cottage, and the lover of Jesus sings of—

"That beautiful shore."
"The valley of blessing so sweet."
"The home over there."
and "The sweet by and by."

Then comes the marriage—

"I know not the hour when my Lord will come  
And take me away to his own dear home."
"Safe in the arms of Jesus,  
Safe on his gentle breast"

could be read as 

When—

the climax is reached.

Some may consider that the likening of Jesus in these songs to an affectionate conjugal partner lowers the
ideal, but it must be remembered Jesus has always represented sentiment, never intellectuality, and the
sentiment of conjugal love does him honour. Conjugal, parental, filial, paternal, or any other kind of love with
hearts and homes in it is worth far more than all the theology ever written. Without domestic love, or even
while a cloud obscures it, the heart and home are desolate, and life unendurable; with it, life is pleasant, the
greatest difficulties can be surmounted, and deepest sorrows endured.

This ideal Jesus but very imperfectly satisfies that craving for sympathy and union which every sane person
feels. That beautiful shore, The home over there, The sweet by and by and The arms of Jesus are mere pictures,
imaginings, expectations, of the realization of which there is not the slightest evidence or even probability. We
have read, "What man is there of you, whom if his son ask bread will he give him a stone?" and here, when the
tendrils of the heart are stretched forth, seeking the support and sympathy of kindred flesh, they are told to cling
to Jesus. What is Jesus? It is not a visible presence; it is not a tangible substance; not even an historical fact. It
is merely a fond imagining, and the heart broods and pants over its own creation, and then languishes when it
finds that creation so unsubstantial. But since the human heart manifests such intense sympathy for a mere
ideal, a brain picture, what an outpouring of practical feeling may we expect when these fountains are opened
upon the real Jesus—the ever-present and ever-suffering humanity. When such sympathy is evoked by the
contemplation of an un-authenticated, bleeding Jesus, and his hour or two of perturbation, terror and sweat,
what sympathy may not be developed, when attention is directed to the sweating, suffering, harassed, and often
bleeding millions of mankind.

"Weep you when you but behold
Our Caesar's vesture wounded. Look you here,
Here is himself."

For how many centuries has thought, energy and wealth been wasted in dreaming. What has been called
religion, has been mere dreaming, imagining, believing. The present, the real, and the practical have been
continuously ignored. Man has been taught to pray, not to work; to neglect the practical and attainable, and
dissipate his energies in quest of the impracticable and unattainable; to despise the tangible means of happiness
with which he is visibly surrounded, and yearn for visionary joys and conditions of being, of which the
countless generations which have preceded him have never given any confirmation. He has been taught to rack
his sympathies over the alleged sufferings of Jesus, and hardened into indifference to the real suffering which
everywhere met his eyes, by being told that such suffering was ordained by God, and without remedy. Thus
hath man dreamed, been taught and believed, nor is he awake yet. He begins however, under favouring
circumstances, to rub his eyes, and feel, half painfully, half stupidly, awake. He begins to note that there are
facts as well as dreams, and also, that the facts are the more reliable. When he acknowledges that facts are his
only trustworthy guides, he will be fully awake. We have seen how he has struggled and pondered and suffered
and sympathised in his dreams, which have been as the troubled sleep of a giant, and gave some idea of the
force and sympathy stored up in him; so we may confidently anticipate that, when fully awake, that force and
sympathy will brush away fantasies, re-cast society, and remodel even the face of the globe.
I am sure, Mr. Editor, you will let me defend my opinions in your new paper, and warn those of my belief against your teachings. If you won't you are as bad as we are, without the same excuse, for we believe that everybody else in the world will be damned if they cannot believe the mysteries which it is impossible for us to understand. You have, along with others of the same class, been telling us that much that we believe is absurd and foolish, but would it not be better for you to have unquestioning faith and follow in the footsteps of Tertullian, and meekly say, "Creda quia impossible"—(I believe because it is impossible)? Let me then appeal to your readers not to believe you, for what you say may be possible, and, consequently, is no trial to their faith, whereas that which is taught in our churches is often impossible and absurd, therefore, hard to believe, and thus there is all the greater merit in believing it. Any fool can believe what is simple and plain, and only needs a little common sense and experience to understand; but a man must be possessed of Divine grace and a very superior soul indeed to believe the creeds taught in our churches. What would be the good of our orthodoxy if everybody could understand it? Then it would come down to the level of our shallow intellects, and it would thus be possible for men to have originated it, just to keep us in their power and set themselves above the common herd; but the fact that it contains much that is foolish, requiring an extra amount of faith to accept, is a proof that it is from God! Let me illustrate, lest I be misunderstood. We believe that Jonah was swallowed by a whale. Now if the statement had been made that Jonah was eaten by a shark, everybody could have believed that, and consequently there would have been no merit, no trial to our faith, in believing such a statement; but when we have to believe that a whale swallowed him, and kept him in its stomach undigested, for three days, and then spewed him out (because he was neither cold nor hot), every one who believes it knows how hard it is! However, I believe it and have often wished that it had been Jonah that had swallowed the whale, for it would have been a greater miracle, and I could have thus displayed my greater faith in believing it.

In your lecture on Sunday night, Mr. Editor, you wanted to throw ridicule on the statement of Joshua commanding the sun and moon to stand still! I suppose you follow in the steps of those infidels who say that it was impossible for these heavenly orbs to stop, because, in the first place, day and night are caused not by their motion around the earth, but by the motion of the earth on its own axis, and consequently if he had desired them apparently to stop, he should have commanded the earth to cease its motion; and, secondly, these infidels say that if the earth had stopped so suddenly it would never have gone again, since it would have been shattered to atoms. I would ask you and them whether you, or God, who wrote the account, knows most about astronomy? If God made the universe, surely he knows more about the working of it than you, and surely he could stop any star, and set it off again any time he pleased! I know you will answer in reply that the laws of the universe are unchangeable, but that is the argument of unbelievers; as for me, I am a believer, and so I accept anything and everything without a murmur, only leaving to myself the right to reject everything an unbeliever may bring against my faith.

In our Christian faith there are a thousand mysteries, and what seem to be contradictions, which would not have been the case if infidels had put it together for us, or if they had been consulted before it was given to the world; but the ways of Divinity are not the ways of infidels, and since Providence has given us these mysteries and contradictions to believe, it is our duty to bow our heads in submission, and, if we are weak in faith, be thankful there are not more.

There has been something said and written on "Eternal Torments," a subject venerable because of its antiquity—true, because of its scriptural support, and comforting—because it provides a hell for the infidels! There are people in this world, nay in this city, and I believe you are one, Mr. Editor, who would deprive us of the comforting hopes that all our enemies and people who are not of our opinion, will roast for ever whilst we enjoy the felicity of heaven! "What would be the good of heaven if everybody went there? I must give you to understand, Mr. Editor, that although I am not an aristocrat, our bishop is. Then do you think he would like to mix with common folks when he dies? Do you think he would like to mix with infidels and Spiritualists? No! No! It is indeed a comfort to think these will all go to hell.

For the present I will leave you with this thought, though to show you I do not do it maliciously, I may tell you that I and a few other old women are going to hold prayer meetings so that you may be brought over to our side. If you will permit me, I may trouble you again at some future time, but for the present,

I am, yours faithfully,

A Country Clergyman

Letter No II.
I am glad, Mr. Editor, to fulfil my promise which I made to you and your readers in the last issue of the Reflector—viz., that I would trouble you again. I say "trouble you" again, for I know what a trouble all the Orthodox are to the heretics, more especially if they are of such sound faith as I am.

You still, Mr. Editor, are going on in the evil "tenor of your ways." You still are trying to teach the people to use their common sense and reasoning powers. When will you learn to rely upon faith? Oh! when will you repose placidly in the bosom of Orthodoxy?

For the good of your readers and your hearers I will point out a few of the benefits I have received from being Orthodox.

1st. I never need to think. All my thinking is done for me. I get my creeds ready made as I do my clothes, and all that I have to do is to see that I hand them on to my children without a single heretical hole in them.

2nd. I have the comforting conviction that I shall be saved, and that you will be damned. This is indeed comforting. I am furthermore comforted by the fact that the blessings of heaven are reserved for a few, that I am among that few, and that we few choice spirits shall flap our angelic wings in Eternal bliss, whilst the great majority of the human race are roasting for ever. These "glad-tidings" I intend to preach to the miserable Kaffirs of this country. It will make them happy.

3rd. I am respected. The more I believe the more I am respected. I get invited out to sip tea and spend evenings with old women, simply because there's nothing I can't believe, if it is labelled "Orthodox." Respectability is Orthodoxy. Orthodoxy means a broad-cloth suit and free admission to all tea-fights and prayer-meetings. Turn heretic and you lose these blessings.

4th. I have now the privilege of talking nonsense without the fear of contradiction. I get in a pulpit and I am safe from criticism. Nobody dare to take me to task. I enjoy a glorious immunity from all questioning. Our Faith covers a multitude of defects, and really works miracles. It turns twaddle into perennial streams of divine comfort and instruction. Where should I and my brother clergymen be if it were not for such a Faith and such a miracle?

5th. By being Orthodox you may calculate on the support and co-operation of the Times, a paper which is truly the backbone of South African civilisation, and without which the world itself would be in danger of ruin. Talk Orthodox nonsense and you may calculate upon a paragraph in this great paper, but talk sound sense, and let it be "christened" heresy, and the clerks in the office won't treat you with common civility when you deliver your advertisements or settle your accounts. Who wouldn't be Orthodox when they enjoy such privileges and such immunities?

6th. This is the principal advantage—You need not be so good as you seem. What you fall short in conduct your belief will make up for you. Only get the credit of being a great "Believer," and your conduct will never be criticised. Only let people see your Faith, and then you can do pretty well as you like. Turn heretic and you're never safe. The Orthodox will watch your character like a cat watching a mouse. Orthodoxy enjoys a great immunity in this respect.

These, Mr. Editor, are only a few of the advantages privileges and immunities of Orthodoxy; but I feel sure they are sufficient to convince all the candid among your hearers and readers of the vast superiority it enjoys over Heresy, I would advise those among them who are heretics to turn Orthodox, and those who are Orthodox to keep so, if they expect the refreshing society of parsons and old women, and an easy passport to our brother saints "on the other side of Jordan."—I remain, yours, etc.

deorative feature

Letter No. III.

I know not, Mr. Editor, how to express my indignation at the method you and other heretics adopt to set aside the tenets and dogmas of our Faith. You presume to set aside the wisdom of ages and the truths of Biblical lore, by the use of your paltry understandings, and the mere exercising of worldly knowledge! Know you not that "The wisdom of man is foolishness with God?" How dare you talk about the mysteries of our Church, as though they were amenable to common sense? Again let me assure you that they can only be truly grasped when the acme of a sublime Faith has been achieved. It belongs not to man to question the ways of Providence, and it is the very height of presumption to think that any heretic can either understand, or reduce to reason, the extraordinary creeds invented by the clergy. Nothing can be done without Faith. Our every day life depends upon it. We trust each other as a matter of necessity. And shall we have more confidence in ordinary men than we have in the true Church? You, Mr. Editor, trusted yourself to the skill and management of the Captain and officers of the steamer that brought you to these shores, without insisting upon the examination of each man's certificate and a relation of his biography before you set foot upon their craft. You exercised your faith, and trusted that all was right. And will you be so profane as to insist upon the examination of our
certificates, and will you demand evidence of our "divine call" to our work, when we clergymen tell you that we are the Captains and officers of the ship that carries you to salvation? If you do, I for one will not give you evidence, for I think that the man who is so wicked as to doubt the word of a clergyman of my denomination, is not fit to be argued with.

I despair of doing any good to you, Mr. Editor, but I may benefit some of your readers, and for that reason I will show you what Faith has done in times past.

Gideon had an army of thirty-two thousand men. The hosts of the Midianites and Amalekites (the enemies of Israel) were like grasshoppers for multitude. It was decided by divine wisdom that thirty-two thousand Israelites were too many to beat them, so twenty-two thousand cowards were sent home. There remained an army, therefore, of ten thousand. They came to a river and Gideon was told to watch them. Seven hundred bowed down on their knees to drink, and were sent home for doing it. The remaining three hundred had lapped the water like dogs, and because they imitated dogs in this respect they were allowed to remain and fight. These three hundred men were divided into companies of a hundred men each, and every man was armed with a trumpet, a lamp, and a pitcher. Think of a British army equipped with such weapons in a war against the Zulus or Boers! Thus armed they marched among the hosts of the enemy. At the word of command they blew their horns, smashed their pots, and held up their lamps. Unaccustomed to such valiant and original Warfare, the Midianites and Amalekites fled as fast as they could, and the holders of the lamps were gloriously victorious. Where was ever such a battle as this? Where was ever victory gained by so novel a design? Talk of Thermopolæ! Why all the battles in the world sink into insignificance in comparison with this, which was won without the shedding of blood, by the blowing of horns, the breaking of pots, and the holding of lamps, by a small army of three hundred men! But, I tell you, it was Faith which did the work. Don't tell me that if they hadn't had the amount of faith they had, that the breaking of a few dishes would have terrified the Amalekites.

There is another case equally wonderful which just occurs to me. Joshua, the successor of Moses, as General of the Jewish army, met with a pretty considerable difficulty at a town called Jericho. The people of the place had taken great care to have it shut up and carefully walled round. By none of the usual strategems of war could the city be entered, so a new method was advised and adopted. Seven priests had seven rams' horns. They walked round the city once a day. Each day these seven priests gave variations on these horns, and on the seventh day such was the efficacy of the music they produced, that the walls fell down. You tell me that it was not a miracle! You assert that the walls fell in consequence of the vibration in the air, creating a sort of vacuum by the vigorous blowing of the seven trumpeters! I tell you it was their faith, and nothing else that worked the miracle.

So it has ever been. Faith is the parent of many wonders. It still is so. Without Faith who could escape the allurements of common sense? It is Faith that keeps us Orthodox, and it is knowledge that makes some heretics. Give me Faith and I am satisfied; take that from me and I have nothing to live on. I mean for! Trusting that Faith may become more abundant,—I remain, yours, etc.

Decorative feature

Letter No IV.

One of the most annoying things in this modern age is the prevalency of common sense. The good old times are departing, and woeful times are most certainly at hand. It is even within my memory, when the word of a clergyman was never doubted, and when boys got deservedly thrashed by the schoolmaster and their parents when they forgot to lift their hats to the village curate. Sad indeed is it now, when even a common tradesman dares to question the existence of the devil, and refuses to pay his pew-rent, because we cannot prove to his satisfaction that he will go to hell if he does not. Oh! my Christian brethren, think of those happy times when the clergy had their own way, and had the power to make a man both pay his pew-rent and believe in an everlasting place of Fire and Brimstone! Those were glorious days! The clergy then were the most exalted of mankind, and the whole world knelt cringingly at their feet. This was as it should be, and we, divinely called, divinely aided, and divinely sanctioned men, could dispense to an unsaved world the undoubted passports to Eternal Glory, without any kind of opposition. The only way then to heaven was through our church, and the only guides to put you safely on the road were the clergymen of the said church. Now alas! every man gets to heaven as cheaply as possible, and for the sake of saving a few shillings, complacently walks round our church instead of going through it. It is shameful. It is destroying the business of those men who belong to the divine profession.

When men get common sense they get stingy. Where men, at death, used to leave all their lands and worldly possessions to the church, that the clergy might make sure of their souls getting to heaven all right, they now are so careless about their Eternal welfare that they leave all the wealth that Providence has granted them
to their wives and children, and a few paltry charitable institutions! The church is left out in the cold! A man's 
wife and family, and his common brethren are actually considered of more account, now-a-days, than are the 
clergy! Sure the world is rushing on to ruin.

But there must be an end to all this presumption on the part of infidels some day or other. Common sense 
must be crushed out if the blessings of Faith are to be enjoyed and preserved; and since we clergymen in Africa 
are not at present able to do it, I believe that something Providential Will happen to bring the desired result 
about. Although I am not a Wesleyan, and according to the revered custom of my church really hate the 
Wesleyans, I am still exceedingly thankful to the Rev. J. S. Spencer for having drawn attention to the necessity 
there is for this, in the proper quarters and in the proper way. Prayer-meetings have great efficacy in ensuring a 
Providential destruction of all common sense upon religious matters. Therefore the Rev. J. S. Spencer has my 
sincere thanks for the good he has done us by taking part in the recent Wesleyan revivals, which I notice have 
secured even our church two new subscribers.

But Infidels need a warning. They think they are safe. But let them beware how they persist in their 
disrespect to the only men on earth who have been deservedly honoured by the distinctive title "Holy." What 
God did four thousand years ago to disrespectful heretics, he can do now. Let the twenty-sixth chapter of 
Numbers, and the ninth and tenth verses be read to learn the fact that because Dathan, Abiram, and Korah had 
been disrespectful to the High Priest, Aaron, and his brother, they, with their households, were swallowed alive 
by the earth. "And the earth opened her mouth and swallowed them," are the very words of Scripture. What an 
awful fate for a heretic to anticipate!

But to the young there is a still more striking case than this of punishment for disrespect to the priests. It 
seems that in the time of the Prophet Elisha, the profession of "Hairdresser" was not established; consequently, 
those who lost their hair through disease or age were obliged to go about with bald heads. I am aware that one 
or two dubious authorities are of opinion that there were "Hairdressers" in those days, and that wigs were so 
customary that it excited the risible faculties of the young to an immoderate degree to see a man with no hair at 
all upon his head. But be this as it may, one thing is certain: Elisha one day went out with a bald head. If he 
wore a wig, he had forgotten it, and had left it at home. Now Elisha was a man of God, and with or without 
hair, was to be respected. Some naughty little children from the city of Bethel, how- ever, could not resist the 
temptation to laugh at the old man without a wig. They not only laughed, but they allowed their levity to carry 
them so far that they exclaimed : "Go up, thou bald head; go up thou bald head." What was the result? Elisha 
simply turned round and cursed them in the name of the Lord. Immediately, thereupon, two she bears came out 
of the wood and ate up forty-two of them! Children of Cape Town beware what you say to the priests when you 
meet them in the streets! In the seventeenth chapter of Deuteronomy and the twelfth verse, we read, "And the 
man that will not hearken unto the priest that standeth to minister there . . . even that man shall die."

Just another word of warning before closing, to those who refuse to contribute towards supporting parsons, 
Ananias and Sapphira refused to give all they had to Peter, and even told a lie, so as to keep a little back for 
their own use (as though it was more important that a man should have money to get something to eat and 
clothe himself with than to give to the priest), so the result was they were both struck dead, Reader, if the priest 
wants it, give all you have, lest you also be struck dead! May this fate, for such a sin, never be yours, is the 
prayer of, yours, etc.

decorative feature

Letter No. V.

It is one of the lamentable symptoms of this age, my Orthodox brethren, that the good old features of our 
Faith are dying out, and many of them have already disappeared, and are no longer practised, thought of, or 
cared for. That glorious ceremony, the Feast of Asses, for instance, has fallen altogether into disuse, and thus 
the Church has been deprived of one of its principal adornments.

This age is so forgetful of the sacred and divine, that it is quite possible there may be many among even my 
brother clergymen who have not heard of the "Feast of the Ass," which was at one time such a sacred ceremony 
and revered custom in several of the churches of France. For the purpose of giving them instruction, therefore, 
as to its nature and object, and for the purpose of showing how much of the spirit of sanctity and veneration we 
have lost by the abolition of this ceremony, I will give you the account of it very nearly in the words of 
Robertson, the historian, in his great work on Chas. V.

The "Feast of the Ass" was held in commemoration of the Virgin Mary's flight into Egypt. A beautiful 
young woman, in rich attire, with a child in her arms, was sat upon an Ass superbly caparisoned. With all due 
solemnity the Ass was slowly led in a priestly procession to the Altar. High mass was then performed, and the 
Ass, throughout the pomp and ritual of this performance, knelt (being trained) at the proper places. A hymn was
then sung in praise of this animal which discoursed so sensibly to Balaam. At the conclusion, the priest, instead of dismissing his congregation with the usual words, "brayed three times like an Ass," and the people, instead of their usual response of "We bless the Lord," "brayed three times in the same manner." Robertson, after giving his authorities for this says, "This ridiculous ceremony was not, like the Festival of Fools, and some other pageants of this age, a mere farcical entertainment exhibited in the Church and mingled, as was then the custom, with an imitation of some religious rites; it was an act of devotion performed by the ministers of religion and by the authorities of the Church."

The only point upon which Robertson and I disagree, is in the kind of ceremony. He says, "This ridiculous ceremony;" I say this, "This religious and therefore sublime ceremony." It is evident to every man of sense that whatsoever is religious is proper; whatsoever is instituted by the Church, and by our religious "pastors and masters," is really venerable and sublime. If this ceremony had not been divine, I admit it would have been ridiculous, (as indeed would be quite a number of others which are still retained in the Church) but being religious it cannot possibly be so.

Perhaps I may qualify this a little lest I be misunderstood. There are faiths, customs, and practices in the false religions which certainly are ridiculous, and which are fit for nothing else but to be laughed at. That Mahomet should have journeyed from Mecca to Jerusalem on the mare Borak, and from thence to heaven, then back again to Jerusalem, and from there safely be conveyed on the mare to Mecca again; and all this in the tenth part of a night, is positively absurd.

That the walls of Thebes should construct themselves to the playing of a lute is also absurd. That Escolapius should raise Hippolytus from the dead; that Appolonius of Tyanna should have worked miracles, after the manner of Jesus, or that Christna should have been a prototype of Christ, is too ridiculous to deserve discussion. These things are not found in the Bible, hence their manifest absurdity. Had they been found therein, or had they been sanctioned by the Church, I frankly admit, that had they been a thousand times more absurd I should have held them as sublime and venerable. Had the story of "Sinbad the Sailor" been substituted in the stead of the Book of Jonah, it would be my duty to believe the story true and divine, and I should have done so. This is the beauty of Faith. Let us cherish this disposition to accept and revere the traditions, books, and doctrines of our Church with humble resignation, and as soon as possible let us restore "The Feast of the Ass." The cost of the importation of the Asses need not be considered. Several congregations already subscribe towards keeping several.—I remain, yours, etc.

**Letter No. VI.**

Let me once again caution you against the statements made by learned men and infidels. They would fain have us believe that our Faith rests purely upon the merits of its intrinsic worth and the integrity of its human founders. They tell us we are Christians, simply because we happen to be born in Christian lands, and because Christian education has been administered unto us. How false a Christian knows all this to be if once he believe in the doctrine of Election! We are Christians because it is God's will that we should be so, whilst it is also God's will that all the rest of mankind should be heathens and heretics. It is furthermore God's will that these heathens and heretics should go to hell for being such.

Anxious to subvert this Holy Faith, the scholars of our own time have conclusively shown that the Gospels upon which our Faith rests, were not written by their reputed authors, and that we have not the slightest trace of them before their supposed authors and the men whose lives they profess to give had long been in their graves. We are really informed upon the very best authority, that the Gospels which we have are nothing more nor less than condensations of a multitude of other Gospels which existed before them, which were read in the Primitive Churches, which were believed in as divine by the first Christians, which were for very many years the only Gospels in use, and of which, undoubtedly, our Gospels are very late, and, as we have said, condensed copies. But these fifty false Gospels, though they were the first, and for a long time the only ones in use, have been condemned by the Church, and that is sufficient to satisfy any good Christian as to their spuriousness.

Though these Gospels have been justly condemned, I cannot help but admit that some of them are very interesting to one who has accustomed himself to the glorious habit of believing. I am rather sorry, myself, that the "Gospel of the Infancy" has been omitted from the Canon, since it contains some pleasing accounts of the Life of Jesus during his boyhood, of which the Canonical Gospels leave us in ignorance. It is in this Gospel that we learn that as soon as Jesus was born he cried out, "Mary, I am the Son of God." When he was taken down into Egypt this Gospel informs us that all the idols fell down before him.

We also learn the following from this Gospel:—

When Mary had put the swaddling clothes of Jesus out to dry after their arrival in Egypt, a son of an
Egyptian priest who was possessed of devils happened to come near them, and immediately the devils came out of the unfortunate man's nose, and they flew away in the shape of crows and serpents. One day he came in contact with a mule, which was none other than a man who had been transformed by the aid of witchcraft into that shape. Jesus got on the mule's back, and immediately it returned into a man. It appears that when Judas Iscariot was a boy, he even then was possessed of a devil, which caused him to attempt to bite the side of Jesus. Immediately Jesus cried out, and the devil jumped out of Judas, "and ran away like a mad dog" (chap. xiv.) It would also appear that when Jesus was quite young he was exceedingly fond of playing with other boys of his acquaintance. One day he made a number of clay sparrows, and he showed his superiority over his companions by commanding his clay birds to fly away, which they readily did. Whilst playing on one occasion with his companions upon the roof of a house, one of his companions fell off and was killed. The rest all ran away, leaving him alone to be accused of the crime of having killed the boy. When, however, the relations of the boy accused him of the murder, Jesus proposed that they should go down and ask the boy who was dead who had killed him. They agreed to this, so Jesus stood over the boy's head and exclaimed, "Zeinunus! Zeinunus! who threw thee down from the house-top?" Then the boy answered "Thou didst not, but such an one did." Whatever school Jesus went to, he knew more than his schoolmaster. He helped his father very materially by enlarging or decreasing any piece of carpentering work which Joseph had not made to the proper size. In this way, by the speaking of a single word, he enlarged the throne of Herod, which his father had made too small. He killed so many people who had offended him, that eventually his parents would not "allow him to go out of the house," because every one who displeases him is killed." (1 Infancy xx. 1—16; 2 Infancy iii. 1—7).

These are by no means all the miracles which are recorded by the author or authors of the "Gospel of the Infancy," but they will serve to throw some light upon the early life of our Master. It is for this reason that I regret that the wisdom and inspiration of our Church have not seen fit to preserve it in the Canon. But since they have not, it only remains for me to submit to what our Church believes without a single murmur.

There are, as I have intimated, many other wonderful Gospels besides this one, all of which, either by the whole Church or sections of it, were at one time considered as infallible and divinely inspired. It becomes our duty, however, to reject them all since the Church has done so. Only let us be careful not to reject the four true Gospels (which are an epitome of the others) since our Church has sanctioned these. The infidels would have you place the whole of them in the same category, to use your common sense in judging and comparing their merits, and only to accept the good and beautiful, in whichever Gospel they are found. But what is the advice of an infidel compared with that of—Yours, etc.

**Letter No VII.**

I am both pleased and proud to learn from the Argus of Monday last, that the Rev. J. S. Spencer argued in his sermon delivered on the previous evening, that Creed is the most important thing in life. It shows that although the rev. gentleman is not a light in our church he is still sound and Orthodox.

I do not mean by this that the Mohammedan, Bhuddist, or Brahminical faith is to be considered above everything else, but that my Faith, and perhaps that of the Rev. J. S. Spencer is.

I will state a few reasons why I deem Creed above all things else in its importance:—

- Whilst men believe they are generally ignorant. Whilst they are ignorant they are easily governed. Therefore belief is a safeguard against insubordination.
- Whilst men believe they attend church. Those who attend church don't go anywhere else. Therefore Belief is a safeguard against Sabbath rambling and the like grievous sins for the good of human health.
- A Believer respects his clergyman, and thinks that he is almost a god. This does him good inasmuch as it provides him with a worthy object to look up to. Therefore Belief is a safeguard against disrespect.
- Believers support the clergy. By this means they prevent the labour-market being over-stocked in other directions. Therefore Belief is a safeguard against idleness. It employs the idle to preach for us.
- Believers, furthermore, by supporting the Clergy cultivate habits of benevolence, since they often give the very necessities of life in order to keep the clergy. Hence Belief is a safeguard against miserly habits.
- Belief does away with the necessity of Thinking and Reasoning. It is therefore a safeguard against intellectual advancement.
- Belief makes the clergy the most important men in human society. It is therefore a safeguard against intellect being placed above such men of piety as I am.
- Creed helps men out of difficulties. It gives them a character. Without a creed they would have no character. At least they wouldn't have a very good one. With a creed their character entitles them even to the laudation and respect of the clergy.
• Our creeds are often our passports to society, position, wealth, and honour. Just to the extent of a man's Orthodoxy does he get on in our church. The most Orthodox are even smiled upon by our bishop.
• Creeds give a man an easy conscience. However big a sinner he is, his creed gives him an assurance that everything will be all right in the end.
• The worst men in the world have got to heaven through their creeds. The greatest villains of the world to-day, simply because of their creeds, stand a chance of getting to heaven that no infidel has, however good he may be.
• This is the most important reason. If a man do not believe in what such as I and the Rev. J. S. Spencer tell him, he cannot possibly get to heaven. We have a patent-right upon these creeds. We have got a sole right to the narrow road, and no one can pass along or find his way unless he gets his instructions from us. Our creeds are the only keys that unlock the doors of heaven; and he who will not use them must not grumble if he be left outside.

I know the infidel will say he is just as good as a parson; but that has nothing to do with it. The question is: Does he believe our creeds? However good a man may be, he is only fit for hell if he doubts myself and the Rev. J. S. Spencer. We two, and others like us, are here to show men to heaven and to sell them their tickets, and anyone who has the audacity to buy a ticket at another shop will have to burn everlastingly for it. This serves them right, for both the Rev. J. S. Spencer and myself have done all we could to show our own importance, and to convince the people that we are the only people who have been favoured with the means of climbing the narrow road which leads to joy, save and except, of course, those who believe what we tell them and do as we command. All outside the Orthodox Faith are in very deed on the broad road, along with the Editor of the Reflector, and those who deem it more important to do what good they can, rather than believe in us.

Let me then, dear reader, beseech you to believe. Believe all and everything the church teaches. Never mind how absurd or nonsensical it may be, it is your duty to believe it, if you wish to get to heaven. Throw away your reason, silence your intellect, and crush your common sense; for what are these but carnal things? Faith is what you want, or rather what we want; so let us have it abundantly, and so oblige quite a number of Country Clergymen.

Letter No VIII.

My dear Orthodox Friends,—It is my good fortune now to find a more direct method of addressing you, without the aid of that blasphemous supporter of common sense, the Cape Town Reflector. We may congratulate ourselves upon its present non-existence, though the existence still of numerous other and far abler periodicals in support of heresy must still be a very painful thorn in our sides.

It has delighted me beyond measure to learn from the daily papers that the Christians in Europe are taking a most decided stand against toleration in the case of the Jews. I am sure all good Christians, in every part of the world, must admit that all Jews should be put to death, because they cannot believe as we do. The Russians are doing what Christianity requires in driving all the Jews out of their country, and in subjecting them to every form of persecution and contempt. The agitation against the Jews in Germany and Poland is another most gratifying evidence that there still are Christians in those parts of the world.

Since it is an undoubted fact that now-a-days there are Christians who have become contaminated by the heretical ideas of this age, and who will, in consequence, shrink from the doctrine of intolerance and persecution which I have stated in the foregoing paragraph, it will perhaps be advisable for me to show from the very books of the Jews themselves that we should persecute them and put them to death. I will, therefore, adduce precept and example from the Old Testament (in which every real Christian firmly believes), to prove the lawfulness of persecution according to the decrees of God, and the absolute necessity of putting those to death who disagree with us.

When Aaron made a golden calf the Jews worshipped it. To this day the Jews worship "gold," and have no inconsiderable reverence for "calves." What was the result of this worship then? Three thousand of them were killed at the bidding of Moses. What should they be done to now for a similar offence? I answer—persecuted and killed.

We Christians know that we are right, and that all Jews, heathens, and heretics are wrong. We know that our God will roast them for ever after they are dead, and how can it be wrong for us to follow our God's example? When our God was upon earth he said—"He that believeth not shall be damned." Paul, inspired by him, said—"Though an angel from heaven were to preach any other Gospel than that which I have preached unto you, let him be accursed;" and John said, in proxy for God—"If any man take away from the words of this
book (the Bible), etc., God shall take away his part out of the book of life;" which means, he shall go to hell. Now the Jew does not believe in Jesus; therefore he must be damned. The Jew preaches a different doctrine to that of Paul; therefore he is accursed. The Jew does not believe in the Book of Revelations; therefore his name is rubbed out of the Book of Life, and he must in consequence go to the bottomless pit.

Now, it is evident that the Jew is damned, accursed and destined for hell. Is he then fit to live? Any man who shows a kindness to a Jew—and the same thing applies to a heretic—has virtually appealed against the decrees of heaven. He has in effect said: God, who knows all things, only considers this man fit for Eternal suffering; I consider him deserving of being decently treated, and if I had my way he would never get even so far as Tophet or Limbo. Depend upon it, God knows better than we do, and if he has destined the Jew for perdition the sooner we help to get him there the sooner we fulfil God's wishes.

The New Testament is the Word of God. The God of the New Testament is the only God which men are permitted to worship. In short, the God of the New Testament is the God of the Old; whosoever therefore does not worship the God of the New, does not worship the God of the Old. The Jew does not worship the God of the New, therefore he does not worship the God of the Old.

Now, in the thirteenth chapter of Deuteronomy we read, "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, let us go and serve other Gods, thou shalt not consent unto him nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him; but thou, shalt surely kill him and thou shalt stone him with stones that he die." It therefore follows that as the Old Testament God is the same as that of the New Testament, and as the Jew does not worship Him, if he worships at all he must worship "other Gods," and that therefore, according to the express command of Scripture he ought to be stoned to death!

The worshippers of "other gods" are always accounted Idolators in the Old Testament. Let us see then how such were treated in the good old Patriarchal and Theocratic times. When Elijah made that celebrated trial with the Priests of Baal, it will be remembered that he came off gloriously victorious. Elated with his victory, he made a dishonest device for getting all the prophets of Baal collected together in one place, and then he slew four hundred and fifty of them with his own hand. Though the Jews are not the prophets of Baal, they do not worship our God, and are therefore just as bad, and in the same category, and ought therefore to receive the same punishment.

Look at the way that Josiah exterminated idolators, and at the frightful treatment they received from Nebuchadnezzar after he was converted! Look how Samuel hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal, because Agag had not waited for Samuel, and had neglected to make a sacrifice to God! Think of those horrible massacres throughout the land of Canaan, of those miserable people who did not worship the only God who was able to harden Pharoah's heart and bring his people out of Egypt. Surely these are examples enough. When God sent hornets before his people of old to drive out those of a different nation and religion, surely it is not wrong for us to accomplish what we can in the same direction without the assistance of hornets. If it was right for Elijah to put those to death who differed from him, it must be right for us. If Moses, Samuel, Josiah, and Nebuchadnezzar acted rightly in putting the worshippers of "other gods" to death, at the command or with the approval of God, how can it possibly be wrong for us to follow in their footsteps? They either acted rightly or wrongly. If they acted rightly, it is our duty to imitate them. If they acted wrongly, then God was to blame, and the Bible is morally guilty. But if this be the case our Church is a fraud, since it assumes that the Bible is faultless. We Christian clergy have decided that the Church is not a fraud; and the Church having decided that the Bible is faultless, it of course follows that these worthies acted rightly. Having acted rightly, it furthermore follows that we ought to follow their examples. If we are in the right, then, we ought to put all to death who differ from us. Since the clergy say we are in the right, and since the clergy are infallible, it is as clear as noonday that every Jew, as well as every heretic, ought to be killed.

May the good work commenced in Germany and Russia succeed and extend till we charitable Christians alone survive, is again the prayer of—Yours, etc.

decorative feature

Letter No. IX.

My heart begins to beat with joy, for my old days yet will bring me peace. In Spain the Roman Catholic Church has been chastising three editorial heretics; for what? for speaking against the clergy! Oh, for the courage and power of Roman Spain to smite the editors of Australia and all the heretical world, for the disrespectful way in which they speak of us! Not till the clergy have had restored to them their vanquished power will the world lie prostrate at their feet content to let them govern, which of course means, simply a government by God's servants, and therefore by God Himself. How happy such a time, when the babblings of
science will be hushed, the freedom of thought destroyed, and the second age of Faith established for ever.

The refusal to bury Michael Fitzpatrick was another step in the right direction. This man had opposed the introduction of the Bible into the schools of the State and had set his face resolutely against the system of payments by results. He had upheld the State in preference to his church, and had exalted the secular authority at the expense of the churchal. He preferred a sound education to an unwavering faith, and an upright life to attendance at church. He therefore deserved to be buried like a dog, and it gave me great pain when I learned that the authorities of the church, out of a craven fear of public indignation, descended to the hypocrisy of reading their service over him. Upon these questions we must make a decided stand. Since we cannot answer the arguments of the infidels we must coerce them; since we cannot refute the products of their common sense, it remains only that we crush that common sense entirely out. Persuasion having been tried and having failed, force becomes our only alternative The more force the more faith, the more faith the more pay, the more pay the more zeal, the more zeal the more glory ad libitum, ad infinitum. I remain, yours, etc.

decorative feature

Letter No X.

MY DEAR ORTHODOX FRIENDS.—In this letter I intend to take my leave of you for a time, unless something of importance crops up on which I may deem it necessary to say a word. In this I shall only beseech you to maintain your orthodoxy in spite of everything especially in spite of all common sense and reason, which are the chief of its enemies. I would ask all my Orthodox brethren to read no books, admit no facts, think no thoughts which are calculated to enlighten them, for enlightenment is the death of Creed. Embrace the loving form of Ignorance, for she, with maternal generosity, supplies from her fruitful bosom the streams of Faith whereat the children of the Church may feed perpetually. Strike low and to the earth, and trample in the dust the majesty of Truth, for 'tis her light and her's alone, that has revealed unto the world our crimes and our deformities. Over her corpse let us build a temple to her departed memory.

As we appreciate the light of a star in the night-time, or of a feeble torch in the gloom, so in the darkness of the Night of Faith, do we appreciate the feeble light of clerical wisdom. When the sun of science is shining our stars and torches are lost, in its too effulgent beams and are therefore unnoticed and unobserved. Across the Sun of Science then, let us spread the Pall of Ignorance, that its beams may reach us not, and that once more the peacefulness of night may be upon us. Then in the gloom of night we clergy will amuse the credulous world with a few intellectual fireworks lit from the fires of Hell. By the light of the torches that devils shall carry, we will preach the following glad tidings.

• God made man capable of falling. He made a tree, the eating of which would cause him to fall. He gave man an appetite for that tree, and placed the tree within his reach. He made a devil to induce him to eat thereof, He knew what would be the result and He permitted it.
• He afterwards drowned all His children in consequence of their doing what He knew they would do, and what He did not prevent.
• He caused all men to be sinners because of the sin of one man.
• For being sinners He condemned all men to everlasting punishment.
• He undertook to save a few by the murder of His innocent Son.
• The majority are nevertheless doomed to eternal suffering. Only a few will be permitted to play the harps of Heaven.
• Hypocrites, ignorant people and all believers of our creeds will stand a better chance of being among the few than the honest and upright among the heretics and heathens.
• There is an awful Devil, going about like a roaring lion seeking whom he shall devour. He at least devours nine for every one that gets salvation. If you don't pay your pew rents he's sure to get you.
• God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son to die, in order that nine out of every ten of the souls which He Himself had created might go to hell.
• Millions of money are spent yearly in order to support the clergy, and to maintain bishops, and costly churches, amid the utmost pomp, splendour and luxury, whilst millions of human beings are starving.
• Years and talents are wasted in defending the Bible, which, if used to emancipate the human mind and spread the glories of science, would banish the clergy from the face of the earth.
• The voice of orthodoxy is inspired with the breath of the coward, and the man of Faith wears the fetters of the slave.

With all the energies of our being if we wish to maintain our position and to defend our citadel from the attacks of the infidel, let us carry these glad tidings to our brethren, and rest not our lying tongues till from pole to pole these glad tidings spread. So, my dear brethren, you will greatly oblige your old friend,
The Christians have ever hated the Jews because the Jews persist in adhering to the religion of their sires. Indispensable though it be, according to certain interpretations of prophesy, that the Jews should remain impervious to Christianity, they have been most thoroughly hated and detested for doing what they could in no wise help, if all be as we are told! Christians say that they have fulfilled the prophesies, and the Christians, therefore, have burned them for doing it!

How the Christians can hate the Jews as a nation is a mystery! The sacred books of the children of Israel are the sacred books of Christendom, and the first parents of the Jews were the first parents of the whole human race,—that is to say, if we argue from the Orthodox stand-point. Adam was a Jew, and Eve a Jewess, and the peopling of the Earth was commenced by these two. Hence, "all people that on Earth do dwell" are descendants of Jews! To hate them, therefore, is to hate our own ancestors, and to despise our descent from Paradise.

Not only were the first parents of the human race of Jewish mould and blood, but the founder of Christianity himself was a Jew. He was from the house of David (according to the interpretations given by Orthodox divines of the contradictory genealogies of Mathew and Luke), both on his father's and on his mother's side. His mother was "purified," after his birth, "according to the law of Moses." When he was eight days old he was circumcised after the custom of the Jews. The usual offering was made unto the Lord in his case as strictly as in all others. As he grew up he told his people that he "came not to destroy the law" of Moses; and when a certain man came to ask him what he should do to inherit eternal life, he replied, not by instancing any of the dogmas or doctrines of the Christian Churches, but by telling him to keep the commandments of Moses. He came to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." His first followers were Jews. All his miracles were wrought in the country of the Jews, and his life, from infancy to death, was passed among them. He preached to them, he healed their sick, he fed their hungry, and he raised their dead. They were the witnesses of the wonders that occurred at his birth; they were present at his cruel death, and they stood in solemn silence to watch him ascend to Heaven. Of Jews, with Jews, and for Jews, then, was the founder of Christianity. To hate the Jews, therefore, is to hate Jesus of Nazareth, and nothing can be more inconsistent in a Christian than such infidelity to his master.

After his death, though Peter and Paul had abated some of their reverence for the Jewish customs, still they had their particular views so decided upon them, that at Antioch they came to words, and had a disgraceful quarrel upon the subject. It seems Peter among the Gentiles had been eating some forbidden moats, but, as soon as he suspected that he was among Jews, he repaired to the limited bill of fare prescribed by the Jewish code. Paul was naturally incensed at this dissimulation, and, thinking he had sufficient cause, he withstood Peter "to the face, because he was to be blamed." This shows that Peter had more respect for the Jews than for the Gentiles. As to Paul, though he called himself the "Apostle of the uncircumcision," he was a Jew to the Jews, and he himself circumcised the disciple Timothy.

If these things are borne in mind, it will be seen how foolish it is for a Christian to detest a Jew. The Jews gave us the Old Testament, and, according to the authorities of Orthodoxy, they also gave us the New. The first man to sin in this world was a Jew, and he who saved us from it was also a Jew. It was Jewish prophesy that foretold Christianity, and it was Jewish miracles that fulfilled it. Therefore, we are indebted to the Jews for the whole scheme of our salvation, and without them the Religion of Christianity would have been impossible. But there is more. God himself regarded the Jews as His "peculiar people." They wore especially His children, and the Psalmist (inspired, of course) exclaims to them, "Oh ye seed of Abraham His servant, ye children of Jacob His chosen!" Is it not, therefore, presumptuous to set aside a divine choice, and to detest those whom God himself has chosen?

The Christian answer to those facts will doubtless be, that the Jewish religion was good for the time it was intended to exist, but that it was decreed by the wisdom of Providence that it should be superseded by a nobler and purer religion, which should be based upon the example of Christ, and not upon the laws of Moses. Hence it is not the Jews, but their imperfect and heathenish religion that is detested.
The miracles of Christianity. "Jesus ascended to Heaven," says the Christian. "So also did Elijah," replies the
miracles wrought in support of the Faith of the Children of Israel, which cannot by any means be equalled by
far greater miracles than ever were performed in evidence of Christianity? And, damaging as it is to the belief
which was attested by so many, such stupendous, and such wonderful miracles?

on the mountain, rose with his body from the dead, and ascended visibly into Heaven. Could that Faith be false
with a quantity of food scarcely sufficient to make a decent meal for the twelve Apostles. He was transfigured
he raised the dead, healed the sick, stilled the tempest, changed water into wine, and fed thousands of people
miracles which he wrought. In proof of his divine character, and of the sublimity and godliness of his teachings,
Nazareth, and by no other being! It would seem that on this point, also, the Jew has the better of the Christian.

In spite of the evident polytheism of the early Jews, we must conclude that the acme of the Judaic Faith is
the sublime doctrine of "The Oneness of God." "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord!" was the
injunction to the chosen people. Couple this with the command, "Thou shalt have none other Gods but Me,"
and understand that the me refers to the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob—the God, in fact, of Israel, Jehovah,
or Yahveh, whose name Josephus tells us was too sacred to be pronounced; and where, then, is there any
allowable possibility of the Christian Trinity? Before the doctrine of the Trinity could for a single moment be
admitted, every one of these commands, and the very foundation of the old dispensation, including the Ten
Commandments themselves, would have to be swept away. If the commands in the Old Testament are given by
God, and are to be obeyed, the doctrines of Christianity are impossible!

Such is the position taken by the Jews. Against this it is urged that God never intended that the religion of
Moses should be final, for by a long line of Hebrew prophets He foretold that He would send His Son into the
World to be the founder of the only absolutely true Faith. Even so early as the "Fall," the prophesy had been
made by manifold types and inspired utterances, and mankind had been thus promised a Redeemer, a Saviour,
and a King. These prophesies were fulfilled alike in the person and character of the humble Jesus of Nazareth.

Truly the Jews are a stiff-necked people, for they raise objections even to this argument. The learned
among them aver that not a single so-called prophesy can be found in the Old Testament relating to Jesus
Christ. Those prophesies which are quoted as fulfilled in the New Testament either are not to be found at all in
the Old Testament, or they bear an entirely different interpretation to that which is given to them by the
supposed Evangelists. The Jews insist upon literal fulfillment. It is not enough for them that we say that the
spirit of prophesy is fulfilled. They want the prophesy carried to its bitter end, and fulfilled at every point.
Especially do they protest against merely historical instances being quoted as prophesies. For instance, in
Matthew we are told that Jesus remained in Egypt until the death of Herod—"That it might be fulfilled which
was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, 'Out of Egypt have I called my Son.'" Now this supposed
prophesy is to be found in the Eleventh Chapter of Hosea, and the First Verse: "When Israel was a child, then I
loved him, and called My son out of Egypt." This is a simple historical statement, and has not the slightest
appearance of prophesy, and could never by any possibility have been mistaken for such, had it not been for the
quotation of it by Matthew. The Rabbis state, that the majority of those so-called prophesies, which are claimed
as fulfilled by the establishment of Christianity, are of a similar character. They are purely historical and local
incidents related, in the past tense, as having already occurred at the time they were recorded. So confident are
all the learned among the tribe of Israel that their Faith is the true one, that they challenge the Christian world to
produce one single prophesy out of their sacred books which was literally fulfilled in all its points by Jesus of
Nazareth, and by no other being! It would seem that on this point, also, the Jew has the better of the Christian.

There is another argument which Christianity has yet to urge. The mission of Christ was confirmed by the
miracles which he wrought. In proof of his divine character, and of the sublimity and godliness of his teachings,
he raised the dead, healed the sick, stilled the tempest, changed water into wine, and fed thousands of people
with a quantity of food scarcely sufficient to make a decent meal for the twelve Apostles. He was transfigured
on the mountain, rose with his body from the dead, and ascended visibly into Heaven. Could that Faith be false
which was attested by so many, such stupendous, and such wonderful miracles?

"But," again interposes the exile from Canaan, "could our faith be false, supported and attested as it was by far
greater miracles than ever were performed in evidence of Christianity?" And, damaging as it is to the belief
of Christendom, such an assertion is well grounded. There is not a miracle wrought in favour of Christianity, of
any importance, but what had previously been wrought in behalf of Judaism, and there were many astounding
miracles wrought in support of the Faith of the Children of Israel, which cannot by any means be equalled by
the miracles of Christianity. "Jesus ascended to Heaven," says the Christian. "So also did Elijah," replies the
Jew. "Jesus rose from the dead." "So also did the man who came in contact with the bones of Elisha, as he was being buried." "Jesus was three days in the bowels of the Earth." "Jonah was three days in the bowels of a fish." "Jesus was transfigured on the mountain." "So also was Moses, for as he descended from Mount Sinai he 'wist not that the skin of his face shone; and they were all afraid to come nigh him.'" "Jesus raised the widow's son at Nain." "Elisha restored to life the deceased son of the Shunamite." "Jesus fed five thousand on five loaves and two fishes." "Elisha prevented the widow's pot of oil from failing." "Jesus fasted for forty days in the wilderness." "Moses abode in the Mount forty days and forty nights, (and) neither did eat bread nor drink water." "Jesus cured the lepers of their disease." "Naaman was cured of leprosy by Elisha." "Jesus walked on the sea of Galilee." "If the Children of Israel did not walk on the Red Sea, they walked through it dry-shod whilst the waters stood like walls on the right hand, and on the left, which was, if anything, a more wonderful miracle." In these things the Gentiles were not at all original; and were it not that the clergy assure us to the contrary, we should be inclined to believe that the Christian miracles wore copies of the Jewish and heathen ones.

Where in Christianity is a miracle equal to that performed by Joshua, of commanding the Sun and Moon to stand still? Where can the miracles performed by Moses to astonish the Court of Pharaoh be equalled? The land covered with frogs, the dust turned into lice, and the rivers of Egypt changed into blood! Has Christianity a miracle more wonderful than the falling down of the walls of Jericho; the turning back of the Sun ten degrees to convince Hezekiah that he was not going to die of a boil; the killing of a thousand Philistines with the jaw-bone of an ass; the speech of Balaam's donkey.; the case of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego; the preservation of Noah, his family, and the animals for so long a time in the Ark; and the wonders that happened to Israel during their Exodus from Egypt? Thus, so far as miracles are concerned, the Jews have undoubtedly the best of it. To one who has advanced beyond the superstitious of both Judaism and Christianity, the many conflicts between the two are fruitful of instruction. The astonishing phenomenon is most strikingly exhibited of a mind, full of absurd beliefs, being quite able to detect absurdity in the beliefs of others. I remember, a few months ago, having a long conversation with a Rabbi upon the subject of Christianity. He was keenly quick in detecting the absurdity of "Three Gods yet only one God," and of its being necessary for God to come on Earth to die to save sinners. He made quite merry over the devils in the pigs, and related the story of the cursing of the fig-tree with a decided smile of sarcasm. But when I ventured to allude to Samson having his strength in his hair, and tying the foxes' tails together with a brand between them to burn the corn of the Philistines, as being equally ridiculous, he grew quite alarmed at my infidelity, and thought it was dangerous to throw doubts upon such subjects. It did not require the slightest argument to convince him of the absurdity of the miracle of turning water into wine; but no amount of argument could convince him that it was not one whit less possible or credible, than the producing of crystal streams of water by striking the barren rock with the rod of Moses! In short, he used his common sense when he looked at Christianity, but carefully laid it aside when he passed judgment upon his own creed. In like manner, too, the Christians act. They can see many absurdities in the Faith of Israel, and make merry at the superstition of the heathens; but they are totally blind to the superstitions which lie at the roots of their own creeds.

What is the cause of this? Because, on anybody else's religion than our own, we are free to judge and examine as we like, and the moment that we are left free to examine as our intellect and common sense may prompt, the absurd and foolish become conspicuous at once. In our own Faith we are restrained from examination through fear. We have been taught from infancy that such and such a story is sacred, and must not be doubted, under penalty of forfeiting the good-will of our heavenly Father. The result is, we dare not examine it. If we dare, and did, what absurdity there might be in it would become as glaring to us as to anybody else. So, because free-thinking upon all the articles of our beliefs is not allowed, we go on from age to age repeating the childish nonsense of our barbarous and semi-barbarous ancestors. Our creeds become chains that moor the ship of civilization to the dark and benighted shores of a baneful ignorance. Allow us the liberty to think upon them, and we sever the cables, and our gallant barque bears us gloriously along over the everlasting waves of the Infinite Sea of Progress. Once this liberty is really lost; once barriers are put in the way of the exercise of the intellect upon all subjects, and men, having no outlet to their hopes and energies, are plunged beneath the waves of a bleak despair. Life loses its cheering and joyous aspects, and sorrow and sadness are the customed lot of the unhappy multitudes. The business of existence seems that of misery, and the sky of humanity is left without a star! Men are driven to madness, and deeds of desperation fill the world with woe. Blinded by the dusts of Creed, man slays his brother man, and rivers of human blood cry up to heaven for vengeance! The pleasure of life seems death, and the labour of existence the wielding of the sword! The people are weighted with fetters, and the beautiful cities of the Earth are transformed into the dismal prison-houses of hopeless slaves. A globe of mental death, a mighty intellectual tomb, floats through the depths of space, with a face that is dark with shame, amid the sister planets of our system. It was the loss of intellectual liberty that goaded on the bigots who lit the
Smithfield fires and fed the lurid flames with human blood. It was the slavery of thought that disgraced the name of humanity with the barbarous Crusades, and which, by the agency of Holy wars, turned the fair fields of Europe and the plains of Palestine into festering sepulchres, clapping in one embrace the hordes of slaughtered dead. It was this that inspired the cruelty of the Spanish Inquisition, which burnt, in wretched heaps, unfortunate witches, and which put to torture and to death the noblest of the sons of men!

One thing more than all others has contributed to this loss of Religious Liberty, and that is unbounded faith in the Bible as an inspired and infallible book. By uplifting it into the sky of Faith, and fixing it in the Heavens of our conscience, all our actions have been coloured by its light. It is the very foundation of the Jewish Religion, therefore, which has been turned against the Jews themselves. They have clung to the Old Testament, which has furnished the warrants for their own deaths. Had it not been for the horrible commands, massacres, and murders detailed within the pages of the Judaic Books of the Law and the Prophets, the Christians could nowhere else have found a justification for the treatment to which they have constantly subjected the unfortunate believers in Moses. Faith in the Old Testament meant the Death of all Religious Liberty and Freedom of Thought. Had not Moses called upon the Faithful in Israel to "Put every man his sword by his side, and go in and out, from gate to gate, throughout the camp, and slay every man his brother, and every man his companion, and every man his neighbour," because a number had been guilty of worshipping a calf which his own brother, Aaron, had made? Three thousand, we are told, fell, at the instance of this command from Moses, to avenge his God upon the idolators who offered their worship to the calf of Aaron. Had not Elijah slay four hundred and fifty of the prophets of Baal with his own hand? Indeed the Christian saw that the Old Testament was filled with denunciations and punishments of the idolaters and the unfaithful. In the days when the chosen ones were under the direct and special Government of God, whole nations had been exterminated, long and bloody wars had been waged, and horrible massacres perpetrated for the express purpose of preserving unwavering Faith in the laws of Moses and the utterances of inspired Prophets. God himself had not unfrequently assisted his people in their bloody work. He had caused earthquakes to swallow, floods to drown, hail-stones to demolish, fire and brimstone to consume, plagues to destroy, hornets to afflict, serpents to poison, and avenging angels to slay those who in any way rebelled against his cruel rule, or worshipped other Gods. The Christians, with morbid minds dwelling upon these Old Testament accounts, placed the Jews in the same category as the children of Baal, or the worshippers of Moloch, and, with the sanction of divine authority and example, they fell upon the helpless descendants of the authors of those awful deeds, the blackest and bloodiest of all that have survived to civilised times. Had the ancestors of the Jews failed to leave on record the details of their wars of extermination, and their unmerciful treatment of the heretics to their faith, I assert again it would have been impossible for the Christians to have drawn, from any other existing source, either sanction or encouragement for the spirit and the crimes which, committed in the cause of Religion, have disgraced the name of Humanity, steeped her hands in blood, and lain her, drunk with superstition, into the mire and mud of degradation and shame.

Though the Jews have not been devoid of this same narrow spirit, which is the chief enemy of all happiness and all advancement, even in modern times, it must be said, to their credit, that, during the darkest part of the night of Christian Faith, they were among the principal guardians of the light of science and the chief defenders of human knowledge. They pursued their studies in natural science when it was criminal to do so, and they were the Physicians of Europe when Superstition sought to effect a cure for the ills of the human frame by paying mad devotion at some saint-befriended shrine. The name of Ben Ezra, Maimonides, Ben Isaac, Haroun and Jehuda,—poets, astronomers, commentators, writers, and physicians—will live in the memories of men so long as devotion to truth, achievements of the intellect, and the efforts of genius can command the sympathy and applause, the honour and esteem, which they ever do command among the intellectual of mankind. These men, and others of their kind and race, followed the golden thread which the Ariadne of Science held lovingly for their guidance out of the mazes of Ignorance and the gloom of Mediaeval Superstitions. Had it not been for them, dark as these times were, they would still have been darker, and the reign of Ignorance would have been devoid of those rays of light which, like the beacon lights to the mariner, were our only safeguards against the entire wreckage of human thought.

And what was their reward for all this? They were hunted to the death. Banished from one country after another, they were often distressed wanderers upon the Earth, without a single land of refuge. When, in 1306, they were expelled from Montpellier, then the old men, with feeble forms worn out in the service of France and the adornment of their age, died heartbroken by the way-side; and men, women, and children, whose only crime had been the worship of one God, foot-sore and weary, upon the lonely roads of France, rested them at night, shelterless from the storms, and unhoused from the bitter winds that mocked at their cheerless fate. Laws were passed compelling them to wear such dresses as would at once proclaim their faith and nation, and they were fox-bidden all intercourse with Christian subjects. Everything was done to strengthen the fanaticism of bigots, and to deepen the hatred of the ignorant, populace. When, previous to the fourteenth century, a Jew was
executed, even in his death the bitterness of hate did follow him, and consequently he was crucified with his head downwards between two dogs. He who, touched by the mystic wand of love, had bestowed his affections upon some Jewish Maid and had made her the mistress of his heart, was to be put to death. When they were expelled from Spain they offered 30,000 ducats to the Queen to remain. For some time Isabella hesitated, and perhaps she would have granted them their wish, but for the relentless ferocity of the Fanatic Torquemada. With a crucifix in his hand he stood upon the threshold of the Royal Palace, and, confronting the Queen, exclaimed: "Judas sold his God for thirty pieces of silver; you are about to sell him for thirty thousand!" Under such bigotry it was impossible for the Jews to remain, and consequently they were expelled, after suffering untold tortures, from the realms of this bigoted Queen. In 1390 a blood-thirsty fanatic, by the name of Hernando Martinez, devoted himself vigorously to preaching that a Jew ought not to be permitted to live, and the ignorant populace, aroused by his evil eloquence, fell upon the Jewish quarter at Seville, and butchered four thousand of these oppressed people, whilst Martinez himself directed and assisted at the dreadful massacre. At Cordova and at Burgos, at Barcelona, and Toledo, and at other fair cities of Spain, the Christian sword shed Jewish blood, and the zeal of the followers of Christ was exhibited in the murdering of his contrynmen.

Banished from Spain, the King of Portugal promised them protection. Some eighty thousand Jews, placing confidence in the word of a Christian, took refuge in his dominions. They had occasion to bitterly repent it. The ecclesiastics of Spain organised a mission, and fired the clergy of Portugal with the wildest hate. Heart-rending scenes of persecution took place everywhere. At last the King issued an edict that the Jews should, within a certain time, be out of his kingdom, with the exception of the children under fourteen years of age, and these were to be kept and educated as Christians. Then, O! Christian Mother, think what the Jewess of Portugal felt, when her child was torn from her bosom of love, to be placed in the hands of her bitterest enemies! Those she had borne of her womb, and nursed at her breast, she was to see no more. Of her dearest treasures in life she was robbed, and it was better that her life itself had been required. The land was full of mourning and sorrow, and bitter cries of the anguish of parents burdened the pitiless Christian ears. Driven to positive madness, mothers took their own offspring and tore them limb from limb, or hurled them from them into the depths of wells, rather than yield them to the protection of their foes. God grant that the priests may never have the upper hand again, lest such scenes of woe be once more repeated!

It was thus that the Jews suffered for their faith and died as martyrs, because they only worshipped one God! And let it not be supposed that all has been related. I have said nothing of the persecution to which they were subjected in England, and the rest of the countries of Europe. I have said nothing of the multitudes that were slain as a "preliminary exercise" in France prior to the mobs of Europe marching to Palestine on the Crusades against Mahommedans. I have said nothing of numbers of Jews being burned at every Royal marriage in Spain, just by way of sport to the Royal couple. But I have said enough, I think, to show that the proposed religion of "Peace," and the worshippers of the "God of love," were very far indeed from forgiving their enemies, or from exhibiting that charity which is accounted the greatest of the Christian virtues!

It is lamentable that in our days some of the ancient spirit still lingers in the ecclesiastical ranks, and that even in Germany, a country of the profoundest learning and philosophy, it should have prompted the priests to renew the ancient animosities, to open the old wounds, and to propose a re-enactment of those scenes which were even a disgrace to the dark ages. The recent events which have occurred in Russia are still more lamentable and disgraceful, for violence, similar to that of the dark ages, has been resorted to.

But, thanks to the achievements of Science, the progress of the human intellect, and the advancement of civilization, the priests are losing their power. Never again can they use their influence to that extent that the liberty of man will be entirely destroyed, and the intellect of the human race led captive in fetters. Reason has ascended the throne of the present age, and she sways the sceptre of everlasting progress. We are beginning now to look at the merits of man, and not the profession of creed. Man! Man! This is the highest title we can have, and be he Jew or be he Gentile, if he be a good, true, and noble man, he is worthy of our esteem and deserving of our fraternal love.

There is still, however, work to do. The growth of Scepticism has diminished Fanaticism, and we owe our liberties to the dauntless labours, and too often cruel deaths, of brave infidels. But whilst the priests have power at all, that is to say so long as they assume false merits, and seek protection from criticism behind a cowardly sanctity,—so long as they class themselves as specially the servants of Providence, and forbid us to touch their holy garments lest our profanity may spoil them, we must work. Our liberties are in danger just to that extent that they claim and use an immunity for their class which is not granted to any other. To the extent of their real power, as priests, will be the evil they inflict upon our present age and its successors. As men, we say nothing against them, providing they will permit us to criticise them as men. It is to make them more "the man," and less "the priest," that we are working to-day. We say to them—Take off the sacerdotal robes and stand up and instruct us as man to man, and our indignation shall cease; but, whilst you protect yourselves and inflict injury on others in performance of your functions as Priests, we shall place ourselves on the side of humanity to
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Ancient Fictions v. Modern Facts and Modern Criticisms of Some Ancient Worthies.

FRIENDS—

In treating of subjects that have been held for so many centuries, both by tradition and training, as sacred and above criticism, I have deemed it expedient to make a few prefatory remarks in reference to the style adopted. Not having been long organised as a society, it is reasonable to expect that some of our members may be unable to free themselves at once from the effects of a life's teachings, and may possibly be inclined to deprecate the adoption of raillery and ridicule in reference to religious subjects, and may also urge that great consideration should be paid to the feelings of all who differ from us. Desiring to pay the utmost deference to objections which will be found to resolve themselves into the two named, I have thought it necessary to anticipate and answer them.

First—In reference to the value of raillery and ridicule as effective agents for attacking and reforming abuses. We are all aware that no publication has been so successful in this line as the London Punch, which for over 40 years has stood unrivalled as a caricaturist, and has often, by covering some undesirable scheme or measure with ridicule, fairly laughed it to defeat. One memorable instance out of many, was when Mr. Lowe, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, contemplated imposing a halfpenny tax upon every box of matches sold. So confident were the Government of being able to carry their Bill, that £250,000 worth of stamps were prepared for immediate issue. For a few weeks Punch fairly overflowed with wit and grotesque humour heaped upon the proposal, and by its influence upon public opinion, there is no doubt, was mainly instrumental in causing the withdrawal of the Bill. I am not so presumptuous as to imagine myself capable of wielding such weapons with the skill of Punch's contributors, aspiring to nothing more than, the position of a volunteer skirmisher, ambitious of popping a shot into the serried flanks of the enemy, and asking your kind indulgence for any lack of skill displayed. The claim the appeal for "consideration" has upon Freethinkers may be estimated by the reflection that for centuries Freethinkers have been subjected to the bitterest persecutions at the hands of the Church and its upholders, it is possible to conceive. In the present day the power of inflicting the faggot and stake, cruel tortures, imprisonments, mutilation, and confiscations, has fortunately passed away, due entirely to secular progress and intellectual advancement outside of the Church, and won solely by the sacrifices and heroic endurance of Freethought martyrs. But innumerable opportunities of subjecting unbelievers to a variety of social tyrannies by the dominant sects still remain, and are freely exercised. In this city at this moment there are hundreds holding the same opinions as ourselves upon religious questions, who dare not avow them openly, because it would be certain to entail social ostracism, loss of profession or business, and disabilities to which it would be almost impossible to expect them to submit. We who are so fortunately placed as to be enabled to have the courage of our opinions, cannot blame, but only pity their position. At the same time we recognise the especial duty imposed upon us of labouring, to the utmost of our ability, to bring about a more tolerant state of affairs.

Col. Ingersoll has very truly described the position referred to above, in the words "that every individual not perfectly free to act according to his honest convictions, is a certificate of the meanness and intolerance of the community among which he resides. Raillery and ridicule Voltaire found most effective weapons in his day, and their value for attacking abuses is now fully recognised in England. Often a timely keen-pointed shaft of ridicule will penetrate the obtuse intellect of a dull unreasoning supporter of existing superstitions, and awaken a spirit of enquiry, where the sententious and ponderous arguments of mature thought, however logical and unanswerable, would fail of effect."
After this somewhat lengthened introduction, I will now proceed with what may appear to some the almost useless task of threshing straw, and slaying the slain. But as it is only by continuous assaults, and as it has been rather forcibly expressed by "damnable iteration" that any effect can be produced, we will commence with that oft-exploded fiction the Creation, and "reputed fall of man," as recorded in the 1st and 2nd chapters of Genesis, upon which is based the whole theory of the atonement and redemption, and entire superstructure of the Christian religion.

Although geological discoveries have demonstrated the vast antiquity of the earth, it is scarcely necessary to seek its aid to refute such a clumsily constructed narrative. The sun being the source of light and heat, millions of years before the time assigned for the Mosaic creation, and under peculiar atmospheric conditions, had stimulated such a prolific and luxuriant vegetation that resulted in the deposition of vast beds of decomposed vegetable matter, evidence of which exist in the extensive coal measures now worked. And yet the sun which is 1,250,000 times larger than our earth, and whose apparent rising and setting constitutes the difference between day and night, light and darkness, is in Genesis represented as not having been made until the fourth day of creation, only some 6000 years ago; while we are also told in the same account that, there had been mornings and evenings, day and night before his existence; to say nothing of the absurdity of an orb of such vast dimensions being made and fixed in the sky, for the sole purpose of giving light to an insignificant ball 1,250,000 times smaller than itself. After Adam was made, we are told that the All Seeing, All Powerful, All Wise, All Perfect, congratulated Himself upon His work, and pronounced it very good, and shortly afterwards discovered that it was not perfect, was not good, as there was no helpmeet for man. And then followed the first recorded instance of Anaesthetics being used for a surgical operation, as during a deep sleep, a rib was abstracted from Adam's side with which to form a woman. It appears that the All Wise had had no experience or foreknowledge of the insatiable curiosity of His latest production; and taking the account as it stands must believe that it was confidently expected that the command to abstain from eating the fruit of a certain tree would be obeyed. We know there is a sect which maintains that the disobedience and fall were pre-ordained, and I must ad- mit that this contention, is quite reconcilable with divine justice as pourtrayed throughout the book. But happily as between man and man, a much more intelligent and humane conception of right and justice prevails, drawn from a purer and more enlightened source than the musty records of a semi-barbarous period. We mortals are not left long in doubt as to the results, the fruit was, as a matter of course, tasted, and like a true woman shared with her husband, whose magnanimity was not very conspicuous in trying to fix upon her the sole blame of the indulgence. Then follows the fierce denunciation, and expulsion from the garden of both for this wifely act. The serpent for its share in the transaction was condemned to crawl upon its belly all the days of its life. It is curious to consider what other form of locomotion it could have, considering its ordinary shape and length. We can only imagine it as progressing in some kind of complicated knot, or reared aloft tilting upon the tip of its tail. It may be noted here that fossil remains of the same kinds of reptiles have been found, proving that they existed in the same form as known to us hundreds of thousands of years before the date referred to; and also that the Serpent and Tree were religious emblems, and symbols of worship in India ere the Egyptians existed as a nation, thousands of years before the time fixed by the Jewish historian for the creation.

To proceed with our story, it is recorded that Adam gave names to every living thing that had been created. Now if the writer had handed down those names, we could have spared the chapter of genealogies that follow, and what an assistance it would have been to evolutionists; we should have known exactly what stock we started with on our career, and by an occasional stock-taking have been enabled to test whether the original capital was intact or otherwise. Noah had a fine opportunity of supplying the omission when drafting the animals into the Ark, but unfortunately he neglected it; due probably to his having taken a good stock of wine on board, as we find there was some left at the end of the voyage. To return to the events of the garden. It appears that the partaking of this involuntary dessert after an al-fresco lunch, had the remarkable effect of so opening Adam's eyes, that he for the first time became conscious of his own identity, and also of Eve's surpassing loveliness, to which it appears he had been previously insensible. The plain and reasonable inference to be drawn from the context by anyone not religiously blind is, that this discovery, particularly the latter, implied an awakened intelligence, which instead of involving a fall to eternal perdition, we should naturally conclude had raised him to a platform immeasurably above the brute creation, which he appears to have previously occupied. Therefore if we are to draw a moral from this Eastern myth, instead of taking the semi-savage one of degredation and misery, that was quite congenial with the ignorant and barbarous age in which it originated, how much more sensible and elevating to suppose it to imply that, man can only rise in the intellectual scale by his own efforts, and that the first and strongest impulse in this direction usually proceeds from woman—"the first links in the intellectual chain are forged in the arms of the nurse."

The next scene in the drama introduces us to Cain and Abel offering sacrifices. And we find that the sacrifice which was most acceptable, had involved the taking of life, while the pure fruits of the earth were
rejected, and that this preference resulted in an accession of jealousy, a quarrel, the descent of a club, and another tragic sacrifice. We cannot help sympathising with the "Bible in Schools' Associations," and others, in their efforts to restore this, and the numberless other fine moral lessons to our public schools, for the instruction and training of the youthful mind. This principle of sacrifice pervades the entire book, and is mostly of a sanguinary character. Abraham was authorised to slay his son Isaac for a sacrifice. And from this period onwards, we find every event initiated, or consummated by a sacrifice. Individuals, families, communities, the nation as a whole are represented as continually sacrificing, until the idea finally expanded into the grand conception that the whole world required a sacrifice, and, as no mere mortal could possibly suffice for such a limitless atonement, no less a victim than the Son of God was deemed worthy of such a stupendous honour, by which it is alleged the human race has been redeemed from the consequences of Adam's fall.

History teaches us that it is chiefly among barbaric and semi-civilised nations that this idea of sacrifice is found, and that not infrequently humanity supplies the victims. In the present day there are some remote parts of the earth, where the influence of modern civilisation has not penetrated sufficiently to abate the savage customs of the inhabitants, and where sacrifices of human beings are of annual occurrence. Only the other day we were informed by telegram that 200 young girls were slain, and their blood used in the mixing of the mortar required in the construction of a temple to some of their gods. The plain common sense inference is, that this idea of sacrifice is essentially a product of the earliest and most savage condition of primitive man, and remains a characteristic of a barbarous or semi-civilised people. And as it is invariably associated with other detestable vices, the records of the doings of such a people can have no moral value or interest for us, except as frightful examples of depravity to be avoided and fought against. What is now, and has always been, the chief rite and sacrament of the Christian Church, but a ceremony designed for the express purpose of perpetuating the memory of a sacrifice, and the partaking of which is indispensable for church membership, young girls and ladies of gentle nurture and refinement, who would shudder and recoil at the sight of blood, are taught to esteem, as a blessed privilege, the joining in a ceremony where a vessel containing a small quantity of wine, specially prepared, to assist the impression produced by the words uttered in presenting it, is passed from lip to lip of any number of votaries, and the dregs afterwards drained by the minister, that not a drop of the consecrated mixture may be lost.

The hymns in use in all the churches may be considered as saturated with the same sanguinary sentiments, particularly one No. 107, called the "Precious blood of Christ." I lately attended one of Mrs. Hampson's meetings, and was chiefly struck with the bountiful use which she made of this "blood" argument; it also being declared absolutely necessary to salvation that everyone must be (metaphorically) washed in the blood of Jesus Pursuing the record, we find that wickedness had so increased with the multiplication of the race, that the deluge was resolved on for the purpose of destroying not only mankind, but all living things from off the face of the earth, a family of eight persons and sufficient representatives of the animal creation with which to make a fresh start, being appointed to be saved from the otherwise general doom.

According to the ancient scientific construction of the universe, the earth was a comparatively level plain, enclosed in a semi-spherical globe, called the firmament, dividing immense seas above, from the earth below, and suggesting to the philosophical and inspired writer, a convenient and effective method of swamping the latter when deemed necessary, by simply opening a sluice or two, translated as windows. As the only reference to the wickedness recorded is the circumstance of the angels descending from Heaven, and conspiring with the daughters of earth, we are led to infer that divine justice required the punishment of the latter, and that the angels referred to, whom in our ignorance we might deem the principal sinners, were passed over unmolested. Has not history down to, and including our own times, demonstrated the universality of the same kind of justice when woman is concerned. Byron expresses the same idea when writing of woman's position in society, in the words—

—— "Victim when wrong,
And martyr oft when right."

The ancient measurements of the ark, when reduced to English feet will give a vessel nearly the size of the Great Eastern, and although we may smile at the idea of a vessel of even those dimensions being large enough to provide accommodation for the animals, nothing is said about the food supply, except that it was to be provided, showing that no miraculous interference with the animals' appetites was contemplated. As a large proportion of the animals were carnivorous, the teeth and claws of liens, tigers, &c., being cited by the defenders of dogmas, as evidences of design, namely to prey upon other animals, a very large additional number were necessary to ration the others, and these, again, other animals, and so on down the scale to rats and mice for the cats, &c. And this provision would have been necessary for not only the 150 days during which the water is said to have prevailed, but for a very long period after its subsidence, or like the Kilkenny cats, they would have devoured each other, and thus numberless links in the chain of creation would have been irrevocably lost. As the heavenly fiat had gone forth that all living things were to be destroyed, fishes must have
been included in the general doom, and, as no explanation is given how this was accomplished, we must suppose that the seas first overflowed and killed all the fresh water fish, and were soon after so diluted with such a tremendous influx of fresh water, as sufficed to destroy all the rest, and afterwards there was a special creation to renew the stock, which the inspired writer has forgotten to refer to. Then we have the covenant, and the bow in the clouds. As the inspired writer flourished a few centuries before much was known about the effects of reflection, and refraction of light, which any schoolboy of the present day can demonstrate with the aid of a glass globe filled with water; we can excuse his ignorance, but not his clumsy method of exposing it.

Noah having had such a surfeit of water, it is not surprising that he lost no time in making provision for a more agreeable beverage. He planted a vineyard; having judiciously preserved a good stock of vines, we may suppose in anticipation of experiencing a peculiar stage of hydrophobia, that he expected to supernove.

After the first vintage it appears his antipathy to the former beverage, led him to use it in even less proportion, and in consequence without the immunity ascribed to the famous Dutchman Mynheer Van Dunck.

It will, perhaps, appear strange to those who have not taken the trouble to expend any thought upon this wonderful event, to be told that this flood, which is stated to have submerged the highest mountains under Heaven, was insufficient to float the Ark from where it had been built, and therefore, that Noah instead of having been floated away to unknown regions, must upon the subsidence of the water, have found that after all he had never left his native village. The recorded height of the flood is given as 15 cubits, and taking the cubit at 18 inches, this gives 22 feet 6 inches as the extreme height of the flood. Why, in modern times we have had inundations in America, India, France, Hungary, and recently in Spain, far surpassing that, and probably covering as large a section of the earth as was known to Noah and his contemporaries.

It will perhaps be said that the cubit given must have referred to quite a different measure, but if so, it would also apply to the dimensions of the Ark; now the measurement of the Ark reckoning the cubit at 18 inches gives 450 feet for its length and 75 feet in breadth which is about midway between the size of the largest vessel of war afloat, and the Great Eastern, the latter being 680 x 83, therefore it is inconceivable that this size could have been indefinitely increased. The fact is patent to the upholders of religious creeds that, credulous people will not, and careless unthinking ones do not, trouble to question anything they, the priests, choose to assert has a divine authority and sanction. Hence we still have these abounding contradictions, and absurd inconsistencies promulgated weekly from 40,000 pulpits, by a specially trained, self-interested army of preachers, to as many congregations; with all that imperturable complacency and assurance, which is only found where divine authority is claimed, and the people taught to regard, as the peculiar privilege of the speaker.

Of the tower of Babel it is only necessary to remark that, the divinely inspired writer pays small compliment to the wisdom of the All-Knowing One, in supposing it was necessary to confuse the tongues, and scatter the workmen, to frustrate the project of building a tower to reach above the skies.

Having critically examined two of the chief events recorded in this inspired book, it will be a desirable change to turn awhile from such childish myths, which were written for, and only adapted to the infancy of our race, and review the lives and characters of a few of the heroes who flourished in the same early and benighted period, but who are lauded, and held up as bright examples for us to emulate and follow. The records of their evil lives is singularly consistent (where there is so much inconsistency), with a very primitive and partially civilised state of society—actions which at the present day would richly merit an acquaintance with the inside of our gaols, and in numberless instances the last dread operation of the law. And yet Christians who have in all ages and countries persecuted the Jews, have nevertheless appropriated this record of that much despised race, and having made it the sheet anchor of Christendom, regard the heroes referred to as the especial favourites of deity. One, the most notorious evil liver of the lot, according to our modern ideas of morality, was especially singled out as the “Man after God's own heart.” And this is the book that strenuous efforts are to be made to re-introduce to our schools, that the characters of the rising generation may be formed on the models of an ancient semi-savage people, whose notions of justice, decency, and morality have nothing in common, but much in direct opposition to modern culture and refinement. We know it is said that the faithful delineation of human character requires that both the good and evil should be portrayed, and that this ad-mixture proves the truthfulness of the records. But while admitting that the characters were quite as bad, perhaps a great deal worse than represented, we have a right to object to the displaying of such examples of vice, and to question its value for the training and instruction of our children. The same argument if logically acted upon, would admit the Newgate Calendar to our schools, as a useful lesson book. The Spartans of old were wont to make their helots drunk, in order to disgust their sons with the sight of intemperance, but if experience and common sense, revolt at such a pernicious use being made of the crimes and follies of others, then why should any exception be made in favour of similar exhibitions that abound in a book, simply because infatuated enthusiasts choose to regard the same book as divinely inspired, and a knowledge of which is deemed necessary for perpetuating a system of ethics, that many sensible and enquiring minds have come to consider a baleful superstition. The tremendous
catastrophe of swamping the earth and its inhabitants, appears to have quite failed of the object of eradicating its wickedness, as the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah with fire and brimstone was so soon afterwards found to be necessary, and, as the first eight selected and saved to found a new world do not appear, from the result, to have been any better than Lot and his companions, its non-reformation is not very remarkable. Abram, or Abraham, called the father of the faithful, and deemed worthy of being the founder of the chosen people, affords another instance where the absence of all the qualities now deemed necessary to constitute an upright, truthful and moral character, seemed a special recommendation for divine favour. His readiness to murder his son Isaac at the command of God, is held up as a model of what true faith should be, and is required in a believer. How would such a plea be received in our law courts? Giteau stated at his trial for the assassination of President Garfield, that he was commanded by God to shoot him, but the jury paid no regard to the plea. Abraham's truthfulness is made manifest in passing his wife off as his sister, when substantial benefits were to be obtained by so doing; and his tenderness and conjugal love are beautifully illustrated in driving Hagar, his bond-slave and concubine, with her child—his child—from his home to perish in the wilderness.

The backslidings, and slaughterings of his descendants are in strict keeping with the character of their founder. This model patriarch is subsequently represented as performing the acrobatic feat of carrying Lazarus to heaven in his bosom. Of Isaac not much is said, but he is also made to illustrate how lightly, and in what small esteem the conjugal tie and chastity were held by these holy men, when personal security or profit was to be obtained by disregarding either. Jacob early displayed the cunning and untruthfulness of his progenitor Abraham. From his taking advantage of his brother's necessities to obtain his birthright, and cheating his old blind father out of his blessing, to his manipulating of Laban's flocks for the increasing of his own share, is one long series of dissimulation and deceit, and is made to appear so worthy and meritorious, as to call down the divine blessing and approval; for besides numerous promises of favours, &c., it is expressly recorded that "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated" (Rom. is. v. 5), notwithstanding which, any intelligent and impartial reader would not fail to consider the forgiving Esau by far the nobler of the two brothers. After Jacob had forestalled his brother, and to escape from the effects of his just resentment, he was packed off by his mother to his uncle Laban, and on the journey, night coming on, he laid down to sleep, first selecting a stone for a pillow. It is related of a chieftain and his son, that while travelling in the snowy highlands of Scotland, and before laying down to sleep, the latter rolled together some snow for a pillow, but the father indignantly kicked it away, incensed at such a sign of effeminacy in his son. Whether the stone pillow, or indigestion caused Jacob to dream, it is recorded that he "dreamed a dream." We all know of the sometimes complete or partial activity of the brain, while the rest of the body is wrapped in unconscious slumber, but no regard is now paid to such unsubstantial vagaries of the mind. Occasionally curious coincidences occur between dreams and subsequent experiences, but beyond noting their occurrence no further significance is attached to such accidental resemblances, but, as a belief in witchcraft was very generally entertained two or three hundred years, ago so a profound belief in dreams prevailed, we may be assured, in the prehistoric ages, and at the period referred to in the Bible they were regarded as direct communications from God. Hence we find the importance attached to dreams is of itself conclusive evidence of the profound ignorance that then existed of the ordinary operations of the mind. Jacob's dream, upon the occasion referred to, does not appear to have impressed him with any very exalted notions of heaven, as upon awaking he was in a great fright, thinking it a dreadful place to inspire such dreams, considering the place, as what we should call, haunted.

Why angels, possessed of wings and other attributes, supposed to render them superior to our sublunary laws of motion, should require ladders to descend from and ascend to the ethereal spheres is passed over unexplained, probably they desired to exhibit certain acrobatic feats for the special entertainment of Jacob, exultant at the chance of escaping from the dull monotony of "loafing round the throne," as a well-known American writer tersely puts it.

In the foregoing we have the three scriptural characters, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the patriarchal Trinity so often referred to in the Bible, and re-produced in the Book of Common Prayer of the Christian Church, with such effusive union, and from whom S.Matthew attempts to trace descent of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, or rather of Joseph, his reputed father, but who, according to Christian theology, had no concern in his son's parentage, while Joseph himself was the son of two fathers, and the curiously mixed genealogy referred to includes Pharez and Zarah, sons of Judah, by Tamar, his own daughter-in-law (Gen. xxxviii), and Solomon, son of David, by Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah the Hittite. In Luke's version of the same genealogy, several names are omitted, presumably on account of their unworthiness, Nathan being substituted for Solomon, but Pharez and Judah are retained, upon which commentators have not thought it necessary to remark, although we have scriptural authority for the saying that, if the fountain be defiled, the stream cannot be pure.

We may pause here, and defer to a future occasion a continuation of the review of Bible characters and incidents, and refer to a few of the modern facts that more particularly concern us in our relations to the world we inhabit. The discoveries of science, whether regarded in their application to our material wants, or in the
inestimable service rendered to humanity, by freeing the mind from a mass of ignorant conceptions and delusions, that have in the past barred the road of progress and enlightenment, are equally deserving of our grateful recognition. Science, and *ergo*, knowledge, is the Archimedian lever that alone can lift us out of the slough of ignorance and superstition in which it has always been the interest and endeavour of the Church to keep us steeped. From the time when the Christian Church assumed and monopolised the supreme power of directing and controlling the mental aspirations of a large section of the civilised world, down until quite recent time, all its energies have been con-centrated upon a fierce and savage attempt at the repression of all freedom of thought and utterance, if suspected of questioning or conflicting with the old worn out myths and fables of a by-gone and illiterate age.

The discoveries in the comparatively modern science of geology, have almost revolutionised thought during the last half century. From the earliest period the conclusions of scientists have been violently opposed by the supporters of the Bible theory. In a former age Galelio was persecuted for promulgating views which were equally novel and obnoxious to the supporters of a religious system based upon written records, for which a divine inspiration is claimed, but which we have very conclusively shown reflects only the ignorance, and, in many respects, the barbarism of an early stage of our common humanity.

Those who have had no opportunity of learning anything about the symbol worship of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, and Brahmins of India, would be surprised to know how largely remainants of the same enter into, and are incorporated, with the forms, ceremonies, and ritual of modern religious services and beliefs. The Bishop's mitre is borrowed from the ancient fish dress of an Egyptian priest, and many ornaments, ecclesiastical and architectural, now in use, formerly represented ideas little suspected by their admirers. The cross and crosier were religious emblems before the date assigned for the Mosaic creation, and if their original significance were generally understood, they would receive scant reverence from their votaries of the present day.

The one great modern fact that may be said to embrace all other facts, is the rapid spread of rational and secular ideas upon politics, religion, morals, and education; which has already exercised a marked influence upon that most antago-nistic and conservative institution, the Christian Church, which has ruled mankind, and fettered the free exercise of the intellect, for the past eighteen centuries. So long as it rested with the Church to withhold all education from the people, or to allow of such only as tended to secure a perpetuation of her absolutism, there was but one attitude, that of determined and bitter hostility towards all or any attempts to break through the bonds of a servile superstition. But since the inherent force of intellect and genius, has snapped link after link of the mental chain so cunningly forged for its special purpose, and through inconceivable pains, penalties, and persecutions, has secured for the people a large measure of liberty of thought and action, secular progress has been rapid and sure. So much so that the Church itself has not been able to resist the humanising influence of the outward pressure, having, if not considerably modified some of the former tenets, discreetly kept them in the background; a few fanatics, hot gospellers, and revivalists, being now the chief exponents of hell fire and brimstone doctrines, to the occasional dismay, and sometimes the confirmed lunacy of weak-minded women.

The almost universal attention now paid to the education of the young, and the general establishment of secular schools, during the last few years, may be expected to have a marked influence in liberalising thought among the masses of the next generation.

So little attention had been paid to popular education in England forty years ago, that I remember during Lord Melbourne's administration, attention being drawn in the public press, to the fact that while £70,000 was voted for the Queen's stables, £30,000 was considered sufficient for subsidising elementary schools. From a return of last year I find the annual cost of the English Board Schools was £1,235,360 9s. 3d., while the school fee of 2d per week paid by the children amounted to £1,480,000, with an average attendance of 204,334, and a computed additional attendance of 10,000 children each year. This is exclusive of 178,150 attending voluntary schools, assisted by the Government in the form of grants for results on periodic examinations.

Notwithstanding the immense advance here shown in the matter of education, we have here, in the youngest dependency of the British Empire, gone beyond the old country in this direction. About the time named, the first band of English settlers were just starting to found a colony in these Islands, and now we can boast of the establishment of a national, free, and secular system of education, at an annual cost exceeding a quarter of a million sterling, which, considered in proportion to the respective revenues of the two countries, is equivalent, in England, to about five millions, devoted to this special purpose.

The clergy here do not conceal the chagrin felt at the substitution of secular for denominational schools, knowing very well that, unless their dogmas are impressed upon the mind during the pliant period of youth, there is small chance of their being embraced when the judgment has matured. One reverend gentleman in a Church Synod, held in this city sometime ago, did not hesitate to utter an undeserved calumny upon all the children attending the Government schools, by stating that they were easily known by their boorish and ruffianly behaviour, or words to that effect, he probably missed that reverential deference to a black coat,
which, with the catechism, is usually made the ne plus ultra of a Church school education.

The triumph of science can be only approximately realised by the impetus given to the general diffusion of knowledge, resulting from the giant strides made by the postal, telegraphic, and telephonic facilities for intercommunication now available to nearly all classes of the community; and electricity bids fair with advancing knowledge to develope into a not less important auxiliary. The steam engine has been a powerful agent in the same direction, during the last fifty years, by breaking down barriers and prejudices, the growth of centuries of isolation, and rendering possible a union and reciprocal interchange of thought and community of interests following the paths of commerce, which would otherwise have been unattainable. And in consequence we may reasonably hope, it has shortened by many decades the advent of that time when nations, more fully realising their common humanity, and impressed with a truer sense of life's obligations here, than can be gained by the contemplation of improbable hereafters, and resolutely discarding the teachings of effêté and worn out superstitions, will cease to engage in the deadly and senseless wars which have chiefly characterised the rule of rival faiths in the miserable past.

Introduction.

When an author has the fortune to be attacked by every succeeding writer upon the same subject for upwards of a century, and when his opinions, so far from being crushed out, become more widely spread by each "refutation," it induces a supicion that "sohisms" so constantly refuted may be truisms after all. This has been notably the case with the essay here reprinted. Since its first publication in 1748 it has been the bête noire of Christian controversialisists. Campbell, Paley, De Quincey, Chalmers, Whately, Babbage, Mansel, Mozley, and a shoal of ministerial minnows sailing in the wake of these theological Tritons, have felt it incumbent upon them to refute "sohisms" of the sceptic Hume. Yet no one will say that unbelief in the miraculous is upon the decline. On the contrary, never were Christians less anxious to insist upon the supernatural elements of their religion, and never more willing to seek reconcilements with science; never were there so many trained minds with perfect confidence that the uniformity of nature has never been disturbed by coups d'état célestes.

In truth, Hume's argument, though so constantly assailed, has never been refuted at all. It has been misapprehended and evaded, but it remains as unanswerable as that of Archbishop Tillotson against the real presence. And this, because in point of fact—the terms being rightly understood—it is a truism. John Stuart Mill well says : "Hume's celebrated principle that nothing is credible which is contradictory to experience, or at variance with laws of nature, is merely this very plain and harmless proposition, that whatever is contradictory to a complete induction is incredible. That such a maxim as this should either be accounted a dangerous heresy, or mistaken for a great and recondite truth, speaks ill for the state of philosophical speculation on such subjects." ("System of Logic," book 3, chap. xxv., sec. 2.)

Few essays so brief, for it must be borne in mind that the first part contains the argument complete in itself, have been so persistently misunderstood. The whole school of Christian-evidence writers have either argued as it were an à priori. argument against the possibility of miracles, or as if it were an argument against testimony being received for wonders; whereas it is neither the one nor the other. Principal Campbell, as Mill points out, "Logic." See the "Three Essays," p. 217.

considered it a complete answer to Hume's doctrine (that things are incredible which are contrary to the uniform course of experience) that we do not disbelieve, merely because the chances were against them, things in strict conformity to the uniform course of experience. Yet no one would call an unusual combination which was found by experience to occur among the whole number of possible cases a miracle, save in the popular, indefinite style of speech which is totally unfit for theological, and still more for logical, purposes. And here lies the gist of the whole misunderstanding. Everyone knows that both etymologically and popularly the word miracle is equivalent simply to a wonder. But Hume's argument is not directed against the occurrence of wonders, prodigies or unprecedented events; though it offers a criterion by which the value of their evidence can be judged. He was not such a simpleton as to contend, or intend, that no testimony could be sufficient to add to our knowledge of the laws of nature. His argument is based on the theological definition of miracles as infractions of the laws of nature by a supernatural being or beings exterior to those laws.

The essay has done much to modify the views of theologians, and they have since its time done their best to class their miracles under "unknown laws." Yet Canon Mozley, certainly the ablest late defender of miracles, admits that "their evidential value depends entirely upon their deviating from the order of nature." A miracle in the theological sense denotes not simply the counteraction of one natural law by another, which is not opposed to experience, but the suppression of the law of uniformity of cause and effect, which experience shows to be universal, and in which all other laws are included.

As Hume puts it, unless there were an uniform experience against any miraculous event, "the event would not merit that appellation." If, by some unknown law, persons could, under given conditions, be raised from the dead, such facts, however wonderful, would take their place in the vast scheme of nature, and no more be properly entitled supernatural than any other. But such an event is classed as a miracle, as our essayist says, "because it has never been observed in any age or country."

The instance of the King of Siam rejecting accounts of ice has often, foolishly enough, been emoted against Hume by opponents who failed to notice the distinction between a discovery of the laws of nature and their suspension. If we could be taken to a region where the dead rise at command with the same certainty that water freezes when the temperature is below a certain point the fact would be indubitable, but the miracle would be gone. We cannot admit a proposition as a law of nature and yet believe a fact in contradiction to it. We must disbelieve the alleged fact, or believe that we are mistaken in admitting the supposed law. In gaining the fact the miracle is lost; because to this, the supernatural nature of the fact, all testimony is incompetent. Mr. W. R. Greg pointed out that


the assertion of a miracle being performed involves three elements, a fact and two inferences. It predicates, first, that such an event took place; second, that it was brought about by the act and will of the individual to whom it is attributed; third, that it could not have been produced by natural means. The fact may have been correctly observed, and yet either or both of the inferences be unwarranted; or either inference may be rendered unsound by the slightest deviation from accuracy in the observation or statement of the fact. Nay, any new discovery in science may show that the inference which has hitherto appeared quite irrefragable, was, in fact, wholly unwarranted and incorrect.

But it has been said: Assume a supernatural power and the antecedent improbability of supernatural visitations is removed. Paley says, "In a word, once believe that there is a God, and miracles are not incredible."

Evidences of Christianity. "Preparatory Considerations."

To this assertion Mill has been thought to lend his authority. He endorses Hume's argument only as substantiating that "no evidence can prove a miracle to anyone who did not previously believe the existence of a being or beings with supernatural power; or who believes himself to have full proof that the character of the Being whom he recognises, is inconsistent with his having seen fit to interfere on the occasion in question."

"System of Logic," Bk. 3, ch. xxv., sec. 2. Dr. Farrar's abuse of Mill's reasoning is well exposed by the author of "Supernatural Religion," Pt. 1, ch. iii.

Now this statement is inadequate. The existence of God, if He be the Supreme Cause of the order of the universe, is rather an additional difficulty to those who think that order was created by Him and subsequently disturbed. The argument against miracles rests on our experience of the order of nature; and is, therefore, equally valid whether a cause of that order be assumed or not. For the only test of the will or way of working of such a cause is to be found within the order itself. Any interference with that order still has to be proved by testimony; and the question remains whether it is more credible that men have been deceived, or that the laws of nature have been disturbed?

This last is the aspect of the argument which comes home to the popular mind. Every individual has experience that men lie and make mistakes; none that miracles occur. Experiment upon experiment; the records of generation after generation; the very stability of our life depends upon and confirms the belief in the uniformity of law. "In the case of miracles, then," says Professor Tyndall, "it behoves us to understand the weight of the negative before we assign a value to the positive; to comprehend the protest of nature before we attempt to measure with it the assertions of men."


Paley's supposition of "twelve men whose probity and good sense I had well known," who should be ready, one after another, to be racked, burnt or strangled, rather than give up the assertion that they had witnessed miracles, does not even meet the ease. For how could it be shown that it was impossible for these twelve men to be deceived? Twelve infallible men would be as incredible as any miracle they were supposed to assert. Paley's reference is simply a disingenuous attempt to imply that twelve good witnesses testified to the Christian miracles at the time and in the place where they are said to have occurred, and that they suffered on this account. Whereas not one single original witness is known; nor can even any early Christian be proved to have suffered for his belief in miracles.

Professor Huxley, who, in his admirable little book on Hume, very captiously, as it seems to me, takes exception to Hume's defining miracles in their theological sense, agrees that his arguments on the matter of testimony resolve themselves into a simple statement of the dictates of common-sense, which may be expressed in this canon: the more a statement of fact conflicts with previous experience, the more complete must be the evidence which is to justify us in believing it. It is upon this principle that everyone carries on the business of common life. "If," continues the Professor, "a man tells me he saw a piebald horse in Piccadilly, I believe him
without hesitation. The thing itself is likely enough, and there is no imaginable motive for his deceiving me. But if the same person tells me he observed a zebra there, I might hesitate a little about accepting his testimony, unless I were well satisfied, not only as to his previous acquaintance with zebras, but as to his powers and opportunities of observation in the present case. If, however, my informant assured me that he beheld a centaur trotting down that famous thoroughfare, I should emphatically decline to credit his statement; and this even if he were the most saintly of men, and ready to suffer martyrdom in support of his belief. In such a case I could, of course, entertain no doubt of the good faith of the witness; it would be only his competency, which, unfortunately, has very little to do with good faith or intensity of conviction, which I should presume to call in question."


The sceptic being securely entrenched in the first part of the essay, the second carries the war into the super naturalists' camp. With the confidence of a thorough student of human nature and historian, Hume gives his conviction that there is not in all history an wholly trustworthy testimony to miraculous events. Huxley says on this passage (page 10 of this edition) :-"These are grave assertions, but they are least likely to be challenged by those who have made it their business to weigh evidence and to give their decision under a due sense of the moral responsibility which they incur in so doing."

Miracles are only alleged to have happened among people devoid of scientific information and critical spirit. The learned author of "Supernatural Religion," in his chapter on "The Age of Miracles," gives abundant proof that the miracles now credited arose in a time of the grossest superstition, among a people believing in the every-day operations of angels and demons, full of religious excitement, and prone to exaggeration. In an age of science, where no one expects miracles, they do not occur, and most are ready to take as evidence of superstition the belief in any others than those in faith of which they have themselves been reared. The same silent process which has destroyed the belief in fairies and witchcraft has undermined all other supernatural beliefs, and they only await the application of criticism to be levelled with the dust. It is true the universe remains a mystery. In one sense every atom is a miracle. It is so because man's faculties are finite and the relations of nature infinite. But the mystery of nature affords no ground for belief in miraculous events, the only testimony to which has been handed down from superstitious and ill-informed ancestors. It is rather a reason for abstaining from the only light we have—the light which comes from reason and observation. The part of a wise man is to study and investigate, and "proportion his belief to the evidence."

There being slight variations in the various editions of the Essay, the present text has been carefully compared with all those in the library of the British Museum.

**On Miracles.**

**Part I.**

**THERE** is in Dr. Tillotson's writings an argument against the real presence which is as concise, and elegant, and strong as any argument can possibly be supposed against a doctrine that is so little worthy of a serious refutation. It is acknowledged on all hands, says that learned prelate, that the authority, either of the scripture or of tradition, is founded merely in the testimony of the apostles, who were eye-witnesses to those miracles of our Savior, by which he proved his divine mission. Our evidence, then, for the truth of the Christian religion is less than the evidence for the truth of our senses; because, even in the first authors of our religion, it was no greater; and it is evident it must diminish in passing from them to their disciples; nor can any one be so certain of the truth of their testimony, as of the immediate object of his senses. But a weaker evidence can never destroy a stronger; and therefore, were the doctrine of the real presence ever so clearly revealed in scripture, it Were directly contrary to the rules of just reasoning to give our assent to it. It contradicts sense, though both the scripture and tradition, on which it is supposed to be built, carry not such evidence with them as sense, when they are considered merely as external evidences, and are not brought home to every one's breast by the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit.

Nothing is so convenient as a decisive argument of this kind, which must at least silence the most arrogant bigotry and superstition, and free us from their impertinent solicitations. I matter myself, that I have discovered an argument of a like nature, which, if just, will, with the wise and learned, be an everlasting check to all kinds of superstitious delusion, and consequently, will be useful as long as the world endures. For so long, I presume, will the accounts of miracles and prodigies be found in all history, sacred and profane.

Though experience be our only guide in reasoning concerning matters of fact; it must be acknowledged that this guide is not altogether infallible, but in some cases is apt to lead us into errors and mistakes. One, who, in
fallen under our observation, here is a contest of two opposite experiences; of which the one destroys the other, we are accustomed to find a conformity between them. But when the fact attested is such a one as has seldom connexion historians is not from any less in proportion as the fact is more or less unusual. The reason why we place any credit in witnesses and the marvellous, in that case, the evidence resulting from the testimony admits of a diminution greater or and the contrary, with too violent asseverations. There are many other particulars of the same kind, which may delivering their testimony, or from the union of all these circumstances. We entertain a suspicion concerning opposition of contrary testimony, from the character or number of the witnesses, from the manner of their experience and observation. Where this experience is not entirely uniform on any side, it is attended with an opposition of contrary circumstances which cause any doubt or uncertainty; and when we discover a superiority on any side, we incline to it; but still with a diminution of assurance in proportion to the force of its antagonist.

A wise man, therefore, proportions his belief to the evidence. In such conclusions as are founded on an infallible experience, he expects the event with the last degree of assurance, and regards his past experience as a full proof of the future existence of that event. In other cases he proceeds with more caution: He weighs the opposite experiments: He considers which side is supported by the greatest number of experiments: To that side he inclines with doubt and hesitation; and when at last he fixes his judgment, the evidence exceeds not what we properly call probability. All probability, then, supposes an opposition of experiments and observations; where the one side is found to overbalance the other, and to produce a degree of evidence proportioned to the superiority. A hundred instances or experiments on one side, and fifty on another, afford a very doubtful expectation of any event; though a hundred uniform experiments, with only one that is contradictory, reasonably beget a pretty strong degree of assurance. In all cases, we must balance the opposite experiments, where they are opposite, and deduct the smaller number from the greater, in order to know the exact force of the superior evidence.

To apply these principles to a particular instance; we may observe that there is no species of reasoning more common, more useful, and even necessary to human life, than that derived from the testimony of men, and the reports of eyewitnesses and spectators. This species of reasoning, perhaps, one may deny to be founded on the relation of cause and effect. I shall not dispute about a word. It will be sufficient to observe, that our assurance in any argument of this kind is derived from no other principle than our observation of the veracity of human testimony, and of the usual conformity of facts to the reports of witnesses. It being a general maxim, that no objects have any discoverable connexion together, and that all the inferences which we can draw from one to another are founded merely on our experience of their constant and regular conjunction; it is evident that we ought not to make an exception to this maxim in favor of human testimony, whose connexion with any events seems, in itself, as little necessary as any other. Were not the memory tenacious to a certain degree; had not men commonly an inclination to truth and a principle of probity; were they not sensible to shame when detected in a falsehood: Were not these, I say, discovered by experience to be qualities inherent in human nature, we should never repose the least confidence in human testimony. A man delirious, or noted for falsehood and villainy, has no manner of authority with us.

And as the evidence, derived from witnesses and human testimony, is founded on past experience, so it varies with the experience, and is regarded either as a proof or a probability according as the conjunction between any particular kind of report and any kind of objects, has been found to be constant or variable. There are a number of circumstances to be taken into consideration in all judgments of this kind; and the ultimate standard, by which we determine all disputes that may arise concerning them, is always derived from experience and observation. Where this experience is not entirely uniform on any side, it is attended with an unavoidable contrariety in our judgments, and with the same opposition and mutual destruction of arguments as in every other kind of evidence. We frequently hesitate concerning the reports of others. We balance the opposite circumstances which cause any doubt or uncertainty; and when we discover a superiority on any side, we incline to it; but still with a diminution of assurance in proportion to the force of its antagonist.

This contrariety of evidence, in the present case, may be derived from several different causes; from the opposition of contrary testimony, from the character or number of the witnesses, from the manner of their delivering their testimony, or from the union of all these circumstances. We entertain a suspicion concerning any matter of fact when the witnesses contradict each other, when they are but few or of a doubtful character, when they have an interest in what they affirm, when they deliver their testimony with doubt and hesitation, or, on the contrary, with too violent asseverations. There are many other particulars of the same kind, which may diminish or destroy the force of any argument derived from human testimony.

Suppose, for instance, that the fact which the testimony endeavors to establish partakes of the extraordinary and the marvellous, in that case, the evidence resulting from the testimony admits of a diminution greater or less in proportion as the fact is more or less unusual. The reason why we place any credit in witnesses and historians is not from any connexion, which we perceive à priori, between testimony and reality, but because we are accustomed to find a conformity between them. But when the fact attested is such a one as has seldom fallen under our observation, here is a contest of two opposite experiences; of which the one destroys the other,
as far as its force goes, and the superior can only operate on the mind by the force which remains. The very
same principle of experience, which gives us a certain degree of assurance in the testimony of witnesses, gives
us also, in this case, another degree of assurance against the fact which they endeavor to establish; from which
contradiction there necessarily arise a counterpoise, and mutual destruction of belief and authority.

"I should not believe such a story were it told me by Cato;" was a proverbial saying in Rome, even during
the lifetime of that philosophical patriot (1). The incredibility of a fact, it was allowed, might invalidate so great
an authority.

The Indian prince who refused to believe the first relations concerning the effects of frost reasoned justly,
and it naturally required very strong testimony to engage his assent to facts which arose from a state of nature
with which he was unacquainted, and bore so little analogy to those events of which he had had constant and
uniform experience. Though they were not contrary to his experience, they were not conformable to it (2).

But in order to increase the probability against the testimony of witnesses, let us suppose that the fact which
they affirm, instead of being only marvellous, is really miraculous, and suppose also, that the testimony,
considered apart and in itself, amounts to an entire proof; in that case there is proof against proof, of which the
strongest must prevail, but still with a diminution of its force, in proportion to that of its antagonist.

A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature; and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these
laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience
can possibly be imagined. Why is it more than probable that all men must die; that lead cannot of itself remain
suspended in the air; that fire consumes wood, and is extinguished by water; unless it be that these events are
found agreeable to the laws of nature, and there is required a violation of these laws, or, in other words, a
miracle to prevent them? Nothing is esteemed a miracle if it ever happen in the common course of nature. It is
no miracle that a man seemingly in good health should die on a sudden: because such a kind of death, though
more unusual than any other, has yet been frequently observed to happen. But it is a miracle that a dead man
should come to life; because that has never been observed in any age or country. There must, therefore, be an
uniform experience against every miraculous event, otherwise the event would not merit that appellation. And
as an uniform experience amounts to a proof there is here a direct and full proof from the nature of the fact
against the existence of any miracle; nor can such a proof be destroyed or the miracle rendered credible by an
opposite proof, which is superior (3).

The plain consequence is (and it is a general maxim worthy of our attention), "That no testimony is
sufficient to establish a miracle unless the testimony be of such a kind that its falsehood would be more
miraculous than the fact which it endeavors to establish: And even in that case there is a mutual destruction of
arguments, and the superior only gives us an assurance suitable to that degree of force which remains after
deducting the inferior." When anyone tells me that he saw a dead man restored to life, I immediately consider
with myself whether it be more probable that this person should either deceive or be deceived, or that the fact
which he relates should really have happened. I weigh the one miracle against the other; and, according to the
superiority which I discover, I pronounce my decision, and always reject the greater miracle, if the falsehood of
his testimony would be more miraculous than the event which he relates; then, and not till then, can he pretend
to command my belief or opinion.

Part II.

In the foregoing reasoning we have supposed that the testimony upon which a miracle is founded may
possibly amount to an entire proof, and that the falsehood of that testimony would be a real prodigy: But it is
easy to show that we have been a great deal too liberal in our concession, and that there never was a miraculous
event

The 1750 edition inserts: "In any history."

established on so full an evidence.

For first, there is not to be found in all history any miracle attested by a sufficient number of men, of such
unquestioned good sense, education, and learning as to secure us against all delusion in themselves; of such
undoubted integrity as to place them beyond all suspicion of any design to deceive others; of such credit and
reputation in the eyes of mankind as to have a great deal to lose in case of being detected in any falsehood; and
at the same time attesting facts, performed in such a public manner and in so celebrated a part of the world, as
to render the detection una voidable: All which circumstances are requisite to give us a full assurance in the
testimony of men.

Secondly. We may observe in human nature a principle which, if strictly examined, will be found to
diminish extremely the assurance which we might have from human testimony in any kind of prodigy. The
maxim by which we commonly conduct ourselves in our reasonings, is, that the objects, of which we have no
experience, resemble those of which we have; that what we have found to be most usual is always most
probable; and that where there is an opposition of arguments, we ought to give the preference to such of them as are founded on the greatest number of past observations. But though, in proceeding by this rule, we readily reject any fact which is unusual and incredible in an ordinary degree; yet in advancing farther, the mind observes not always the same rule, but when anything is affirmed utterly absurd and miraculous, it rather the more readily admits such a fact, upon account of that very circumstance which ought to destroy all its authority. The passion of surprise and wonder, arising from miracles, being an agreeable emotion, gives a sensible tendency towards the belief of those events from which it is derived. And this goes so far, that even those who cannot enjoy this pleasure immediately, nor can believe those miraculous events of which they are informed, yet love to partake of the satisfaction at second-hand or by rebound, and place a pride and delight in exciting the admiration of others.

With what greediness are the miraculous accounts of travellers received, their descriptions of sea and land monsters, their relations of wonderful adventures, strange men, and uncouth manners! But if the spirit of religion join itself to the love of wonder, there is an end of common-sense, and human testimony, in these circumstances, loses all pretensions to authority. A religionist may be an enthusiast, and imagine he sees what has no reality: He may know his narration to be false, and yet persevere in it with the best intentions in the world for the sake of promoting so holy a cause: Or even where this delusion has no place, vanity, excited by so strong a temptation, operates on him more powerfully than on the rest of mankind in any other circumstances; and self-interest with equal force. His auditors may not have, and commonly have not, sufficient judgment to canvass his evidence: What judgment they have, they renounce by principle, in these sublime and mysterious subjects: Or if they were ever so willing to employ it, passion and a heated imagination disturb the regularity of its operations. Their credulity increases his impudence; and his impudence overpowers their credulity.

Eloquence, when in its highest pitch, leaves little room for reason or reflection, but addressing itself entirely to the fancy or the affections, captivates the willing hearers, and subdues their understandings. Happily, this pitch it seldom attains. But what a Cicero or a Demosthenes could scarcely operate over a Roman or Athenian audience, every Capuchin, every itinerant or stationary teacher, can perform over the generality of mankind, and in a higher degree, by touching such gross and vulgar passions (4).

Thirdly. It forms a very strong presumption against all supernatural and miraculous relations, that they are observed chiefly to abound among ignorant and barbarous nations; or if a civilised people has ever given admission to any of them, that people will be found to have received them from ignorant and barbarous ancestors, who transmitted them with that, inviolable sanction and authority which always attend received opinions. When we peruse the first histories of all nations we are apt to imagine ourselves transported into some new world, where the whole frame of nature is disjointed and every element performs its operations in a different manner from what it does at present. Battles, revolutions, pestilence, famine, and death, are never the effects of those natural causes which we experience. Prodigies, omens, oracles, judgments, quite obscure the few natural events that are intermingled with them. But as the former grow thinner every page, in proportion as we advance nearer the enlightened ages of science and knowledge, we soon learn that there is nothing mysterious or supernatural in the case, but that all proceeds from the usual propensity of mankind towards the marvellous, and that, though this inclination may at intervals receive a check from sense and learning, it can never thoroughly be extirpated from human nature.

It is strange," a judicious reader is apt to say upon the perusal of these wonderful historians, "that such prodigious events never happen in our days." But it is nothing strange, I hope, that men should lie in all ages. You must surely have seen instances enow of that frailty. You have yourself heard many such marvellous relations started, which, being treated with scorn by all the wise and judicious, have at last been abandoned even by the vulgar. Be assured, that those renowned lies which have spread and flourished to such a monstrous height, arose from like beginnings, but being sown in a more proper soil, shot up at last into prodigies almost equal to those which they relate.

It was a wise policy in that false prophet, Alexander, who, though now forgotten, was once so famous, to lay the first scene of his impostures in Paphlagonia, where, as Lucian tells us, the people were extremely ignorant and stupid, and ready to swallow even the grossest delusion. People at a distance, who are weak enough to think the matter at all worthy inquiry, have no opportunity of receiving better information. The stories come magnified to them by a hundred circumstances. Fools are industrious in propagating the imposture; while the wise and learned are contented, in general, to deride its absurdity, without informing themselves of the particular facts by which it may be distinctly refuted. And thus the impostor above-mentioned was enabled to proceed from his ignorant Paphlagonians to the enlisting of votaries, even among the Grecian philosophers and men of the most eminent rank and distinction in Rome: Nay, could engage the attention of that sage emperor, Marcus Aurelius, so far as to make him trust the success of a military expedition to his delusive prophecies.

The advantages are so great, of starting an imposture among an ignorant people, that even though the
delusion should be too gross to impose on the generality of them—*which, though seldom, is sometimes the case*—it has a much better chance of succeeding in remote countries, than if the first scene had been laid in a city renowned for arts and knowledge. The most ignorant and barbarous of these barbarians carry the report abroad. None of their countrymen have large correspondence or sufficient credit and authority to contradict and beat down the delusion. Men's inclination to the marvellous has full opportunity to display itself. And thus a story, which is universally exploded in the place where it was first started, shall pass for certain at a thousand miles distance. But had Alexander fixed his residence at Athens, the philosophers of that renowned mart of learning had immediately spread throughout the whole Roman empire, their sense of the matter; which, being supported by so great authority, and displayed by all the force of reason and eloquence, had entirely opened the eyes of mankind. It is true, Lucian, passing by chance through Paphlagonia, had an opportunity of performing this good office. But, though much to be wished, it does not always happen, that every Alexander meets with a Lucian, ready to expose and detect his impostures (5).

I may add as a *fourth* reason which diminishes the authority of prodigies, that there is no testimony for any, even those which have not been expressly detected, that is not opposed by an infinite number of witnesses; so that not only the miracle destroys the credit of the testimony, but even the testimony destroys itself. To make this the better understood, let us consider, that in matters of religion, whatever is different is contrary, and that it is impossible the religions of ancient Rome, of Turkey, of Siam, and of China should, all of them, be established on any solid foundation. Every miracle, therefore, pretended to have been wrought in any of these religions (and all of them abound in miracles), as its direct scope is to establish the particular system to which it is attributed; so has it the same force, though more indirectly, to overthrow every other system. In destroying a rival system, it likewise destroys the credit of those miracles on which that system was established; so that all the prodigies of different religions are to be regarded as contrary facts, and the evidences of these prodigies, whether weak or strong, as opposite to each other. According to this method of reasoning, when we believe any miracle of Mahomet or any of his successors, we have for our warrant the testimony of a few barbarous Arabians: And on the other hand, we are to regard the authority of Titus Livius, Plutarch, Tacitus, and, in short, of all the authors and witnesses, Grecian, Chinese, and Roman Catholic, who have related any miracle in their particular religion; I say, we are to regard their testimony in the same light as if they had mentioned that Mahometan miracle, and had in express terms contradicted it, with the same certainty as they have for the miracles they relate. This argument may appear over subtle and refined, but is not in reality different from the reasoning of a judge who supposes that the credit of two witnesses maintaining a crime against any one is destroyed by the testimony of two others who affirm him to have been two hundred leagues distant, at the same instant when the crime is said to have been committed.

One of the best attested miracles in all profane history is that which Tacitus reports of Vespasian, who cured a blind man in Alexandria by means of his spittle, and a lame man by the mere touch of his foot; in obedience to a vision of the god Serapis, who had enjoined them to have recourse to the Emperor for these miraculous cures. The story may be seen in that fine historian (6); where every circumstance seems to add weight to the testimony, and might be displayed at large with all the force of argument and eloquence, had anyone were now concerned to enforce the evidence of that exploded and idolatrous superstition. The gravity, solidity, age, and probity of so great an emperor, who, through the whole course of his life conversed in a familiar manner with his friends and courtiers, and never affected those extraordinary airs of divinity assumed by Alexander and Demetrius: The historian, a cotemporary writer noted for candor and veracity, and withal the greatest and most penetrating genius perhaps of all antiquity; and so free from any superstition and credulity that he even lies under the contrary imputation of Atheism and profaneness: The persons, from whose testimony he related the miracle, of established character for judgment and voracity, as we may well presume; eye-witnesses of the fact, and confirming their verdict after the Flavian family were despoiled of the empire, and could no longer give any reward as the price of a lie. *Utrumque, qui interfuerit, nune quoque memorant, postquam nullum mendacio pretium.* To which, if we add the public nature of the facts as related, it will appear that no evidence can well be supposed stronger for so gross and so palpable a falsehood.

There is also a memorable story related by Cardinal de Retz, which may well deserve our consideration. When that intriguing politician fled into Spain to avoid the persecution of his enemies he passed through Saragossa, the capital of Arragon, where he was shown in the cathedral a man who had served seven years as a door-keeper, and was well known to everybody in the town that had ever paid their devotions at that church. He had been seen for so long a time wanting a leg; but recovered that limb by the rubbing of holy oil upon the stump, and the cardinal assures us that he saw him with two legs. This miracle was vouched by all the canons of the church; and the whole company in town were appealed to for a confirmation of the fact; whom the cardinal found, by their zealous devotion, to be thorough believers of the miracle. Here the relater was also cotemporary to the supposed prodigy, of an incredulous and libertine character, as well as of great genius; the miracle of so singular a nature as could scarce admit of a counterfeit, and the witnesses very numerous, and all of them, in a
manner, spectators of the fact to which they gave their testimony. And what adds mightily to the force of the evidence and may double our surprise on this occasion is that the cardinal himself, who relates the story, seems not to give any credit to it, and consequently cannot be suspected of any concurrence in the holy fraud. He considered justly, that it was not requisite, in order to reject a fact of this nature, to be able accurately to disprove the testimony and to trace its falsehood through all the circumstances of knavery and credulity which produced it. He knew that, as this was commonly altogether impossible at any small distance of time and place, so was it extremely difficult, even where one was immediately present, by reason of the bigotry, ignorance, cunning and roguery of a great part of mankind. He therefore concluded, like a just reasoner, that such an evidence carried falsehood upon the very face of it, and that a miracle supported by any human testimony, was more properly a subject of derision than of argument.

There surely never was a greater number of miracles ascribed to one person than those which were lately said to have been wrought in France upon the tomb of Abbe Paris, the famous Jansenist, with whose sanctity the people were so long deluded. The curing of the sick, giving hearing to the deaf and sight to the blind, were everywhere talked of as the usual effects of that holy sepulchre. But what is more extraordinary; many of the miracles were immediately proved upon the spot before judges of unquestioned integrity, attested by witnesses of credit and distinction in a learned age, and on the most eminent theatre that is now in the world. Nor is this all: A relation of them was published and dispersed everywhere; nor were the Jesuits, though a learned body supported by the civil magistrate, and determined enemies to those opinions in whose favor the miracles were said to have been wrought, ever able distinctly to refute or detect them (7). Where shall we find such a number of circumstances agreeing to the corroborration of one fact? And what have we to oppose to such a cloud of witnesses but the absolute impossibility or miraculous nature of the events which they relate? And this surely, in the eyes of all reasonable people, will alone be regarded as a sufficient refutation.

Is the consequence just, because some human testimony has the utmost force and authority in some cases, when it relates the battles of Philippi or Pharsalia for instance; that therefore all kinds of testimony must, in all cases, have equal force and authority? Suppose that the Cesarean and Pompeian factions had each of them claimed the victory in these battles, and that the historian of each party had uniformly ascribed the advantage to their own side; how could mankind at this distance have been able to determine between them? The contrariety is equally strong between the miracles related by Herodotus or Plutarch and those delivered by Mariana, Bede, or any monkish historian.

The wise lend a very academic faith to every report which favors the passion of the reporter; whether it magnifies his country, his family, or himself, or in any other way strikes in with his natural inclinations and propensities. But what greater temptation than to appear a missionary, a prophet, an ambassador from heaven? Who would not encounter many dangers and difficulties in order to attain so sublime a character? Or if, by the help of vanity and a heated imagination, a man has first made a convert of himself and entered seriously into the delusion; who ever scruples to make use of pious frauds in support of so holy and meritorious a cause?

The smallest spark may here kindle into the greatest flame, because the materials are always prepared for it. The avidum genus auricularum(8), the gazing populace, receive greedily, without examination, whatever soothes superstition, and promotes wonder.

How many stories of this nature have in all ages been detected and exploded in their infancy? How many more have been celebrated for a time, and have afterwards sunk into neglect and oblivion? Where such reports, therefore, fly about, the solution of the phenomenon is obvious, and we judge in conformity to regular experience and observation when we account for it by the known and natural principles of credulity and delusion. And shall we, rather than have a resource to so natural a solution, allow of a miraculous violation of the most established laws of nature?

I need not mention the difficulty of detecting a falsehood in any private or even public history, at the time and place where it is said to happen, much more where the scene is removed to ever so small a distance. Even a court of judicature, with all the authority, accuracy, and judgment, which they can employ, find themselves often at a loss to distinguish between truth and falsehood in most recent actions. But the matter never comes to any issue if trusted to the common method of altercation and debate and flying rumors; especially when men's passions have taken part on either side.

In the infancy of new religions the wise and learned commonly esteem the matter too inconsiderable to deserve their attention or regard. And when afterwards they would willingly detect the cheat in order to undeceive the deluded multitude, the season is now past, and the records and witnesses, which might clear up the matter, have perished beyond recovery.

No means of detection remain but those which must be drawn from the very testimony itself of the reporters: And these, though always sufficient with the judicious and knowing, are commonly too fine to fall under the comprehension of the vulgar.

Upon the whole, then, it appears that no testimony for any kind of miracle has ever amounted to a
probability much less to a proof; and that, even supposing it amounted
to a proof, it would be opposed by another proof; derived from the very nature of the fact which it would
endeavor to establish. It is experience only, which gives authority to human testimony; and it is the same
experience, which assures us of the laws of nature. When, therefore, these two kinds of experience are contrary,
we have nothing to do but subtract the one from the other, and embrace an opinion either on one side or the
other with that assurance which arises from the remainder. But according to the principle here explained, this
subtraction with regard to all popular religions, amounts to an entire annihilation; and therefore we may
establish it as a maxim that no human testimony can have such force as to prove a miracle and make it a just
foundation for any such system of religion.(9)

I am the better pleased with this method of reasoning, as I think it may serve to confound those dangerous
friends or disguised enemies to the Christian religion, who have undertaken to defend it by the principles of
human reason. Our most holy religion is founded on Faith, not on reason, and it is a sure method of exposing it
to put it to such a trial, as it is by no means fitted to endure. To make this more evident, let us examine those
miracles related in scripture, and not to lose ourselves in too wide a field, let us confine ourselves to such as we
find in the Pentateuch, which we shall examine according to the principles of these pretended Christians, not as
the word or testimony of God himself, but as the production of a mere human writer and historian. Here, then,
we are first to consider a book presented to us by a barbarous and ignorant people, written in an age when they
were still more barbarous and in all probability long after the facts which it relates, corroborated by no
concurring testimony, and resembling those fabulous accounts which every nation gives of its origin. Upon
reading this book, we find it full of prodigies and miracles. It gives an account of a state of the world and of
human nature entirely different from the present: Of our fall from that state: Of the age of man extended to
near a thousand years: Of the destruction of the world by a deluge: Of the arbitrary choice of one people as the
favorites of heaven and that people the countrymen of the author: Of their deliverance from bondage by
prodigies the most astonishing imaginable: I desire anyone to lay his hand upon his heart and after serious
consideration declare whether he thinks that the falsehood of such a book, supported by such a testimony,
would be more extraordinary and miraculous than all the miracles it relates; which is, however, necessary to
make it be received according to the measures of probability above established.

What we have said of miracles may be applied without any variation to prophecies; and indeed all
prophecies are real miracles, and as such only, can be admitted as proofs of any revelation. If it did not exceed
the capacity of human nature to foretel future events, it would be absurd to employ any prophecy as an
argument for a divine mission or authority from heaven; so that, upon the whole, we may conclude that the
Christian religion not only was at first attended with miracles, but even at this day cannot be believed by any
reasonable person without one. Mere reason is insufficient to convince us of its veracity: And whoever is
moved by Faith to assent to it is conscious of a continued miracle in his own person, which subverts all the
principles of his understanding, and gives him a determination to believe what is most contrary to custom and
experience.

Notes.

(1) Plutarch, in vita Catonis Min. 19.
(2) No Indian, it is evident, could have experience that water did not freeze in cold climates. This is placing
nature in a situation quite unknown to him, and it is impossible for him to tell a priori what will result from it.
It is making a new experiment, the consequence of which is always uncertain. One may sometimes conjecture
from analogy what will follow; but still this is but conjecture. And it must be confessed, that in the present case
of freezing, the event follows contrary to the rules of analogy, and is such as a rational Indian would not look
for. The operations of cold upon water are not gradual according to the degrees of cold, but whenever it comes
to the freezing point the water passes in a moment from the utmost liquidity to perfect hardness. Such an event
therefore may be denominated extraordinary, and requires a pretty strong testimony to render it credible to
people in a warm climate; but still it is not miraculous, nor contrary to uniform experience of the course of
nature in cases where all the circumstances are the same. The inhabitants of Sumatra have always seen water
fluid in their own climate, and the freezing of their rivers ought to be deemed a prodigy: but they never saw
water in Muscovy during the winter; and therefore they cannot reasonably be positive what would there be the
consequence.

(3) Sometimes an event may not, in itself, seem to be contrary to the laws of nature, and yet, if it were real,
it might, by reason of some circumstances, be denominated a miracle, because, in fact, it is contrary to these
laws. Thus if a person, claiming a divine authority, should command a sick person to be well, a healthful man
to fall down dead, the clouds to pour rain, the winds to blow—in short, should order many natural events which
immediately follow upon his command;—these might justly be esteemed miracles, because they are really, in this case, contrary to the laws of nature. For if any suspicion remain that the event and command concurred by accident there is no miracle and no transgression of the laws of nature. If this suspicion be removed, there is evidently a miracle, and a transgression of these laws; because nothing can be more contrary to nature than that the voice or command of a man should have such an influence. A miracle may be accurately defined, a transgression of a law of nature by a particular volition of the Deity, or by the interposition of some invisible agent. A miracle may either be discoverable by men or not. This alters not its nature and essence. The raising of a house or ship into the air is a visible miracle. The raising of a feather, when the wind wants ever so little of a force requisite for that purpose, is as real a miracle, though not so sensible with regard to us.

(4) The many instances of forged miracles, and prophecies, and supernatural events, which, in all ages, have either been detected by contrary evidence, or which detect themselves by their absurdity, mark sufficiently the strong propensity of mankind to the extraordinary and the marvellous, and ought reasonably to beget a suspicion against all relations of this kind. This is our natural way of thinking, even with regard to the most common and most credible events. For instance, there is no kind of report which rises so easily and spreads so quickly, especially in country places and provincial towns, as those concerning marriages; insomuch that two young persons of equal condition never see each other twice, but the whole neighborhood immediately join them together. The pleasure of telling a piece of news so interesting, of propagating it, and of being the first reporters of it, spreads the intelligence. And this is so well known that no man of sense gives attention to these reports till he finds them confirmed by some greater evidence. Do not the same passions, and others still stronger, incline the generality of mankind to the believing and reporting with the greatest vehemence and assurance all religious miracles?

(5) It may here perhaps be objected that I proceed rashly, and form my notions of Alexander merely from the account given of him by Lucian, a professed enemy. It were indeed to be wished that some of the accounts published by his followers and accomplices had remained. The opposition and contrast between the character and conduct of the same man as drawn by a friend or an enemy is as strong, even in common life, much more in these religious matters, as that betwixt any two men in the world—betwixt Alexander and St. Paul, for instance. See a letter to Gilbert West, Esq., on the conversion and apostleship of St. Paul.

(6) Hist., lib. 5, cap. viii. Suetonius gives nearly the same account in vita Vesp.

(7) This book was written by Mons. de Montgeron, counsellor or judge of the Parliament of Paris, a man of figure and character, who was also a martyr to the cause, and is now said to be somewhere in a dungeon on account of his book.

There is another book, in three volumes (called "Recueil des Miracles de l'Abbé Paris"), giving an account of many of these miracles and accompanied with prefatory discourses, which are very well written. There runs, however, through the whole of these a ridiculous comparison between the miracles of our Savior and those of the Abbé, wherein it is asserted that the evidence for the latter is equal to that for the former: As if the testimony of men could ever be put in the balance with that of God himself, who conducted the pen of the inspired writers. If these writers, indeed, were to be considered merely as human testimony, the French author is very moderate in his comparison, since he might, with some appearance of reason, pretend that the Jansenist miracles much surpass the others in evidence and authority. The following circumstances are drawn from authentic papers inserted in the above-mentioned book.

Many of the miracles of Abbe Paris were proved immediately by witnesses before the officiality or bishop's court at Paris, under the eyes of Cardinal Noailles, whose character for integrity and capacity was never contested even by his enemies.

His successor in the archbishopric was an enemy to the Jansenists, and for that reason promoted to the see by the Court. Yet twenty-two rectors or cures of Paris, with infinite earnestness, press him to examine those miracles, which they assert to be known to the whole world, and indisputably certain: But he wisely forbore.

The Molinist party had tried to discredit these miracles in one instance, that of Madamoiselle le Franc. But besides that, their proceedings in many respects are the most irregular in the world, particularly in citing only a few of the Jansenist's witnesses, whom they tampered with: Besides this, I say they soon found themselves overwhelmed by a cloud of new witnesses one hundred and twenty in number, most of them persons of credit and substance in Paris, who gave oath for the miracle. This was accompanied with a solemn and earnest appeal to the Parliament. But the Parliament were forbidden by authority to meddle in the affair. It was at last observed that where men are heated by zeal and enthusiasm there is no degree of human testimony so strong as may not be procured for the greatest absurdity: And those who will be so silly as to examine the affair by that medium, and seek particular flaws in the testimony, are almost sure to be confounded. It must be a miserable imposture indeed that does not prevail in that contest.

All who have been in France about that time have heard of the great reputation of Mons. Heraut, the Lieutenant de Police, whose vigilance, penetration, activity and extensive intelligence have been much talked
of. This magistrate, who by the nature of his office is almost absolute, was invested with full powers on purpose to suppress or discredit these miracles; and he frequently seized immediately and examined the witnesses and subjects of them; but never could reach anything satisfactory against them.

In the case of Madamoiselle Thibaut he sent the famous de Sylvia to examine her, whose evidence is very curious. The physician declares that it was impossible she could have been so ill as was proved by witnesses, because it was impossible she could in so short a time have recovered so perfectly as he found her. He reasoned like a man of sense from natural causes; but the opposite party told him that the whole was a miracle, and that his evidence was the very best proof of it.

The Molinists were in a sad dilemma. They dared not assert the absolute insufficiency of human evidence to prove a miracle. They were obliged to say that these miracles were wrought by witchcraft and the devil. But they were told that this was the resource of the Jews of old.

No Jansenist was ever embarrassed to account for the cessation of the miracles, when the churchyard was shut up by the king's edict. It was the touch of the tomb which produced these extraordinary effects; and when no one could approach the tomb, no effects could be expected. God indeed could have thrown down the walls in a moment; but he is master of his own graces and works, and it belongs not to us to account for them. He did not throw down the walls of every city like those of Jericho on the sounding of the rams' horns, nor break up the prison of every apostle like that of St. Paul.

No less a man than the Duc de Chatillon, a duke and peer of France of the highest rank and family, gives evidence of a miraculous cure performed upon a servant of his, who had lived several years in his house with a visible and palpable infirmity.

I shall conclude with observing that no clergy are more celebrated for strictness of life and manners than the secular clergy of France, particularly the rectors or curds of Paris who bear testimony to these impostures.

The learning, genius, and probity of the gentlemen, and the austerity of the nuns of Port Royal, have been much celebrated all over Europe. Yet they all give evidence for a miracle wrought on the niece of the famous Pascal, whose sanctity of life, as well as extraordinary capacity, is well known. The famous Racine gives an account of this miracle in his famous history of Port-Royal, and fortifies it with all the proofs which a multitude of nuns, priests, physicians and men of the world, all of them of undoubted credit, could bestow upon it. Several men of letters, particularly the Bishop of Tournay, thought this miracle so certain, as to employ it in the refutation of Atheists and Freethinkers. The Queen-Regent of France, who was extremely prejudiced against the Port-Royal, sent her own physician to examine the miracle, who returned an absolute convert. In short, the supernatural cure was so uncontestable that it saved for a time that famous monastery from the ruin with which it was threatened by the Jesuits. Had it been a cheat, it had certainly been detected by such sagacious and powerful antagonists and must have hastened the ruin of the contrivers. Our divines who can build up a formidable castle from such despicable materials, what a prodigious fabric could they have reared from these and many other circumstances which I have not mentioned!—How oft would the great names of Pascal, Racine, Arnaud, Nicole, have resounded in our ears? But if they be wise, they had better adopt the miracle as being more worth a thousand times than all the rest of their collection. Besides, it may serve very much to their purpose. For that miracle was really performed by the touch of an authentic holy prickel of the holy thorn, which composed the holy crown, which, etc.

(8) Lucret, iv., 594.

(9) I beg the limitations here made may be remarked when I say that a miracle can never be proved so as to be the foundation of a system of religion. For I own, that otherwise there may possibly be miracles or violations of the usual course of nature, of such a kind as to admit of proof from human testimony, though perhaps it will be impossible to find any such in all the records of history. Thus, suppose all authors in all languages agree that from the 1st of January 1600, there was a total darkness over the whole earth for eight days: Suppose that the tradition of this extraordinary event is still strong and lively among the people, that all travellers who return from foreign countries bring us accounts of the same tradition without the least variation or contradiction: It is evident that our present philosophers, instead of doubting that fact, ought to receive it for certain, and ought to search for the causes whence it might be derived. The decay, corruption, and dissolution of nature, is an event rendered probable by so many analogies, that any phenomenon which seems to have a tendency towards that catastrophe, comes within the reach of human testimony, if that testimony be very extensive and uniform.

But suppose that all the historians who treat of England should agree, that, on the 1st of January 1600, Queen Elizabeth died; that both before and after her death she was seen by her physicians and the whole court, as is usual with persons of her rank; that her successor was acknowledged and proclaimed by the Parliament; and that, after being interred a month, she again appeared, took possession of the throne, and governed England for three years: I must confess I should be surprised at the concurrence of so many odd circumstances, but should not have the least inclination to believe so miraculous an event. I should not doubt of her pretended death and of those other public circumstances that followed it: I should only assert it to have been pretended,
and that it neither was nor possibly could be real. You would in vain object to me the difficulty and almost impossibility of deceiving the world in an affair of such consequence; the wisdom and integrity of that renowned queen; with the little or no advantage which she could reap from so poor an artifice: All this might astonish me; but I would still reply that the knavery and folly of men are such common phenomena that I should rather believe the most extraordinary events to arise from their concurrence than admit so signal a violation of the laws of nature.

But should this miracle be ascribed to any new system of religion, men in all ages have been so much imposed on by ridiculous stories of that kind, that this very circumstance would be a full proof of a cheat, and sufficient with all men of sense not only to make them reject the fact, but reject it without farther examination. Though the being to whom the miracle is ascribed be in this case Almighty, it does not, upon that account, become a whit more probable; since it is impossible for us to know the attributes or actions of such a Being, otherwise than from the experience which we have of his productions in the usual course of nature. This still reduces us to past observation, and obliges us to compare the instance of the violations of truth in the testimony of men with those of the violation of the laws of nature by miracles, in order to judge which of them is most likely and probable. As the violations of truth are more common in the testimony concerning religious miracles than in that concerning any other matter of fact; this must diminish very much the authority of the former testimony, and make us form a general resolution never to lend any attention to it, with whatever specious pretext it may be covered.

Lord Bacon seems to have embraced the same principles of reasoning:—"We ought," says he, "to make a collection or particular history of all monsters and prodigious births or productions, and in a word of everything new, rare, and extraordinary in nature. But this must be done with the most severe scrutiny, lest we depart from truth. Above all, every relation must be considered as suspicious which depends in any degree upon religion, as the prodigies of Livy: And no less so, everything that is to be found in the writers of natural magic or alchemy, or such authors, who seem, all of them, to have an uncontrollable appetite for falsehood and fable." "Facienda enim est congeries sive historia naturalis particularis omnium monstrorum et partuum naturae prodigiosorum; omnis denique novitatis et raritatis et insensatiin natura. Hoc vero faciendum est cum severissimo delectu, ut constet fides. Maxime autem habenda sunt pro suspectis quæ pendent quomodocunque ex religione, ut prodigia Livii: Nec minus quei inveniuntur in scriptoribus magiae naturalis, aut etiam alchymiae, et hujusmodi hominibus; qui tanquam proci sunt et amatores fabularum." —"Nov. Organ.," lib. 2., Aph. 29.
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Civil and Religious Liberty.

"O Liberty! how many crimes are committed in thy name!" So exclaimed Madame Roland, one of the most heroic and most beautiful spirits of the great French Revolution, when above her glittered the keen knife of the guillotine, and below her glared the fierce faces of the maddened crowd, who were howling for her death. But Madame Roland, even as she spoke, bowed her fair head to the statue of Liberty which—pure, serene, majestic—rose beside the scaffold, and stood white and undefiled in the sunlight, while the mob seethed and tossed round its base. Madame Roland bent her brow before Liberty, even as the sad complaint passed her lips; for well that noble-hearted woman knew that the guillotine, by which she was to die, had not been raised in a night with the broken chains of Liberty, but had been slowly building up, during Jong centuries of tyranny, out of the mouldering skeletons of the thousands of victims of despotism and misrule. The taunt has been re-echoed ever since, and lovers of repression have changed its words and its meaning, and they have said what noble Madame Roland would never have said: "O Liberty, how many crimes are committed by thee, and because of thee!" They have never said, they have never cared to ask, how many crimes have been committed against Liberty in the past; how many crimes are daily committed against her in the England which we boast as free. They have never said, they have never cared to ask, whether the excesses which have, alas! disgraced revolutions, whether the bloodshed which has oftentimes stained crimson-red the fair, white, banner of Liberty, are not the natural and the necessary fruits, not of the freedom which is won, but of the tyranny which is
be ascribed the excesses which stained a revolution that was in its beginning, that might have been throughout, Revolution, and so far so far defiance. These men rang the tocsin which awoke France, and taught the French people to think; they nurtured in their breasts a spirit of self-reliance; they roused a spirit of them—as Holbach and Diderot—might fairly be called Atheists; some were nothing of the kind. These men writings of those who are commonly called the Encyclopaedists. These men determination to shake off a cruel and unjust yoke was implanted in the bosoms of the French people by the fain put into the mouths of our friends an answer to those who say that the excesses of the French Revolution crushed and starved to death, lies the secret of the blood shed of the Revolution. But we have in England, as we shall see as we go on, many of the abuses left of that feudal system which the Revolution destroyed for ever in France. The feudal system was spread, all over Europe in the Middle Ages, those Dark Ages when all sense of equal justice and of liberty was dead. It concentrated all power which the Revolution destroyed for ever in France. The feudal system was spread, all over Europe in the Middle Ages, those Dark Ages when all sense of equal justice and of liberty was dead. It concentrated all power in the hands of the few; it took no account of the masses of the people; it handed over the poor, bound hand and foot, to the power of the feudal superior, and it cultivated that haughty spirit of disdainful contempt for labour, which is still, unfortunately, only too widely spread throughout our middle and upper classes in England. This system gradually lost its harsher features among ourselves; but in France it endured up to the time of the Revolution. Therefore, before passing on to the parallel between our state and that of ante-revolutionary France, I would fain put into the mouths of our friends an answer to those who say that the excesses of the French Revolution are the necessary outcome of free thought in religion and of free action in politics. It is perfectly true that the determination to shake off a cruel and unjust yoke was implanted in the bosoms of the French people by the writings of those who are commonly called the Encyclopaedists. These men were Freethinkers; some of them—as Holbach and Diderot—might fairly be called Atheists; some were nothing of the kind. These men taught the French people to think; they nurtured in their breasts a spirit of self-reliance; they roused a spirit of defiance. These men rang the tocsin which awoke France, and so far it is true that Freethought produced the Revolution, and so far Freethought may well be proud of her work. But not to Freethought, not to Liberty, must be ascribed the excesses which stained a revolution that was in its beginning, that might have been throughout,
so purely glorious. For do you know what French Feudalism was? Do you know what those terrible rights were, which have branded so deeply into the French peasant's heart the hatred of the old nobility, that even to the present day he will hiss out between clenched teeth the word "aristocrat," with a passionate hatred which one hundred years of freedom have not quenched?

In the reign of Louis XIV. there was a Count, the Comte de Charolois, who used to shoot down, for his amusement, the peasants who had climbed into trees, and the tilers who were mending roofs. The *chasse aux paysans*, as it was pleasantly termed, the "hunt of peasants," was remembered by an old man who was in Paris during the Revolution as one of the amusements of the nobility in his youth. True, these acts were but the acts of a few; but they were done, and the people dared not strike back. Then there was another right, a right which outraged all humanity, and which gave to the lord the first claim to the serfs' bride. The terrible story in Charles Dickens's "Tale of Two Cities" is no fiction, except in details, if we may judge from some of the chronicles of the time. (Dufaure gives many interesting details on French feudalism.) Then they might harness the serfs, like cattle, to their carts; they might keep them awake all night beating the trenches round their castles, lest noble slumbers should be disturbed by the croaking of the frogs. When any one throws in the Radical's teeth the excesses of the French Revolution, let the Radical answer him back with these rights, and ask if it is to be wondered at that men struck hard, when the outrages and the oppressions of centuries were revenged in a few wild months? Marvel not at the short madness that broke out at last; marvel rather at the cowardice which bore in silence for so long.

I pass from these hideous rights of feudalism to its milder features, as they existed in France before the Revolution, and as they exist among us to-day in England. The laws by which land is held and transmitted, the rights of the first-born son, the laying-on of taxation by those who do not represent the tax-payer, a standing army in which birth helps promotion, the Game Laws—all these are relics of feudalism, relics which need to be swept away. It is on the existence of these that I ground my plea for wider freedom; it is on these that I rely to prove that Civil and Religious Liberty are still very imperfect among ourselves.

In France, before the revolution, people in general, king, queen, lords, clergy, thought that things were going on very nicely, and very comfortably. True, keener-sighted men saw in the misery of the masses the threatened ruin of the throne. True, even Royalty itself, in the haggard faces and gaunt forms that pressed cheering round its carriages, read traces of grinding poverty, of insufficient food. True, some faint rumour even reached the court, amid its luxury, that the houses of the people were not all they should be, nay, that many of them were wretched huts, not fit for cattle. But what of that? There was no open rebellion; there was no open disloyalty. What disloyalty there was, was confined to the lower orders, and showed itself by a fancy of the people to gather into Republican clubs, and other such societies, where loyalty to the Crown was not the lesson which they learned from the speakers' lips. But such disloyalty could of course be crushed out at any moment, and the court went gaily on its way, careless of the low, dull growling in the distance which told of the coming storm. We, in England, to-day, are quite at ease. True, some of our labourers are paid starvation-wages of 10s., 11s., 12s., a week, but again I ask, what of that? Has not Mr. Fraser Grove, late M.P., told the South Wiltshire farmers that they had a right to reduce the labourer's wage to 11s. a week, if he could live upon it, and, if he did not like it, he could take his labour to other markets? Why should the labourer complain, so long as he is allowed to live? Then the houses of our people are scarcely all that they should be. I have been into some so-called homes, composed of two small rooms, in one of which father and mother, boys and girls growing up into manhood and womanhood, were obliged to sleep in the one room, even in the one bed. I have seen a room in which slept four generations, the great-grandfather and his wife, the grandmother (unmarried), the mother (unmarried), and the little child of the latter, and in addition to these relatives, the room also afforded sleeping accommodation to three men lodgers. Yet people talk about the "immorality of the agricultural poor," as though people could be anything except immoral, when the lads and lasses have to grow up without any possibility of being even decent, much less with any possibility of retaining the smallest shred of natural modesty. The only marvel is how, among our poor, there do grow up now and then fair and pure blossoms, worthy of the most carefully-guarded homes. But a very short time since there were worse hovels even than those I have mentioned. Down at Woolwich there were "homes" composed of one small room, 12 feet by 12, and feet high in the middle of the sloping roof, and the huts were built of bad brick, the damp of which sweated slowly through the whitewash, and the floor was made of beaten earth, lower in level than the ground outside, and in front of the fire they kept a plank all day baking warm and dry, in order that at night they might put it into the bed, to keep the sleeper next the wall from being wet through by the drippings as he slept. And in other such huts as these four families lived together, with no partition put up between them, save such poor rags as some lingering feeling of decency might lead them to hang up for themselves—and these huts, these miserable huts, were the property of Government, and in them were housed her Majesty's married soldiers, housed in such abodes as her Majesty would not allow her cattle to occupy near Windsor or near Balmoral. Yet among us there is no open rebellion; there is no open disloyalty. Among us, too, what disloyalty there is, is chiefly confined to
the lower orders, and that, as everyone knows, can be snuffed out at a moment's notice. Among us, it also shows itself in that fancy of the people to gather into Republican clubs and other such societies, where loyalty to the Crown is not the lesson most enforced by the speakers. The quiet, slow alienation of the people from the Throne is going on unobserved; a people who are loyal to a monarchy will not form themselves into Repub-

lican Clubs; yet our rulers never dream that the people are discontented, and that these clubs are signs of the times. They fancy that the agitation is only the work of the few, and that there is no widely-spread disaffection behind the Republican teachers; only the leaders of popular movements know the vast force which they can wield in case of need, but the Government will never listen to these men, any more than in France they would listen to Mirabeau, until it was too late. Yet do sensible people think that a sound and a healthy society can rest upon the misery of the masses? and do our rulers think that palaces stand firm when they are built up upon such hovels as those which I have described? It appears they do; for our Queen and our Princes seem to believe in the lip-loyalty of the crowds which cheer them when they make us happy by driving through our streets, loyalty that springs from the thoughtlessness of custom, and not from true and manly reverence for real worth. For I would not be thought to disparage the sentiment of loyalty; I hold it to be one of the fairest blossoms which flower on the emotional side of the nature of man. Loyalty to principle, loyalty to a great cause, loyalty to some true leader, crowned king of men by reason of his virtue, of his genius, of his strength—such loyalty as this it is no shame for a freeman to yield, such loyalty as this has, in all ages of the world, inspired men to the noblest self-devotion, nerved men to the most heroic self-sacrifice. But just as only those things which are valuable in themselves are thought worthy of imitation in baser metal, so is this true golden loyalty imitated by the pinchbeck loyalty, which shouts in our streets. For what true loyalty is possible from us towards the House of Brunswick? Loyalty to virtue? as enshrined in a Prince of Wales? loyalty to liberality, and to delicacy of sentiment? as exemplified by a Duke of Edinburgh? loyalty to any great cause, whose success in this generation is bound up with the life of any member of our Royal House? The very questions send a ripple of laughter through any assemblage of Englishmen, and they are beginning to feel, at last, that true loyalty can only be paid to some man who stands head and shoulders above his fellows, and not to some poor dwarf, whom we can only-see over the heads of the crowd, because he stands on the artificial elevation of a throne.

The court in France was very extravagant; it spent £34,000,000 in eight years, while the people were starving, our princes do not spend so much; they dare not; but that the spirit is the same is clearly seen when a wealthy queen sends to Parliament to dower her sons and her daughters: when the scions of a family so rich as are the Brunswicks, become beggars to the nation, and pensioners on the pockets of the poor. However, courts are expensive things, and if we want them we must be content to pay for them. Now, in France, the nobles, the clergy, the great landed proprietors, paid next to nothing: the heavy burden of taxation fell upon the poor. But the poor had not much money which they could pay out to the State, and it is not easy to empty already empty pockets with any satisfactory results so, in France, they hit upon the ingenious system called indirect taxation; they imposed taxes upon the necessaries of life; they squeezed money out of the food which the people were obliged to buy. Also, those who imposed the taxes were not those who paid them: they laid on heavy burdens, which they themselves did not touch with one of their fingers. We, in England, also think that it conduces to the cheerful paying of taxes that they should be laid chiefly upon those who have no voice wherewith to complain of their incidence in Parliament. If you want to knock a man down, it is very wise to choose a dumb man, who cannot raise a cry for help. A large portion of the working classes, and all women, have no votes in the election of members of Parliament, and have therefore no voice in the imposition of the taxes which they are, nevertheless, obliged to pay. It is a long time since Pitt told us that "taxation without representation is robbery;" it is a yet longer time since John Hampden taught us how to resist the payment of an unjust tax, and yet we are still such cravens, or else so indifferent, that we pay millions a year in taxation, without determining that we will, have a voice in the control of our own income. We are crushed under a heavy and a yearly increasing national expenditure, partly because of our extravagant administration, partly because the burden falls unequally, weighing on the poor more than upon the rich, and wholly because we have not brotherhood enough to combine together, nor manhood enough to say that these things shall not be. Our system of taxation is radically vicious in principle, because it must of necessity fall unequally. Those who impose the burdens know perfectly well that it is impossible for the poor to refuse to pay indirect taxes, however onerous those taxes may be: they must buy the necessary articles of food, whether those articles be taxed or no; a refusal to pay is impracticable, and no combination to abstain from buying is possible, because the things taxed are the necessities of life. Yet as long as indirect taxation is permitted—and the major part of our annual revenue is drawn from Customs and from Excise—so long must taxation crush the poor, while it falls lightly on the rich.

On this point I direct your attention to the following extract, taken from the Liverpool Financial Reformer, and quoted by Mr. Charles Watts in his "Government and the People":—

"A recent writer in the Liverpool Financial Reformer, divided the community into three divisions—first, the aristocratic, represented by those who have an annual income of £1,000 and upwards; the middle classes were
represented by those who had incomes from £100 to £1,000; and the artisan or working classes were those who were supposed to have incomes under £100 per year. He then assessed their incomes respectively at £208,385,000; £174,579,000; and £149,745,000. Towards the taxation, each division paid as follows. The aristocratic portion contributed £8,500,000, the middle classes £19,513,453, and the working classes £32,861,474. The writer remarks: ‘The burden of the revenue, as it is here shown to fall on the different classes, may not be fractionally accurate, either on the one side or the other, for that is an impossibility in the case, but it is sufficiently so to afford a fair representation in reference to those classes on whom the burden chiefly falls. Passing over the middle classes, who thus probably contribute about their share, the result in regard to the upper and lower classes stands thus:—Amount which should be paid to the revenue by the higher classes (that is, the classes above £1,000 a year), £23,437,688; amount which they do pay, £8,500,000; leaving a difference of £14,937,688, so that the higher classes are paying nearly £15,000,000 less than their fair share of taxation. Amount which should be paid by the working classes (or those having incomes below £100), £16,846,312; amount which they do pay, £32,861,474; making a difference of £6,015,162; so that the working classes are paying about £16,000,000 more than their fair share. In other words, the respective average rates paid upon the assessable income of the two classes are—by the higher classes, 10d. per pound; the working classes, 4s. 4d. That is to say, the working classes are paying at a rate five times more heavily than the wealthy classes.’”

The whole system of laying taxes on the necessaries of life is radically vicious in principle; to tax the necessaries of life is to sap the strength and to shorten the life of those men and those women on whose strength and whose life the prosperity of the country depends; it is to enfeeble the growing generation; it is to make the children pale and stunted; it is, in fact, to undermine the constitution of the wealth-producers. To tax food is to tax life itself, instead of taxing incomes; it is a financial system which is, at once, cruel and suicidal. As a matter of fact, taxes taken off food have not decreased the revenue, and when this policy of taxing food shall have become a thing of the past, then a healthier and more strongly-framed nation will bear with ease all the necessary burdens of the State. Indirect taxation is also bad, because it implies a number of small taxes (some of which are scarcely worth the cost of collecting), and thus necessitates the employment of a numerous staff of officials, whereas one large direct tax would be more easily gathered in.

It is also bad, because, with indirect taxation, it is almost impossible for a man to know what he really does pay towards the support of the State. It is right and just that every citizen in a free country should consciously contribute to the maintenance of the Government which he has himself placed over him; but when he knows exactly what he is paying, he will probably think it worth while to examine into the national expenditure, and to insist on a wise economy in the public service. I do not mean the kind of economy which is so relished by Governments, the economy which dismisses skilled workmen, whose work is needed, while it retains sinecures for personages in high places; but I mean that just and wise economy which gives good pay for honest work, but which refuses to pay dukes, carls, even princes, for doing nothing. This great problem of fair and equal taxation ought to be thoroughly studied and thought over by every citizen; few infringements on equal liberty are so fraught with harm and misery as are those which pass almost unnoticed under the head of "collection of the revenue"; few reforms are so urgently needed as a reform of our financial system, and a fair adjustment of the burdens of taxation.

In France they had Game Laws. If the season were cold the farmers might not mow their hay at the proper time, lest the birds should lack cover; they might not hoe the corn, lest they should break the partridge eggs; the birds fed off the crops, and they might not shoot or trap them; if they transgressed the Game Laws they were sent to the galleys; herds of wild boar and red deer roamed over the country, and the farmers and the peasants were forbidden to interfere with them. Englishmen! who call yourselves free, do you imagine that these relics of barbarism, swept away by the French Revolution in one memorable night, are nothing but archæological curiosities, archaic remains, fossilised memorials of a long-past tyranny? On the contrary, our Game Laws in England are as harsh as those I have cited to you, and the worst facts I am going to relate you have no parallel in the history of France. These cases are so shameful that they ought to have raised a shout of execration through the land; they have been covered up, and hushed up, as far as possible, and I have taken them from a Parliamentary Blue-book; and I have taken them thence myself, because I would not quote at second-hand deeds so disgraceful, that had I not read them in the dry pages of a Parliamentary Commission I should have fancied that they had been either carelessly or purposely exaggerated in order to point a tirade against the rich. I allude to the deer-forests of Scotland.

But before dealing with these it is interesting to note the curious points of similarity between our Game Laws and those of the French. In France, they were sometimes forbidden to mow the hay because of the cover it yielded to the birds: in England, you will sometimes find a clause inserted in the lease of a farm, binding the farmer to reap with the sickle instead of with the scythe, that is, to reap with an instrument that does not cut the corn-stalks off close to the ground, so that cover may be left for the birds; thus the fanners' profits are decreased by the amount of straw which is left to rot in the ground for the landlord's amusement. In France, the game
might not be touched even if the crops were damaged; in England, the hares may ruin a young plantation, and
the farmer may not snare or shoot them. In France, those who transgressed the Game Laws were sent to the
galleys; in England, we send them to prison with hard labour, and we actually pay for the manufacture of
10,000 criminals every year, in order that our Princes of Wales and our landed proprietors may make it the
business of their lives "to shoot poultry." In France, the herds of wild boar and red deer might not be molested;
in England we manage these things better; we have, un- fortunately, no wild boar, but we clear our farmers and
our peasants out of the way in order that we may be sure that our deer are not interfered with. As the son of a
Highland proprietor said, when planning a new deer-forest: "the first thing to do, you know, is to clear out the
people." The first thing to do is to clear out the people? Yes! clear out the people: the people, who have lived
on the land for years, and who have learned to love it as though they had been born landowners; the people who
have tilled and cultivated it, making it laugh out into cornfields which have fed hundreds of the poor; the
people, who have wrought on it, and toiled with plough and spade; turn out the people and make way for the
animals; level the homes of the people and make a hunting ground for the rich. "It is no deer-forest if the
farmers are all there," said a witness before the Commission; and so you see the farmers must go, for of course
it is necessary that we should have deer-forests. No less than forty families, owning seven thousand sheep,
seven thousand goats, and two hundred head of cattle, were turned out from their homes in the time of the
present Marquis of Huntly's grandfather, their houses were pulled down, and their land was planted with
fir-trees; some of the leases were bought up; in cases where they had expired the people were bidden go. And
thus it comes to pass, according to the evidence of one witness—a witness whom members of the Commission
tried hard to browbeat, but whose evidence they utterly failed to shake—thus it comes to pass that "you see in
the deer-forests the ruins of numerous hamlets, with the grass growing over them." A pathetic picture of homes
laid desolate, of the fair course of peaceful lives roughly broken into; of helpless and oppressed people, of
selfish and greedy wealth. "From Glentanar, thirty miles from Aberdeen, you can walk it forests until you come
to the Atlantic." And this evil is growing rapidly; in 1812 there were only five deer-forests in Scotland; in 1873
there were seventy. In 1870, 1,320,000 acres of land were forest; in 1873, there were 2,000,000 acres thus
rendered useless. Under these circumstances, it is scarcely to be wondered at that the population is decreasing;
the population of Argyleshire in 1831 was 103,330; in 1871, forty years later, when it ought to have largely
increased, it had, on the contrary, decreased to 75,635; in Inverness it was 94,983; during the same time it has
gone down to 87,480.

But this is not all. While some farmers and peasants are "cleared out" altogether, those who are allowed to
remain suffer much from the depredations of the deer and other game. In Aberdeenshire alone no less than 291
farmers complained of the enormous damage that was done to their crops by the deer. The deer-forest is not
generally fenced in; and as deer are very partial to turnips, it naturally follows, that the herds come out of the
forest and feed off the farmers' crops. One proprietor graciously states that he does his best to keep the deer
away from the farms, but—judging by the complaints of the farmers—these laudable efforts scarcely appear to
be crowned with the success that they deserve. Not only, however, do the deer stray out of the forests, but the
farmers' sheep stray in, and as sheep are not game he is not permitted to follow them to fetch them out. When
such evidence as this comes out, and we know the pressure that is put upon tenants by their landlords, and the
danger they run by giving offence to their powerful masters, we can judge how much more remains behind of
which we know nothing. And, in the name of common justice, what is all this for? Why should a farmer be
compelled to keep his landlord's game for him? Why should the farmer's crops suffer to amuse a man who does
nothing except inherit land? This wide-spread loss, these desolated homes, these ruined lives, what mighty
national benefit have these miseries bought for England? They all occur in order that a few rich men may
have the pleasure of shooting at a bull. But at
this point the question of the Game Laws melts insensibly into that of the Land Laws, for under a just system of Land Tenure such deeds as these would be impossible; then, men could not, for their own selfish amusement, turn sheep-walks into forests, and farms into moors.

With our great and increasing population it is absolutely necessary that all cultivable land should be under cultivation. To hold uncultivated, land which is capable of producing bread and meat is a crime against the State. It is well known to be one of the points of the "extreme" Radical programme that it should be rendered penal to hold large quantities of cultivable land uncultivated. Then, instead of sending the cream of our peasantry abroad, to seek in foreign countries the land which is fenced in from them at home; instead of driving them to seek from the stranger the work which is denied to them in the country of their birth; we should keep Englishmen in England to make England strong and rich, and give land to the labour which is starving for work, and labour to the land which is barren for the lack of it. "Land to labour, and labour to land" ought to be our battle-cry, and should be the motto engraven on our shield.

But it is impossible to throw land open to labour so long as the laws render its transmission from seller to buyer so expensive and so cumbersome a proceeding. It is impossible also to effect any radical improvement so long as the land is tied up in the hands of the few fortunate individuals who are now permitted to monopolise it. Half the land of England, and four-fifths of the land of Scotland, is owned by 160 families. These few own the land which ought to be devoted to the good of the nation. Land, like air, and like all other natural gifts, cannot rightly be held as private property. The only property which can justly be claimed in land is the improvement wrought in the soil. When a man has put labour or money into the land he farms, then he has a right to the advantages which accrue from his toil and from his invested capital. But this principle is the very contrary of that which is embodied in our Land Laws. The great landowners do nothing for the land they own; they spend nothing on the soil which maintains them in such luxury. It is the farmers and the labourers who have a right to life-tenancy in the soil, or, more exactly, to a tenancy, lasting as long as they continue to improve it. The farmer, whose money is put into the land—the labourer, whose strength enriches the soil—these are the men who ought to be the landowners of England. As it is, the farmer takes a farm; he invests capital in it; he rises early to superintend his labourers; the land rewards him with her riches, she gives him fuller crops and fatter cattle, and then the landlord steps in, and raises the rent, and thus absolutely punishes the farmer for his energy and his thrift. The idle man stands by with his hands in his pockets, and then claims a share of the profits which accrue from the busy man's labour. Meanwhile the labourer—he whose strong arms have guided the plough, and wielded the spade, he who has made the harvest and tended the cattle—what do our just Land Laws give to him? They give him a wretched home, a pittance sufficient—generally at least—to "keep body and soul together," parish pay when he is ill, the workhouse in his old age, and he sleeps at last in a pauper's grave. O! just and beneficient English Law! To the idle man, the lion's share of the profits; to the man who does much, a small share; to the man who does most of all, just enough to enable him to work for his masters. But if this gross injustice be pointed out, if we protest against this crying evil, and declare that these crimes shall cease in England, then these landowners arise and complain that we are tampering with the "sacred rights of property." Sacred rights of property! But what of the more sacred rights of human life? The life of the poor is more holy than the property of the rich, and famished men and women more worthy of care than the acres of the nobleman. If these vast estates are fenced in from us by parchment fences, so that we cannot throw them open to labour, so that we cannot make the desert places golden with corn, and rich with sheep and oxen; if these vast estates are fenced in from us by parchment fences, then I say that the plough must go through the parchment, in order that the people may have bread.

The maintenance of a standing army, in which birth helps promotion, is another blot upon our shield. A Duke of Cambridge, General Commanding-in-Chief, and Colonel of four regiments, who holds these offices by virtue of his "high" birth, and in spite of the most palpable incapacity, is an absurdity which ought not to be tolerated in a country which pretends to be free. A Prince of Wales, who has never seen war, made a Field-Marshal; a Duke of Edinburgh, created a Post-Captain; such appointments as these are a disgrace to the country, and a bitter satire on our army and our navy. Carpet-soldiers are useless in time of war, and they are a burden in time of peace; and to squander England's money on such officers as these, simply because they chance to be born Princes, is a distinct breach of equal Civil Liberty.

The need of Electoral Reform is well-known to all students of politics. No country is free in which all adult citizens have not a voice in the government. A representation which is based upon a property qualification is radically vicious in principle. But not only is our civil liberty cramped by the fact that the majority of citizens are not represented at all, but even the poor representation we have is unequally and unjustly distributed. In one place 136 men return a member to Parliament; in another, 18,000 fail to return their candidate. In Parliament 110 members represent 83,000 voters. The next no represent 1,080,000. A group of 70,000 voters return 4 members; another group of 70,000 return 80. In one instance, 30,000 voters outweigh 546,000 in Parliament by a majority of 9. Hence it follows that a minority of electors rule England, and, however desirable it may be that
minorities should be represented, it is surely not desirable that they should rule. Our present system throws overwhelming power into the hands of the titled and landowning classes, who, by means of small and manageable boroughs, are able to outvote the masses of the people congregated in the large towns. As long as this is the case, as long as every citizen does not possess a vote, as long as the few can, by means of unequal distribution of electoral power, control the actions of the many, so long England is not free, and civil liberty is not won.

To strike at the House of Lords is to strike at a dying institution; but dying men sometimes live long, and dying institutions may last for centuries if only they are nursed and tended with sufficient care. A House in the election of whose members the people have no voice; a House whose members are born into it, instead of winning their way into it by service to the State; a House which is built upon cradles and not upon merit; a House whose deliberations may be shared in by fools or by knaves, provided only that the brow be coronetted—such a House is a disgrace to a free country, and an outrage on popular liberty. As might be expected from its constitution, this House, of Lords has ever stood in the path of every needed reform, until it has been struck out of the way by hidden menace or by stern command. Is there any abuse whose days are numbered? be sure it will be defended in the House of Lords. Is there a monopoly which needs to be abolished? be sure it will be championed in the House of Lords. Is there any popular liberty asked for? be sure it will be refused in the House of Lords. Is there any fetter struck from off the limbs of progress? be sure that some cunning smith will be found to weld the fragments together again, under the name of an amendment, in the House of Lords. The only use of the thing is, that it may act as a political barometer by which to prognosticate the coming weather; that which the House of Lords blesses is most certainly doomed, while whatever it frowns upon is crowned for a speedy triumph. It has not even the merit of courage, this craven assemblage of toy-players at legislation; however boldly it roars out its "No," a frown from the House of Commons makes it tremble and yield: like a reed, it stands upright enough in the calm weather; like a reed, it bows before the storm-wind of a popular cry. As a question of practical politics, the House of Lords should be struck at almost rather than the Crown, because the whole principle of aristocracy is embodied in that House, the whole fatal notion that the accident of birth gives the right to rule. Our puppet kings and queens are less directly injurious to the commonwealth than is this titled House. The gilded figure-head injures the State-vessel less than the presence of hands on her tiller-ropes which know naught of navigation. And with the fall of the House of Lords must crash down the throne, which is but the ornament upon its roof, the completion of its elevation; so that when the toy-house has fallen at the breath of the people's lips, and we can see over the near prospect which it now hides from our gaze, we shall surely see, with the light of the morning on her face, with her golden head shining in the sun-rays, with the day-star on her brow, and the white garments of peace upon her limbs, with her sceptre wreeathed in olive-branches, and her feet shod with plenty, that fair and glorious Republic for which we have yearned and toiled so long.

Having seen the chief blots upon our Civil Liberty, let us turn our attention to the defects in our religious freedom. And here I plead, neither as Freethinker nor as Secularist, but simply as a citizen of a mighty State, and member of a community which pretends to be free. For every shade of Nonconformity I plead, from the Roman Catholic to the Atheist, for all whose consciences do not fit into the mould provided by the Establishment, and whose thought refuses to be fettered by the bands of a State religion. I crave for every man, whatever be his creed, that his freedom of conscience be held sacred. I ask for everyman, whatever be his belief, that he shall not suffer, in civil matters, for his faith or for his want of faith. I demand for every man, whatever be his opinions, that he shall be able to speak out with honest frankness the results of honest thought, without forfeiting his rights as citizen, without destroying his social position, and without troubling his domestic peace. We have not to-day, in England, the scourge and the rack, the gibbet and the stake, by which men's bodies are tortured to improve their souls, but we have the scourge of calumny and the rack of severed friendship, we have the gibbet of public scorn, and the stake of a ruined home, by which we compel conformity to dogma, and teach men to be hypocrites that they may eat a piece of bread. The spirit is the same, though the form of the torture be changed; and many a saddened life, and many a wrecked hope, bear testimony to the fact that religious liberty is still but a name, and freedom of thought is still a crime. Public opinion, and social feeling, we can but strive to influence and to improve; what I would lay stress upon here, is the existence of a certain institution, and of certain laws, which foster this one-sided feeling, and which are a direct infringement of the rights of the individual conscience.

First and foremost, overshadowing the land by her gigantic monopoly, is the Church as by law established. This body—one sect among many sects—is given by law many privileges which are not accorded to any other religious denomination. Her ministers are the State-officers of religion; her highest dignitaries' legislate for the whole Empire; national graveyards are the property of her clergy; and the best parts of national buildings are owned by her rectors. So long as the State was Christian and orthodox, so long might the Establishment of the State-religion be defensible, but the moment that the Church ceased to be co-extensive with the nation, that
same moment did her Establishment become an injustice to that portion of the nation which did not conform to her creed. Every liberty won by the Nonconformist has been a blow struck at the reasonableness of the Establishment. She is nothing now but a palpable anachronism. Jews, Roman Catholics, even "Infidels" (provided only that they veil their Infidelity), may sit in the House of Parliament. They may alter the Church's articles, they may define her doctrines, they may change her creed; she is only the mere creature of the State, bought by lands and privileges to serve in a gilded slavery. The truth or the untruth of her doctrines is nothing to the point. I protest in principle against the establishment by the State of any form of religious, or of anti-religious, belief. The State is no judge in such matters; let every man follow his own conscience, and worship at what shrine his reason bids him, and let no man be injured because he differs from his neighbour's creed. The Church Establishment is an insult to every Roman Catholic, to every Protestant dissenter, to every Freethinker, in the Empire. The national property usurped by the Establishment might lighten the national burdens, were it otherwise applied, so that, indirectly, every non-Churchman is taxed for the support of a creed in which he does not believe, and for the maintenance of ministrations by which he does not profit. The Church must be destroyed, as an Establishment, before religious equality can be anything more than an empty name.

There are laws upon the Statute Book which grievously outrage the rights of conscience, and which subject an "apostate"—that is, a person who has been educated in, or who has professed Christianity, and has subsequently renounced it—to loss of all civil rights, provided that the law be put in force against him. The right of excommunication, lodged in the Church, is, I think, a perfectly fair right, provided that it carry with it no civil penalties whatsoever. The Church, like any other club, ought to be able to exclude an objectionable member, but she ought not to be able to call in the arm of the law to impose non-spiritual penalties. But the "apostate" loses all civil rights. The law, as laid down, is as follows: "Enacted by statute 9 and 10, William III., cap 32, that if any person educated in, or having made profession of, the Christian religion, shall by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking, assert or maintain there are more Gods than one, or shall deny the Christian religion to be true [this Act adds to these offences, that of "denying any one of the persons in the Trinity to be God," but it was repealed quoad hoc, by 53 George III., c. 60] or the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be of divine authority, he shall upon the first offence be rendered incapable to hold any ecclesiastical, civil, or military office, or employment, and for the second, be rendered incapable of bringing any action, or to be guardian, executor, legatee, or grantee, and shall suffer three years' imprisonment without bail. To give room, however, for repentance, if within four months after the first conviction, the delinquent will, in open court, publicly renounce his error, he is discharged for that once from all disabilities." Some will say that this law is never put in force; true, public opinion would not allow of its general enforcement, but it is turned against those who are poor and weak, while it lets the strong go free. Besides, it hangs over every sceptic's head like the sword of Damocles, and it serves as a threat and menace in the hand of every cruel and bigoted Churchman, who wants to extract any concession from an unbeliever. No law that can be enforced is obsolete; it may lie dormant for a time, but it is a sabre, which can at any moment be drawn from the sheath; the "obsolete" law about the Sabbath closed the Brighton Aquarium, and Rosherville Gardens, and is found to be quite easy of enforcement; though people would have laughed, a short time since, at the idea of anyone grumbling at its presence on the Statute Book. Poor, harmless, half-witted, Thomas Pooley, in 1857, found the Blasphemy Laws by no means "a dead letter" in the mouth of Lord Justice Coleridge. And there are plenty of other cases of injustice which have taken, and do take place under these laws, which might be quoted were it worthwhile to fill up space with them, and but little is needed to fan the smouldering fire of bigotry into a flame, and to put the laws generally in force once more. Already threats are heard, murmurs of the old wicked spirit of persecution, and it behoves us to see to it that these swords be broken, so that bigots may be unable to wield them again among us.

I do not, as I have said, protest now against these laws as a Secularist; I challenge them only as unjust disabilities imposed on men's consciences, and I appeal to all lovers of liberty to agitate against them, because they impose civil disabilities on some forms of religious opinion. And to you, O Christians! I would say: fight Freethought, if you will; oppose Atheism, if you deem it false and injurious to humanity: strike at us with all your strength on the religious platform; it is your right, nay, it is even your duty; but do not seek to answer our questions by blows from the statute book, nor to check our search after truth by the arm of the law. I impeach these laws against "infidels," at the bar of public opinion, as an infraction of the just liberty of the individual, as an insult to the dignity of the citizen, as an outrage on the sacred rights of conscience.

I do not pretend, in the short pages of such a paper as this, to have done more than to sketch, very briefly and very imperfectly, the chief defects of our civil and religious liberty. I have only laid before you a rough draft of a programme of Reform. Each blot on English liberty which I have pointed to might well form the sole subject of an essay; but I have hoped that, by thus gathering up into one some few of the many injustices under which we suffer, I might, perchance, lend definiteness to the aspirations after Liberty which swell in the breasts of many, and might point out to the attacking army some of the most assailable points of the fortress of bigotry.
and caste-prejudice, which the soldiers of Freedom are vowed to assail. I have taken, as it were, a bird's-eye
view of the battle-ground of the near future, of that battle-ground on which soon will clash together the army
which fights under the banner of privileges, and the army which marches under the standard of Liberty. The
issue of that conflict is not doubtful, for Liberty is immortal and eternal, and her triumph is sure, however it
may be delayed. The beautiful goddess before whom we bow is ever young with a youth which cannot fade,
and radiant with a glory which nought can dim. Hers is the promise of the future; hers the fair days that shall
dawn hereafter on a liberated earth; and hers is also the triumph of to-morrow, if only we, who adore her, if
only we can be true to ourselves and to each other. But they who love her must work for her, as well as worship
her, for labour is the only prayer to Liberty, and devotion the only praise. To her we must consecrate our
brain-power and our influence among our fellows; to her we must sacrifice our time, and, "if need be, our
comfort and our happiness; to her we must devote our efforts, and to her the fruits of our toil. And at last, in the
fair, bright future—at last, in the glad tomorrow—amid the shouts of a liberated nation, and the joy of men and
women who see their children free, we shall see the shining goddess descending from afar, where we have
worshipped her so long, to be the sunshine and the glory of every British home. And then, O men and women
of England, then, when you have once clasped the knees of Liberty, and rested your tired brows on her gentle
breast, then cherish and guard her evermore, as you cherish the bride you have won to your arms, as you guard
the wife whose love is the glory of your manhood, and whose smile is the sunshine of your home.

Chapter I. The Dawn Of Life.

ALL things on this earth may be roughly divided into two classes: things which have motion, and things
which have not; in other words, things which are living, and things which are dead. The first constitute the
animal and vegetable kingdoms, and the mineral kingdom contains all the inanimate class. Motion and life
seem at once to be intimately connected; we recognise the vitality of any living thing, animal or vegetable, by
its power of motion; whether from place to place, as in an animal, or in simple changes of form or aspect, as in
both animal and vegetable.

Yet we must not confound motion and life. We see motion in even the class of inanimate things. Steam will
rise in the air, a stone will fall to the ground; both these are instances of motion, yet even a child scarcely
considers them as any sign of life. I propose to myself the project of pondering how far life and motion may be
assumed to be indeed one and the same element, though they may differ in degree as much or more than a man
differs from a jelly-fish. It will be necessary first to think what phases of motion are readily perceptible to our
senses, and then to follow up that chain till we approach forms of motion almost as little to be rendered account
of to our senses as is the ultimate mystery, life itself. We may at any rate prove that there is a path advancing
step by step into the unknown; we may even go along some part of the road, and we may form a just notion as
to where that road will ultimately lead us.

I have already instanced the simplest form of motion with which we are acquainted—the falling of a stone
or other body towards the earth. This action or motion is so general or, as it were, natural, that countless
generations of men had witnessed it and it did not even occur to them to think of rendering a reason for it. Some
of the old Greek philosophers gave a feeble consideration to the matter, but did not or could not follow the
question out; and there it rested till an English philosopher, Isaac Newton, had the remembrance of their
difficulties brought to his mind by observing an apple fall from a tree, and set himself to think why the apple
should fall to the earth, and whether that motion was in the apple or in the earth. The result of long thought and
calculation on his part was the ascertained truth that every substance in the universe is attracted, or drawn
towards, or seeks to approach every other substance;: and that it will so approach if there be not forces acting in
other directions to prevent it. This attraction is called the force of gravitation, or weight-force; and it is so called
because it is greater in proportion to the weight and density of the body exercising that attraction.
It is this same force that accounts for the second form of motion that I mentioned—the rising of steam through the air; for the particles of steam are lighter in proportion to their size or bulk than the particles of the air; the particles of the air are, therefore, more forcibly attracted to the earth, and squeeze out of place or force away the steam higher up into the air, i.e., farther away from the earth.

If instead of air we take water for an example, we shall see the same series of motions repeated, for a piece of iron will sink or drop through the water, because iron is heavier or denser, bulk for bulk, than water; and a bubble of air or a piece of cork will rise through water (just as steam does through the air) because both air and cork are lighter or less dense, bulk for bulk, than water. And now, if instead of water we take mercury, which is also a fluid, we shall find that a piece of gold will sink in it, but a piece of iron will float in it; and this again for the same reason, because gold is denser than mercury, and iron is not so dense as mercury.

Here we may learn two things: firstly, that some solids may be less dense than other fluids; and, secondly, that density is after all but a comparative and conditional term, and is proportional to the medium or atmosphere in which, the action takes place, for both iron and gold will sink in water, or drop through the air, yet only one of them will sink in mercury.

We all know that what is called an empty bucket, that is, a bucket full of air, is not so heavy as a bucket full of water, and that this again is not so heavy as a lump of iron the same size, and this lump of iron will not be so heavy as a bucket full of mercury, nor this again so heavy as a similar mass of gold.

Now the real meaning of the weight or heaviness of all these is simply the greater or less force with which they are attracted towards the earth; that force being in exact proportion to their density as compared with their bulk. For the earth is the great mass towards which all substances on the earth are attracted, and as far as earthly things are considered we may call it the centre of gravitation. It is our greatest and heaviest mass, and hence all earthly things progress or fall towards it when not prevented by other forces or obstacles. It is true that what we call celestial objects have also an attraction for each other and the earth, and for all things on the earth; but distance is also an element in the calculation of gravitation, and the earth is so much nearer that a stone let go at the distance of 1000 or 100,000 feet above the earth is attracted more powerfully by the earth which is near than by the sun which is so far off, though the sun is 1,300,000 times larger than the earth, and its attraction proportionately great.

And the planets and our earth and the sun would all rush together but for their motion in their orbits—a circular motion which they have that counterbalances this attraction or motion of gravitation and keeps them hovering at a distance. What is the secret or cause of this circular or orbital motion may be discovered by another Newton, but it will certainly be found to be but a phase of this universal force of gravitation.

Indeed all motions and conditions seem to be but phases or consequences of phases of this universal law. Next in order to gravitation as generally defined, we might place what is called the attraction of cohesion—an attraction that does not seem quite so dependent on density, and that might be defined as the greater attraction that substances of the same nature have for each other under favourable circumstances than for substances of a dissimilar nature. It is this attraction that causes the homogeneousness or consistency of [unclear: t] metals, or stone, or wood, &c. This attraction gives as its evidence the two qualities known as hardness and tenacity. It may be exemplified by the cutting of a piece of wood or lead with a steel knife, whereas a piece of steel could not be cut with a wooden or leaden knife. The mechanical explanation of this fact is that the particles of steel have a greater attraction of cohesion for each other than have the particles of wood or lead; the particles of wood or lead may be easily separated, but the particles of steel are separable with difficulty.

This attraction of cohesion may seem to be but a passive or defensive attraction, while gravitation is an active or offensive power; yet the seemingly passive force of cohesion is always really in action, for it must not be forgotten that it is this force which at every instant holds bodies together in resistance to the active force of gravitation which might otherwise cause an indiscriminate mingling of their atoms with those of all the other bodies composing the mass of the earth. And some phases of this form of attraction are palpably active, for under this head may be classed the force of chemical affinity, and the force which produces and guides crystallization.

The force, chemical affinity, bears a very close resemblance to the attraction of cohesion, and may be roughly defined as the attraction which the particles of one clearly defined chemical element or substance have for another of those elements. At present these elements are known to have certain affinities or combining powers with each other, and these attractions or affinities vary in each case, so that an element will leave one with which it is already combined to join another for which it has a greater affinity, and will again leave that, if one for which it has a still greater affinity be presented to it.

And now we come to the force of crystallization, and must give our earnest attention to this force; for we get here the first glimpse of a force or motion that in some of its actions closely resembles life. For we have here introduced defined growth towards a defined form. Crystals are of varying sizes and shapes according to their substance, the same substance generally following fixed and certain rules as to form. The growth of
crystals is sometimes so rapid or vivid that with some substances, and a strong magnifying glass, the crystals may be seen forming themselves. In some instances this action of growth might well be mistaken for some part of the action that is seen in vegetable life. On ancient flint implements accretions of iron and manganese have been found which bear more than a casual resemblance to various cryptogamous plants, mosses, lichens, and algae or seaweed. An example familiar to us all is that of the mosslike appearance of a frozen window-pane, the "moss" being simply water in a state of crystallization.

This last example brings us face to face with another series of forces or attractions; the force by which bodies may be brought to, and held in, any one of the three conditions: the solid, the fluid, and the gaseous—in a word, how water may exist as ice, water, or steam, each of the three conditions giving powers of combination, or altered force, which would not be possible in any other condition. As far as we know, all elements are capable of these conditions under given circumstances, and there is, as just said, a considerable intrinsic difference in the conditions. Fluids seem only compressible with intense force, while solids have a considerable and gases an excessive amount of compressibility. Fluids and solids, again, have the attraction of cohesion, so that solids retain their form, and fluids their equilibrium; yet in gases the force of cohesion seems to be almost, if not altogether, absent. A pound of any solid substance, or a pint of any fluid, would retain their simple appearance in a vacuum; but it would seem that the same measure of gas would permeate and fill up (though in a rarefied or attenuated form) any vacuum however great.

Now, each of these conditions is distinctly defined and separate, and the change from one to another seems to be effected by some form of the most living force we have yet spoken of—heat. And as we consider this force of heat we find it to be as universal as gravitation, every substance having specific, or intrinsic, or self-contained heat, just as it has specific or self-contained weight. And specific heat varies in different bodies just in a similar manner to what specific weight or gravity does. And just as we may not perceive the weight of a body till some displacement occurs which allows the force of gravitation to come into perceptible action, so specific heat may only become manifest or perceptible when certain changes are brought about in the condition of the substance containing it. When heat is thus manifest or active, it does to the evidence of our senses change some substances from the solid into the fluid state, and from that again into the gaseous state, and a deprivation of heat will act in just the reverse direction.

Chemical action or affinity, which has already been spoken of, is very frequently attended by the evolution or absorption of heat, and for the reason already given, i.e., a disturbance in the molecular conditions of elements which makes manifest their specific heat. Chemical action, indeed, is the main source of the heat with which we are acquainted, for the heat of the sun itself is but the result of chemical action or combustion in or on the sun.

As with the other forms of force or motion or attraction spoken of, heat is but a comparative condition, and our experience of it on this earth has but a very limited range. We may readily imagine a planet or world where the heat was so great that water was only known in a gaseous state, and their rivers might be of molten metal; or, on the other hand, one so cold that ice might be their usual building material, roofed with sheets of hydrogen, an element that we only know in a gaseous state. And any bodily organism of living creatures would have to be proportionately altered; yet there is nothing repugnant to the idea of a similar condition to mind, or soul, or life, call it what we will, existing under the changed circumstances.

And I think this may be taken as a probable solution of the question whether there is life on other planets or worlds; for wherever there exist the forces that we have knowledge of on this earth, there will life follow as a natural consequence.

I spoke just now of combustion. This word simply means chemical action or combination so intense that heat and light result. And in light we have reached almost the last of the series of forces of which we have yet any clear conception. We have seen by now that the word force is to be used in a somewhat different sense from that generally ascribed to it. It is too generally confounded with "strength" or "motion:" yet we see it may be existing where we have only pictured inactivity, or rest, or death. We may see a soldier standing "at ease." He too is resting, yet the muscles of his legs and back are all in action, or the man would fall to the earth. And in speaking of light as a force it might be thought that I was applying a false word. In giving an instance or two of the power of light, we may recognize that it is literally a force.

We know that a plant in comparative darkness will hardly grow, and will at best be but pale and sickly. It is light that gives the green colour to all vegetation, simply because it is the initial force which gives the chemical elements in vegetation the impulse to unite and form healthy green flesh necessary for the plant's full life. Again, light is the force that draws all our photographic pictures. In taking those pictures, where the light falls strongest the chemical salts are destroyed or decomposed; where the light does not fall those salts are left untouched.

It must need force to do this, and light is that force. Light is certainly the initial force of a vast amount of chemical action, and again it seems sometimes to be the consequence of chemical action; as with heat, which is
in turn the origin or result of such action. Some time we may have knowledge of latent or specific light as well as of specific heat or specific gravity.

As yet we know but little of the vast force involved in light. George Stephenson said that a railway engine was driven by the rays of bottled sunshine contained in the coals that fed the furnace, and there seems no doubt that he was correct. Coal is the buried vegetation of forests of millions of years ago. The sun shone on those trees and on their leaves and branches day by day in their growth, the light and warmth was effective in working the chemical change that formed their vegetable tissue, and when the trees fell, century by century, their dead bodies contained and preserved the results of this action; this absorbed or latent light and heat lay buried in them, is in them when they are mined and dug up, and when they are put into the fire-box of the engine. The fire is lit, and by combustion, the bottled sunbeams, developed into the form of heat, are transmitted to the water in the boiler, this heat turns the water from fluid into the gaseous state of steam; the steam occupies vastly more space than water, and in endeavouring to get room to spread itself to its natural bulk is allowed to force out a piston, this piston moves a crank which turns the wheel on which the engine rests, and the whole engine moves on.

In this brief story we see what permutations or changes may take place in the same force; now it appears to us as light, now as heat, now as chemical action, now as mechanical motion overcoming the attraction of gravitation. Indeed there seems but one force, and the changes in it are but changes in that they are more clearly perceived by some one of our imperfect senses than by the others.

I have used the words initial force once or twice and shall need to explain this somewhat, for the ultimate purposes of our argument. Initial force, then, is the impulse which once given to matter or force is carried on in the matter or force itself without need for repetition of the original impulse. For instance, the mechanical action involved in the striking of a match is the initial force which gives rise to its combustion, and this combustion may be conveyed to things innumerable without need for any repetition of mechanical action. With a slight knowledge of chemistry, we may remember where a single drop of sulphuric acid is capable of initializing the same process of combustion.

In some cases the force of crystallization may be initialized in a similar way. A mass of salts may be in a condition ready for crystallization, and continue in that preparatory stage till some tiny initial mechanical impulse, such as even the prick of a needle, is given, when the mass will at once rush into crystals. We all know too that nitro-glycerine may by a slight mechanical force be driven into gas, and possibly a frightful explosion ensue. Any slight amount of one kind of force may, under favourable circumstances, be the initializer of a vastly increased mass of some widely different phase.

And now I will only call attention to one other form of force before endeavouring to show how all these forces, or some combination of them, may have given the initial impulse to the wondrous force of life. This last force to which I shall draw attention is electricity, a force of whose knowledge we are but yet in the infancy; and a force that seems, even as far as our present knowledge goes, to be capable of a considerable number of phases. This is the force by which, to give a simple example, a man's words may be conveyed almost without lapse of time from one place to another (the electric telegraph); it is also the force that causes the attraction of a magnet for iron.

Whether electricity be the cause of some of the various forms of force already named, or simply a resultant of them, is more than can be said at present: it sometimes appears in the one character and sometimes in the other. It seems in this way to add greater strength to the presumption that all force is but some different and convertible phase of some great and ultimate property;—the very property of being or existing; for existence and movement or force are inalienable and interchangeable terms. But be electricity what it may, it is already known that all things are subject to its influence, and that it is therefore presumably as universal and great in its results as gravitation itself.

With all this well weighed and considered—bearing in mind the different possibilities of matter in its known conditions of solid, fluid, and gaseous—bearing in mind the powers of chemical combination and the novel substances engendered thereby—bearing in mind the power of definite form and growth of which the force of crystallisation is an example—bearing in mind that an initial impulse however slight, once communicated, may give rise to a condition so widely differing from itself that the change is to our present powers utterly inexplicable; and that this condition will be perpetuated as long as there is matter favourably situated to be affected by it—bearing in mind all this, I ask if there is anything very inconceivable in the idea that matter has been so acted upon by some initial impulse that has given rise to the phase of force which we call life, with all its attendant phenomena?

For, after all, what is life? Animated beings may be traced down to a type wherein they seem little more than inert masses of matter—masses of gelatinous substance, or of vegetable growth scarce differing from rust—and with little more than the power of growth or assimilation of similar matter to that of their own substance, which they have in common with many substances that we hold to be but minerals with the chemical
properties of cohesion and combination.

To such a view as this the continual objection made is: "Yes, but you never show us what is the initial force by which inanimate matter is endowed with the property of life." To this I can but say: Can we yet explain any initial impulse? And why do you call any matter inanimate? Is not chemical action itself a phase of life, just as we reasonably presume all these other forces to be but phases of some universal ruling principle? And indeed to me there seems a less distance between the crudest forms of living organisms and simple chemical action, than between those same organisms and intellectual man. This difference and progress I shall make an attempt to follow in my next study, the "Dawn of Humanity." And as to the question of defining or pointing out the initial force which institutes the beginning of life, that initial force just as easy or as difficult to point out as any other initial force of which I have spoken: we see the results, and it is a simple matter of comparative result on which we have arbitrarily made the distinction of calling one phenomenon animate action, while we stigmatize the other as inanimate.

Yes: the greater our power of observation, the less do we see to be the distinction between life and death, between force and matter; death (i.e. inanimation) is but hidden life, matter is but hidden force. Change, or rather motion, is the one constant rule of all things; and as our senses grow, and fresh capacities or organs of sensibility are developed, we shall grasp at higher and still more intangible phenomena. It is not that Nature's workings are so mysterious, but that our own faculties are so small, our own eyesight so dim. Yet if we will carefully consult and ever strive to improve the faculties we have, and follow out and strengthen in our being the perceptions of justice and truth which Nature everywhere shows us, we shall grow to know her better, and to have fuller, stronger sight—we shall be worthy to know more of the at present mysterious meaning of life. When we are so worthy the knowledge cannot be hidden from us, we may become intelligent co-operators in Nature's work; and with power in our eyes and love in our hearts we shall fulfil the poet's golden prophecy, and become in very deed

"the crowning race
Of those that, eye to eye, shall look
On knowledge; under whose command
Is earth and earth's, and in their hand
Is Nature like an open book."

Chapter II.
The Dawn of Humanity.

In the previous study, I have presumed or asserted that matter, under certain conditions, may become a living organism, such active life being the sequence of an initial impulse which we may hope eventually to trace and solve. I have further asserted that matter to which such an impulse has been once conveyed, may continue or even increase that impulse under suitable conditions. These assertions cover two of the most advanced theories yet deduced from our knowledge of to-day—viz., Spontaneous Generation, and the Development or Origin of Species. In plain words, the theory of Spontaneous Generation declares that, under certain conditions of matter, life will be initiated and living organisms will be evolved or spontaneously generated; and the theory of Development is that these organisms once evolved will not only have the power of continuing the impulse, i.e. of propagating themselves, but also of developing further and higher capabilities under favouring conditions, and thereby of becoming higher organisms—organisms, in fact, such that we could no longer readily accept the supposition of their being in that condition spontaneously generated.

The theory of Spontaneous Generation has as yet but a limited acceptance, owing to the difficulty at present of producing positive argument and irrefutable experiment in its support, and owing, moreover, to its entire antagonism to any biblical or other revelation, or to belief in any super-natural power. But it seems to me that the position may be conclusively proved and justified even by negative argument; and it may be useful so to justify it before going further.

Evidently all primary generation (or initiation of life) must either be spontaneous, or else the act of some creative power foreign to the organism itself. In other words, life is either the natural, innate, and inevitable result of certain conditions of matter, or it is the act of a creator external to the matter. Such a presumed creator is usually styled God, and we may therefore conveniently use this term in the sense specified. Nor shall we in so using the word be doing any wrong to the somewhat numerous class who seem disinclined to accept the
theory of spontaneity of life, while yet rejecting the inconsistencies which become every day more palpable in the theory of God and his creation of life. For indeed there is no logical halting-place between the two conclusions. Either all phenomena (life included) are attributable to certain natural properties and sequences, or they are due to an extra-natural power, a God.

Let us shift our questioning, then, from matter to its presumed "Creator." Let us inquire into the origin of God. How came he into existence? Did he create himself? If so, we have a notable instance of the spontaneous generation which his believers deny. Had God himself a creator outside himself? If so, we may apply the same questioning as to his creator. We only get the elephant and tortoise fable over again.

There is but one resource left, and that is the assertion that God has existed for ever. This is but a begging of the question, for no proof is given of the truth of the assertion; and being unverified and unverifiable, it has not the least tangible claim to assent from our intellect.

The God theory is then placed in this dilemma: that it must either acknowledge spontaneity of life (which renders the God theory itself unnecessary), or take refuge in an unverified assertion utterly beyond the ken of our senses and intellect.

Against such a course of argument as this the constant objection of Theists or supernaturalists is, that there are more things existent than can be brought to the evidence of our senses; but on that perfectly allowable position they base the startling affirmation that therefore we must not reason about God, or, at any rate, must not accept any conclusion of our reason which leads to his rejection! Yet in all the assertions that they make in support of the God theory, it is to these very senses of ours that they ultimately appeal; they have recourse with confidence to our senses and our reason for acknowledgment of what they call the works of a God, and thereby of a God himself, and yet they deny to our senses and reason any right to evidence of, or faculty to criticise, the hypothetical being whom they expect our reason to recognise!

The words reason and senses may in this connection be used as of the same meaning, for reason is but the collected and developed experience of our senses. Now, if this reason and these senses may be safely appealed to, and their evidence be received in the case of results, materialists hold that the questionings of reason may be and must be extended to causes, and that indeed the conclusions of reason are the only ones that can validly be accepted by the organism that has given birth to it, and, as it were, delegated to it the care and power of the guidance and government of the organism.

It is to this reason and to these senses that Materialism appeals, for it sees in man's being no evidence of any higher tribunal. Nor need it care to do so, since it also sees in the reason and the senses, and the self-responsibility of man, a faculty of development, of power, and of harmony with nature, far beyond the feeble dreams and dulcet cajoleries of any God theory, ancient or modern.

And Materialism claims for itself and for its evidence a higher character and a greater worth of acceptance than it holds due to any religious or supernatural or ultra-intellectual theory And this on several grounds. For Materialism appeals to no select few, but to senses and faculties which all possess. It does not recognise that any special clique or class of man has received a supernatural revelation of things in which all men have a joint and equal concern. Its evidences are facts which have been gathered with care and painstaking by close observers and lovers of nature, not dark fancies evolved from the tortured and ascetic brains of men who have begun their system with the assumption that nature is an abhorrent and unholy thing. Materialism, claims the higher character, because it comes into the light and courts the examination and aid of all, not shrouding and hiding itself in impenetrable unintelligibleness, and hurling threats and cursings and thunderings at those who shall dare to deny its infallibility, analyse its inconsistency, or despise its degrading sycophancy and terrorism.

Though I have spoken of Spontaneous Generation as not having been to the consent of all irrefutably proved, it must not be forgotten that there are men who decisively affirm that they have to the evidence of the senses produced organic life where it was previously non-existent. The evidence of Bastian and others is convincing that living organisms are constantly evolved in liquids which have been hermetically sealed in flasks while boiling, or submitted to still greater heat, and carefully preserved from all extraneous influence of the atmosphere.

The arguments used by opponents to explain or contradict these experiments, is what is known as the "germ" theory—an assertion that there are countless seeds of living organisms floating in the air, and ever ready to develop themselves into active life when favourable conditions of matter are presented. It is true that these germs may be invisible in even the most powerful microscope, and so imperceptible as to elude the subtlest chemical test, yet the theory has the convenient property of continuing to refer the initiation of life to some primary act on the part of a creator. It is to such germs, also, that many forms of disease, epidemic or otherwise, are attributed; so that if the theory of the creation of germs be correct, it will follow that the appearance of certain new and previously unknown forms of disease, such as diphtheria or rinderpest, is an evidence that the creation was not an act once accomplished and done with, but that the Creator still busies himself from time to time with doubtful benefits to his creatures.
Let it be understood that Materialists do not deny that low organisms may propagate themselves by germs, as well as by other means more clearly visible to our senses. Materialism simply denies any extra-natural creation or origin of these germs, and the materialistic explanation of a new form of parasitic disease would be that certain novel conditions of matter had evolved or developed into a new form some low type of organism, which, once generated, might propagate itself either by cell-growth or by germs. The Germ theorists would say, that if all the germs or sporules of small-pox, typhoid fever, &c., could once be destroyed, we should never see those diseases more; the Evolutionist says that similar unsanitary conditions to those that now exist where those dis-eases are rife, would again evolve them.

It must not be forgotten that it would be no refutation of spontaneous generation even if men had not yet succeeded in producing it. It is the action of nature that is in question, rather than man's power, to evoke that action. And certainly, whether by spontaneous generation or otherwise primitive and extremely simple organisms are, under favourable circumstances, everywhere readily and plentifully generated, and in an ascending scale from them we have a series of ever higher developments.

As instances of fairly low (though not the lowest) animal and vegetable organisms, I may take the amœba and the alga, previously referred to as "masses of gelatinous substance, or of vegetable growth, scarce differing from rust." The amœba is but a floating speck of jelly that absorbs or covers other floating particles of matter which can afford sustenance to it. It has no defined organs of nutrition, or of any other function; it simply lets the floating particle sink into its jelly-like substance, and then, by a process no more vital than chemical affinity, or even simple attraction of cohesion, it absorbs what there may be in the floating particles analogous to its own substance, and lets the remainder again sink or drop through. Its action seems no more a living one than is the action of the isinglass used in "fining" beer. The isinglass that is there introduced falls gradually to the bottom of the cask, enfolding in its own substance, and bearing down with it, every floating speck of turbid matter, and leaving the beer clear. And, undoubtedly, any particle of isinglass or other gelatinous matter that might previously have existed in the floating specks would be absorbed from out them into the homogeneous mass of the isinglass itself. Why this action of the isinglass is to be set down as mechanical action, while that of the amoeba is to be exalted to the dignity of living action, it is not for me to say, since I do not believe in the distinction.

Some forms of the algæ are a sort of grey-green mould or rust: they "vegetate exclusively in water or in damp situations; they require no nutriment, but such as is supplied by water and the air dissolved in it, which they absorb equally by every part of their surface." These are the words of one of the most strenuous advocates of the God theory. Yet if for algæ we substitute the word rust, how perfect a description we get of the action of moisture or water on iron. And what is the difference between the two actions? As far as I can see, it is simply this, that the algæ form a compound of three elements, oxygen, hydrogen, and carbon, while the iron merely absorbs oxygen from the air or water, and so forms a compound of only two elements, oxygen and iron. No one disputes the spontaneous evolution of rust, that is, of a compound of iron and oxygen: strange that men should find it so hard to credit the spontaneous evolution of a compound of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen!

Two objections may here be raised: firstly, that rust will only appear or propagate itself where there is iron or some other metal to feed it; and, secondly, that the action of algæ, or, at any rate, of other living organisms, is more vivid than that of rust. To the first objection it is a sufficient answer that neither will algæ nor any other organisms appear or propagate themselves where there is not suitable food for them; and to the second, I would reply that I am not asserting an equal degree of vital action in both the cases, but simply that both instances are but different degrees of the same natural and spontaneous action; the dragging of one stick across another may seem to be action remote enough from that of combustion, yet we know that combustion is but an enhanced form of such action, and is, under given circumstances, edible thereby.

In the lower living organisms, the distinction between animal and vegetable is frequently so confused as to render the organisms incapable of being classified with certainty; some motionless and apparently vegetable growths having other well-defined animal properties, whilst some actively moving organisms are, in other respects, as undoubtedly vegetable. One would almost say, that on the threshold of life the organisms are debating and undecided as to which of the two great channels they will follow. When this choice is made, the same indecision seems extended again somewhat to choice of species; the mass of the primitive organisms being involved in a hazy mist, to which only a very self-confident man could venture to assign defined limits and arbitrary classifications.

In these lower forms of life, the methods of extension or spreading, or repetition of both animal and vegetable organisms are, as might be presumed, identical; and are visibly effected by either gemmation, or fissure, or both. Gemmation is only another word for budding; buds form on the original organism, which break off and become independent organisms. Fissure means that the original organism, when grown, splits into two or more independent organisms. Some of the lowest organisms are asserted to consist of single cells of animated organic matter, and it is, of course, the development of further cells that renders practicable either
gemmation or fissure. Yet we may soon find organisms with a considerable accretion of cells not separating from each other, but remaining with the parent organism, and, as it were, helping in the mutual and better development of each; and we then begin to find special groupings of these cells fulfilling certain definite functions in the economy of the organism, becoming, in point of fact, the organs for the support and growth and propagation of the organism.

Here, too, we begin to come on clearer distinctions between animal and vegetable; whose main difference has been roughly, but fairly well-defined in the observation that with a vegetable the food is mainly applied to continually increasing its fabric throughout its life, whereas, with the animal, the food is only applied to growth till the adult form is attained, and is then simply used to maintain that condition in efficiency.

We then go on to find special and peculiar formations and growths of cells for various purposes in the structure of the organism; so that, eventually, we have cells whose special purpose is to form the tissue or flesh of a plant, while others of different structure form the bark or fruit and in animals we have cells which form the fibres of the muscle, somewhat different ones forming the bone, and others yet different forming the brain or nerve matter, &c., &c.

This development of different cells and functions is but one form of the variations which are taking place, of which, perhaps, the most important is the adaptation of the organisms themselves to altered circumstances in which they may find it convenient or necessary to live, and the development of varied forms and powers which will render that life more acceptable and enjoyable to them. And it may fairly be said that this variation or development is a fact in which all classes of observers agree, though not all are willing to allow to it the same great ultimate results. It is the reasoning out of such of these results as we have undoubted cognizance of to their possible and logical conclusions, and the acceptance of those conclusions, that constitutes the theory already referred to of development or origin of species.

In the lower forms of organisms this development or variation is, as I have previously intimated, very conspicuous, so that fructification or generation has frequently to be waited for and observed before the organisms can with any certainty be assigned to a definite class. And this question of fructification or generation brings us to one of the most vexed and evaded questions in the whole history of physiology or development—that of alternate generation, which will be presently discussed.

For a further phenomenon has manifested itself in the course of these developments—the difference of sexes; and to this I shall need to draw your careful attention, since in his own case man has based on that difference a series of artificial and arbitrary, and therefore unjust, distinctions which have done more than any other act to retard the progress and hinder the happiness of the human race.

We noticed that in the extension or propagation of the lower forms of life, the growth or birth of further cells was followed by a constant budding or splitting off from the parent organism, but that in somewhat higher forms we find cells remaining and allotting themselves to various special functions, and forming special organs for those purposes. As might naturally be supposed, a substitute is at once provided for the superseded actions of gemmation or fissure; so that among the first definite organs we find those for the extension or propagation of the species, and with such a specialized function we also find, as we might anticipate, a more methodical manner of fulfilling that function. The cells or germs which will form the infant organisms are no longer indiscriminately severed as soon as formed; but are stored in assigned receptacles to await what shall seem to the organism a fitting time for their evolvement and extrusion. To convey this fitness and impulse for extrusion is the function of a further organ, which in its turn has secreted special cells.

In these two sets of organs and their difference of cells we have the first glimpse of separate male and female functions. To distinguish the two classes of cells, the latter are usually called germ cells, and the former sperm cells. The secretion of sperm cells, and their application, in due time, to the germ cells, is the function of the male organs; the secretion of the germ cells, and the care of their development after impregnation, is the female function. For a long time we find both these organs existing in the same creature; and this arrangement is very general throughout vegetable life, from the lowest forms to the very highest. It also extends into some fairly high grades of animal life, the oyster being a notable instance of hermaphroditism, as this union of the two organs in one being is termed.

At first, too, both these functions may be performed within the one being without any extraneous aid; but presently it would seem that a better result is attained by some intermingling of possible slight variations, and we find two individual organisms uniting in a mutual and utterly reciprocatory act of parentage, each being having fulfilled the functions of father, and accepted the responsibilities of mother, to an ensuing progeny. But this intermingling does not seem an inevitable necessity, for there is evidence that many such organisms have the capacity of both self and reciprocal impregnation. Here, too, the strange fact may be noted that in some organisms the co-operation of three individuals is necessary to effect the generative act.

The change from gemmation to sexual generation is by no means an invariable or fixed one, for we have here intervening the strange phenomenon of alternate generation just referred to. Various organisms may
propagate a progeny by means of sexual organs, and the members of this progeny will be of a totally different type to their parents in nature, appearance, and capabilities, and having no sexual organs, but giving birth to their progeny by the primitive methods of gemmation or fissure; yet this further progeny will be fully developed like the first set of parents, having sexual organs, yet giving birth in turn to organisms that differ in type, and only propagate by gemmation. It is, as it were, an inheritance from grandparent to grandchild, with an intervening generation of an utterly different and inferior organism. In some instances this descent seems to run through three forms of organisms before reverting to the original type.

This phenomenon is affected to be made somewhat light of and readily explained away by the holders of the God theory; apparently because it militates somewhat against their idea of a creation, and is equally strong evidence in favour of the materialistic theory of development or origin of species. If, as is the case, a stationary and, in so far, vegetable-like polyp can give birth to an independent and totally different swimming creature (a form of medusa), which lives its life and gives birth again to stationary polyps, it is easy enough to say that the one is but a latent or intervening form of the other; but this does not explain the difference, nor destroy the evident fact that some organisms under certain circumstances do evolve an utterly different form of being. It were perhaps to "consider too curiously" to ask the God theorists which of the types was the one originally created, and whence came the other?

It is too much the habit of the God theorists to play fast and loose with species; holding, when it suits their purpose, to the idea of the special creation of each individual species, and dropping that idea when the conclusions become at all inconvenient. Yet there are only two possible ways of accounting for species. Either they are the results of the development of accidental or beneficial natural variations; or they must be the result of distinct creative acts. In the first case the materialistic theory of development must be accepted with all its consequent inductions (summarized towards the end of this paper); in the second case all the logical consequences of special creation must be accepted, of which consequences we may readily find an exemplification. It is a definite and accepted fact, for instance, that there are various species of entozoa or internal parasites finding a congenial habitat in the flesh and organs of special animals and incapable of existence elsewhere. There are also varied species of external parasites which make their dwelling-place on the skin of animals, and live by extracting the grateful juices from within, nor can they exist on other than specified animals. In the case of man, we may instance psoriasis (as the itch is technically called), the presence of exceedingly small but irritating animalculæ, without troubling to refer to larger easily remembered insects. With the creation theory, or with the germ theory as propounded by non-evolutionists, we must accept the conclusion that the first man and animals had within and without them all the various types of the parasitic organisms with which their descendants are still troubled.

II. The Dawn of Humanity.

SURELY, none but a fabled God, the dark imagination of an ignorant and uncultured mind, could look upon poor Adam or any other man, afflicted inwardly with tœnia and ascarides, busied externally with the prolific pediculi that enliven the solitude of the primitive savage, and having the monotony of his consequent reflections diversified by the chigo of the West Indies and the guinea-worm of torrid Africa; could look too upon the sheep with a diseased liver, owing to the fasciolæ or "flukes" therein existent; could gaze on the pig evincing more than a suspicion of trichine or "measles," and upon the potato for the food of the same pig already bearing the germs of the dreaded "disease," and pronounce such a sample of his creative powers as "very good!"

Let it not be thought that these conclusions are only ludicrous; they are very serious indeed—for Bibliolaters and the germ theorists. Nor let it be said that I am speaking of repulsive things: the man who believes that God made all these things and called them good, must also believe that God made what repulsiveness they have; and it is not my fault if the theory of creation is capable of a reductio ad absurdum.

To return to the gradations and developments of functions, we find, at the stage at which we had just arrived, individual organisms with only one set of generative organs and functions—those of the male or those of the female respectively; though, again, it does not follow that this is an instant and unvarying result, since we may find forms of the same organisms in which some individuals have only male or female organs or functions, while others have both, powerfully developed. This is even the case in some of the orchids, plants bearing a very high rank in vegetable life. In some species of gregarious insects, as ants or bees, we find a further variation, for there are a very small number with female organs, a larger number with male organs, and a vast majority without any sexual organs at all; yet the grubs, which would otherwise have become non-sexual insects or working bees, can be, in case of need, developed by the other working bees themselves into perfect females or queens.

Difference of sex is, as we all know, the rule in the higher grades of animal life. We find, too, an increasing
importance and responsibility attaching to the female functions. In some cases, as in fishes (which are classed very high in animal life, being \textit{vertebrated}), the functions of both male and female may continue to be as simple or even more simple than in some of the primitive forms already mentioned; for with most fishes no congress of the sexes is needed for the act of generation. The ova of the female are simply extruded in some convenient locality, and the secretion of the male is extruded in the water near by. But with birds, and with the mammalia upwards to man, the maternal function is one of increasing burden and responsibility; no longer limited to the simple formation and extrusion of germs or ova containing, as it were, \textit{latent} life, but now nourishing and cherishing the impregnated cell or cells within their own body or otherwise, till eventually an almost perfectly developed progeny is put forth into the world. In this natural function and adaptability we have a link which stretches through all remaining types of life, in very deed "one touch of nature" that "makes the whole world kin;" for in the system of development that I have roughly sketched we have, in the incident of separation of sex, arrived at or passed through all the phases of living organisms of which we have any knowledge—the lowest organisms as well as articulata, crustaceæ, insects, fishes, reptiles, birds and mammalia—all therein included. At the head of these as intelligent beings may be probably placed the insect the ant, and the mammal \textit{man}.

I cannot attempt to explain in brief words all the evidence that is adduced by materialists in favour of the assertion that \textit{MAN} has been eventually developed by simple natural laws from lower organisms somewhat such as now surround us. I will only draw attention to two inevitable conclusions: firstly, that if we verify any one instance in an organism of development or adaptation to an altered condition of surroundings, there is no logical bar to such a series of developments as would eventually result in man, and might through him go on to still higher beings; and secondly, that if we concede the spontaneous generation of any one living organism we at once lay a sufficient basis for such a series of developments as is just suggested.

Both these conclusions are antagonistic to and utterly do away with any necessity for recourse to imaginary forces outside the natural properties of matter. And this is, in brief, the essential point of Materialism. In matter, \textit{i.e.}, \textit{in that which is perceptible to our senses}, we find the basis of, and the potentiality for, all of which those senses and their resultant reason can give us any knowledge. We find, for example, in the fact of man's mind or intellect, simply a high instance of this potentiality of matter; mind or intellect being but an empty phrase, without the existence of brain and reason (\textit{i.e.}, experience of the senses) to evolve and contain it. Materialism does not, as is falsely assumed, degrade the vital forces of life and thought to the level of the inert and inanimate conditions usually attributed to matter; on the contrary it elevates ignorantly despised matter to the capabilities and possibilities of the highest existence and most subtle energies; materialism is no adding of death unto death, but a resurrection of all things unto life. It does not hold matter as alien or foreign to spirit, it sees in the one but a capacity or phase of the other; it does not say matter is a vice, it finds no vice resultant anywhere but from the want of knowledge of the laws of matter; it does not look on matter as a foe to virtue and high intelligence, it sees in matter the noble mother of \textit{all} living.

I have wronged my argument somewhat by seeming to assume that an \textit{hypothesis} was necessary for the first of the conclusions given above. But development is already more than a theory, it has established itself in the region of indisputable fact. One of the most recent observations on this point is that concerning the axolotl, a Mexican lizard, furnished with gills, and living only in the water; but which by accidental natural circumstances, or by such circumstances artificially imitated, may be developed into a perfect land salamander (hitherto considered of an entirely different \textit{genus}, which is a greater distinction than a \textit{species}), breathing only by lungs and being incapable of a life in the water; its gills having disappeared together with the tail-fin, dorsal ridge and other especially aquatic adaptations, and corresponding capacities for a life on land having been developed.

Now if the variation from a life only possible in water to one only possible in air,—if such a variation or adaptation or \textit{development} can be brought about during the brief period of existence of one little reptile, who shall dare to assign a limit to the variations and developments that may be evolved in untold myriads of years? This factor of \textit{time} is one of the most difficult to realize and grasp the full import of, since we have but such a tiny experience of it in our own life, or even in all the centuries during which man has left any written or graven record of his life and acts. Thirty or forty centuries would seem to be the limit of the period during which we have anything like historical record of man, though we may grasp that there were then many and diverse races of men, some of which had attained a high state of civilization. Nor does there seem to be any indubitable change traceable in the actual bodily framework of man during that time. But sufficient explanations of this at once suggest themselves. In the first place, that, as has been already noticed, it is in the lowest and simplest organisms that cardinal changes are most readily evolved, and we may expect in the case of so high an organism as man that many generations may pass away before any distinct and palpable development may have manifested itself; and that indeed \textit{no change would, be necessitated in such organs as had, during all that period, been sufficiently adapted to the circumstances}; secondly, that in tracing the record of man through
prehistoric times, in such evidence as is afforded us by fossil implements and bones of man himself, we do get
irrefutable evidence of development since that more distant period; and, lastly, that if we will consider the case
of organs or faculties which have not been sufficiently adapted to the circumstances, we shall get here, too,
distinct and indubitable evidence of development.

Somewhat of such development it will be my effort to trace in the next study—the Progress of Civilization;
the development of the faculties by which we have reached from the material into that which has been usually,
and, we hold, incorrectly, styled and considered the immaterial. With more highly developed faculties we may
find how all things are material: i.e., ultimately reducible to the cognizance of the senses; we shall find in
materialism the eventual explanation of all that lay outside the ken of duller senses, and was therefore attributed
to ultra-intelligible and extra-natural agency; we shall find in materialism the sure basis and touchstone for both
the outward and inward conduct of man—all true work, all true science, all true morality being therefrom
deducible and provable. Nought of despondency, nought of untrust is there in Materialism, no dark, cold,
fanciful belief, but simple knowledge, full of Nature's warmth and life and light. Not ours

"to seek
If any golden harbour be for men
In seas of Death and sunless gulfs of Doubt,"

for to us Doubt is not sunless, it is the very bright and bracing air in which we grow ever more strong, more
humble, more confident,—and we trouble about no poetical fictions as to Death; for we hold that, as far as man
is concerned, Death is but the condition of non-existence, and it is manifestly absurd to endow the sheer
absence of existence with either charms or terrors.

III.—The Progress of Civilisation

In tracing the progress of man from a simple animal condition to one of high intellectual power or
civilisation, two methods of inquiry are available; firstly, such historical record as is afforded by writings and
monuments, together with what pre-historic evidence we may gather from fossil bones or implements, or other
evidences of man; and, secondly, such knowledge as we may deduce from the conditions and characteristics of
existing uncivilised races. To my mind the evidence resultant from the comparison of present existing
conditions is less open to difference of opinion than the historic or pre-historic source. It is on this account that
I have preferred to exemplify the development theory by reference to now existing types and conditions from
the lowest organisms up to man, and by showing a power and action of development in those which infer
a previous course of development ere reaching their present condition, rather than to base my position more
specially on fossil forms and types which indubitably establish such development, according to some observers,
whilst others dispute the conclusions thus arrived at. In man, however, with both these sources of inquiry at our
command we may aduce evidence of development which it is impossible to controvert, and I think we may
further prove that such progressive development has been incessant, and will, under given circumstances,
continue to be so.

In considering man and the higher organisms by comparison with the lower and primitive types, we may
take the greatest acquired difference as that of sex. And for this diversity of sex the Materialist may find a ready
and natural explanation. In the lowest types of life, as we have already seen, the beings have the powers and
functions of both sexes (i.e., impregnation and conception) united in one body, and these functions may
presently be exercised either independently of another being, or reciprocally with another being. Now, it is a
natural fact, and resultant from obvious reasons, that liability to conception may and does exist before the
power of impregnation is existent. For impregnation can only be effected by an animal already arrived at
puberty, while the capacity for reception and retention of the sperm cells exists, and may come into operation
before the actual capacity for conception, which is also an attribute of puberty.

If, therefore, we presume a double-sexed animal at just this stage of its existence taking part with, or being
forced to submit to an older and fully developed animal in what should virtually be a reciprocal act, we shall
find as the result that the immature animal will receive and retain sperm cells with which its germ cells will in
due time be vivified, while the mature animal will have received no sperm cells from its partner, and its own
germs cells will, therefore, remain unimpregnated and unvivified. In plain words the first animal will have found
exercise for its female organs alone, and the second for its male organs alone. And, supposing no further
intercourse or exercise of the organs to take place, it is evident that the one animal will have fulfilled the
function of a mother only, and the other that of a father only. It will also be seen, and I call special attention to
this fact, that an animal might be forced or coaxed into the position of maternity before its own impulses or
capabilities would have prompted any such responsibility.

Another singular natural feature now comes into play. Where an act is susceptible of repetition, the use of the necessary organ has a tendency to cause an increased ability of that organ; and the disuse of an organ has a corresponding tendency to produce debility or atrophy of that organ. So that in the next acts of intercourse of the two individuals we have presumed, there will be a tendency to the unisexual function alone being exercised. Taught by experience, too, the older individual may have learnt that by being careful always to select young and scarcely mature individuals it may secure what amount of gratification is afforded by the sexual act, without any resultant burden or incommodity of maternity to itself. It might, in fact, readily act as a male being, with the tendency to masculinity continually increasing throughout its life. And some of its progeny would inherit this tendency to be of the male sex only; as also others of the progeny would, from the mothers induced habit, have a corresponding tendency to be of the female sex only. With these tendencies once developed into fixed habits, and they certainly will so develop, the fact of division into separate sexes is accomplished.

Upon the incidents mentioned in the earlier part of the preceding paragraph two others follow almost as corollaries; firstly, that with the idea of the evasion of the incommodity of maternity once conceded, it would need the exercise or development of but a very slight amount of cunning or instinct to lead an experienced mature animal to evade the maternal function when trafficking with even a matured animal of less experience; and, secondly, that in addition to the induced femininity of the younger animal, there would be developed and perpetuated a sort of habit of juvenility which might explain the seeming secondariness of development or immaturity in some aspects of females generally; and further, the general earlier capacity of parentage on the part of the female than of the male which is now existent.

And I think it may easily be shown that maternity is an incommodity sufficiently great to prompt to its evasion in the manner I have suggested. For in even the lowest organisms the fact of the organism being gravid, or heavy with young, will necessarily restrain its liberty of action or locomotion, and yet will entail on it a necessity for increased action in order to find the extra food for the formation of its coming progeny.

The habit of unisexuality on the part of either male or female, would be further established by the fact that with many of the lower types, both of animals and vegetables, the act of fructification once fulfilled the being dies. Those of my readers who have kept silkworms may have noticed how the male moth will live even for several days, should not a female moth be present, but that the sexual act once accomplished the male forthwith dies. And the fact of the female receiving and retaining the male secretion may be well seen in the female moth who does not begin laying eggs till two or three days afterwards, and who has within her body, in common with many other insects, a special cavity, called the spermotheca, for the storing up till time of need of the secretion received from the male. In the ant also, the instant death of the male after the sexual act, and the long-continued impregnation of the female, is a prominent example of this phenomenon.

I instance these things to show that I am not drawing on hypothesis alone, but also on facts and parallels for the theory as to origin of sex. I hope, at least, to have shown that there may be a perfectly intelligible and natural way of accounting for difference in sex, and of refuting the super-natural fiction that "male and female created he them." It is but one contradiction the more of the fable of creation that primitive and even some advanced forms of animal life are not of divided sex.

Among the evidences that can be adduced in proof of the some time general hermaphroditism of the progenitors of animals that are now of clearly defined sexes, is the fact that the rudiments or survivals of the organs and characteristics of either sex are found in animals of the opposite sex; rudiments of specially male organs or characteristics being traceable in every woman, as are likewise rudiments of the female organs in every man. Man, with other male mammals, has nipples, and there are known cases in which a perfectly developed man has given milk in sufficient quantity to suckle a child. It would even seem from recent observations in Germany that this faculty and power may be somewhat readily called into activity. In women, when the specially female functions have lapsed through age, the male characteristics more or less assert themselves; there is a distinct tendency to a more masculine type in feature, voice, &c., and not unfrequently some appearance of hair on the lips or chin. In the domestic fowl, a hen past laying will acquire spurs and comb like the male, and the habit of crowing. Again in the human being, if accidentally or purposely the specially sexual organs are removed, there is an instant and persistent tendency to the development of the surviving organs and characteristics of the opposite sex (as though these organs had only been kept in a state of dormancy by the predominances of the previous set); thus male eunuchs are beardless, their muscles less firm in texture, and their breasts grow and soften; and, conversely, in women from whom the ovaries have been removed, the breasts shrink and disappear, and masculinity of voice and bearing supervene.

A still stronger exemplification of this survival of double sexuality remains. As it is in the generative organs that the main departure from the stage of hermaphroditism has been made, so also is it there that we must be prepared to furnish crucial proofs if we would maintain a still existing identity of being in male and female; such an identity, I mean, as should do away with all distinctions other than those really existing in
Nature. And it is precisely in those organs that survival can most clearly be evidenced, most celebrated anatomists and physiologists asserting that precise analogues or rudiments of every portion of the female economy are to be found in the man, and vice versa.

I am calling attention at this length to the present and real identities and differences of male and female, because in the case of the human being the natural difference has been very much over-rated, and, as I have already said, man has based a series of artificial and arbitrary and unjust distinctions on that difference. I wish it to be clearly understood that I am not relating what seems to me a very probable history of the origin of sex. Whether my theory be altogether correct or not, we shall doubtless, by searching, eventually find out that division of sex has been as simply and naturally induced as any other phenomenon which was at one time a mystery, but is now clear. Such a mode of natural action as I have suggested would go far to account for all the good and evil of existing civilisation. For the difference of sex is certainly at the very base of civilisation as far as man is concerned: from this difference (as I shall endeavour to show) have arisen all the conditions of social and political life, all the working of men together for mutual and common interests, all the good that has been engendered by reciprocity of action and sharing of benefits, and all the social evil from which the world still groans, and which is but the resultant of selfishness or non-reciprocity.

For I take civilisation to mean the banding of many together to do that which could not be done by one, and the more entirely mutual and reciprocal the benefits received from such union are, the higher and truer is the civilisation. It is the custom to credit man alone with being civilised, but it will be seen that under the definition I have adopted many other animals may be included, some sorts of ants, bees and wasps among insects, while perhaps the beaver is the only other among mammals. It will be seen that intelligence alone does not imply civilisation, for though the elephant, the dog, and other animals have a high degree of intelligence, yet the cases are rare in which they seem to combine for a general good. And when such instances do occur, they seem but temporary and transitory conditions, whereas, in the beaver and the insects named the union is a permanent one, insomuch that fixed habitations are erected for the general welfare of the community. Indeed the word civis means a denizen of a city or State, and in all the animals I have classed as civilised the construction of cities or common wealths is an essential feature. Yet the art of building alone does not constitute civilisation: birds, squirrels, and sticklebacks build nests, though generally only for temporary purposes: moles dig passages and chambers, spiders make webs, and catapillars spin cocoons.

It is in the fact of community that we find civilisation; it is in what tends to and ensures the general benefit of that community that we find the good of civilisation: it is where the personal acts or interests of an individual are selfish, and, therefore, irrelevant or inimical to the general well-being that we have evil resultant. I know it is asserted by some sophists that all actions of man spring from a selfish motive, but we need not trouble much about such a definition; it will be sufficient for our purpose to distinguish between the acts in which a man may believe that his own well-being or happiness will be an eventual result of benefitting others, and the acts in which he seeks a personal advantage utterly irrespective of any evil consequences of such acts to others. Few of my readers will hesitate to call the former acts good and unselfish, and the latter selfish and evil.

Now, it would seem that the class of actions confined to self-interest alone had their origin in a natural consequence of the primitive unisexual and self-sufficient condition, and that the wider class of feelings and actions have been the eventual outcome of separation into sex — i.e., of the rendering each individual reciprocally helpful to, and more or less dependent on, the well-being and full life of some other.

For in looking for the primitive origin of man's power of feeling, passion, idea, thought, and reason, we must be ready to recognize and accept beginnings utterly small and infinitesimal as compared with his present powers; we must be prepared to find that the love of a mother for her child had as rudimentary and material an origin as the breast and the milk with which she suckles the babe. As we may already ascribe back the wondrous delicacy of finger of a Benvenuto Cellini or a Michael Angelo to slow development from such power as lies in the vague changes of form of the amoeba, so may we look for the birthplace of all the passions that a Shakespeare portrays, of all the wisdom with which a Socrates and a Bacon enrich the world, in the cravings of hunger and the sensations of heat and cold on the unisexual being, and then, with wonderfully increased impetus, in the fresh set of feelings evolved when quest for love was added to the quest for food. For many of the capabilities evolved and developed in either quest would become of avail in the other, the mutual action and reaction giving to the organs an acceleration and extent of development which they might not otherwise have attained.

In speaking of sensations of heat, cold, and hunger in the lowest organisms, no further intellectual action is implied on their part than is involved in the simple chemical, or even mechanical, effects of heat and cold, moisture and dryness: some such action, for instance, as is seen in the rotifer, a fairly advanced organism, which, in the absence of moisture, dries up, and will lie, to all intents and purposes, as dead matter, even for years, but will instantly revive and resume full activity with the advent of a few drops of water.

A distinct tendency of animated matter is to accept such conditions as are favourable to animation, the
distinguishing power of locomotion being developed and constantly exerted to this end. Nor can it be doubted that constantly recurring experiences of things iminical to the organism's well-being will cause even a mechanical tendency to the avoidance of such evil things, and will develop a provision from the remembrances of experiences, which is the stepping-stone to an intellect. We see the pimpernel flower close itself when rain is coming, that its pollen may not be injured by the moisture. Doubtless the mechanical cause of this is that some condition of the atmosphere previous to rain causes a relaxation, and therefore a closing, as in sleep, of the flower. We see men and women, when rain is coming, take an umbrella, that their clothes or their health may not be injured. They are warned by some evidence of their senses: a dark cloud in the sky causes a mechanical relaxation in the retina of their eye analogous to the relaxation of the corolla of the pimpernel, or they see a change in that further mechanical contrivance, the barometer. Why are we to call the carrying of an umbrella an intellectual act, and the closing of a flower a mechanical act? Men only use a further developed set of experiences and remembrances and mechanisms; the base of the action and the resultant are essentially the same, the avoidance of a condition hurtful to the well-being of the organism. Man's intellectual chain may be longer than that of the pimpernel, but the links are forged, of the same metal.

The fact is that every experience of an organism is in some way duly registered in the organism, just as truly as every touch of a sculptor's chisel has its effect in the image he produces. One result of this law—a result that will at some time be as clear to our understanding as it is now in many instances to our vision—is that the accretion of experiences produces, as might be expected, some definite change or growth in the organism itself, such change being, in point of fact, an organ; and so truly is this the case that it is by examining the organs of any living thing that we arrive at the knowledge of the conditions and experiences of its life. Indeed, we should not greatly err in calling organs materialized experiences. In such a way we may not only clearly explain the necessarily slow progress of development, but we may also show the very how and why of its existence.

And so the varied necessities of food and love induced the gradual evolution and development of the organs and faculties of touch, sight, hearing, smell, taste, locomotion, prehension, speech; and from the experiences and remembrances attendant on their continual use arose by similar slow evolution all the powers that we call intelligence, or mind, or soul. For we may find a fully sufficient basis for mind and all its phenomena in such experiences and remembrances, such impressions, inherited or acquired—impressions inherited from countless ages of progenitors as unconsciously, but just as tangibly, as our limbs are inherited—impressions from our own smaller experiences—impressions which we acquire from others by living converse, or by bookly intercourse with the mighty dead.

It is the quest for food and the quest for love that are at the bottom of the two laws so clearly enunciated by Charles Darwin—Sexual Selection and the Survival of the Fittest. It must be borne in mind that this survival of the fittest simply means the survival of the types or animals best capable of living under certain conditions and contingencies; it does not mean the survival of the animals which man might have considered the most fitting denizens of the earth as far as his ideas were concerned. For further consideration as to these two laws, I must refer the reader to the works of the author just mentioned. I simply wish here to note that the quest for food, coincident with the survival of the fittest, and the quest for love, which evolved the principle of sexual selection, opened out two separate and widely varying vistas of impulse and action.

As already estimated, the quest of food involved feelings mainly concerning the self of the organism, and affecting only the inward personality of the individual; while from the quest for love, for intercourse and companionship with fellow-beings, have arisen the feelings concerning the larger world outside the individual—the feelings which have their outcome in parental affection, social relations, and civilisation. And in the commingling and interaction of these inward and outer interests we may find the source of all intellectual action. For, indeed, the reaction of these two sets of feelings on each other has been so incessant and so multitudinous that it is difficult, if not impossible, now to classify some of the many varied passions of man according to their original incentive. And the organs naturally bear evidence to this intermingling of causes and events, for the gentle murmuring of words of love is as delicious to the lips and tongue as is the most delicate fruit, and "the warmth of hand in hand" is more tender and delightful than the sunniest glow of summer skies.

In man, as in the male of many other animals, this inter-changeability of usage of the organs has been temporarily used to evil ends, for the organs of prehension acquired in the quest for food have been in some instances developed by the quest for love into instruments of outrage; so that, as already said, the young of the opposite sex have continually had enforced on them the function of maternity before their own strength or inclination would have suggested any such burden or responsibility. In looking at the means of prehension used for amatory purposes by male animals generally, it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the maternal office has been a matter of compulsion rather than of equal and voluntary acceptance. In some beetles, the cruel-looking specially-developed organs of prehension are repulsively suggestive of the idea that conquest and not endearment is their purpose, and that it must have been a great repugnance on the part of the female which has
necessitated such implements of brute force in the male.

It is true that in the course of time a habit of tolerance, or even of perfect acquiescence, has been acquired by some females, yet the habit is far from universal, and, perhaps, never will be so, so long as the female remains exposed to the capacity of having maternity forced upon her despite her own will, while the male is incapable of having the office of paternity enforced by outrage on him.

In the primitive and savage condition of mankind we have such evidence of the abominable treatment and outrage of the young females as to leave us without wonder that the result has been to make woman of a generally more feeble type than man, and to have induced in her an utterly abnormal and unnatural phenomenon from which men and even female animals are exempt. At the first glance it is pitiful to reflect that man’s vaunted superiority over the brute, the greater activity of his brain, and the subtler cunning of his hand have for so long lent themselves to the oppression that has resulted in such pernicious consequences and in the still existent slavery, social and physical, of the female of his own species. The function of child-bearing has been exaggerated to an utterly disproportionate degree in her life; it has been made her almost sole claim to existence. Yet it is not the true purpose of any intellectual organism to live solely to give birth to succeeding organisms; its duty is also to live for its own happiness and well-being. Indeed, in so doing, it will be acting in one of the most certain ways to ensure that faculty and possession of happiness that it aims to secure for its progeny. But up to the present woman has scarcely been treated as an intellectual being. In earlier history her fate was entirely subordinated to the passions of man, nor has our civilization yet sufficiently advanced to leave her to choose her own life, or to develop the powers, the inclinations, or the individuality which lie within her nature; and in our still feeble intellectual powers, in our narrow sympathies, and in our stunted capacities, we men are reaping the natural consequences of our blindness and injustice.

Truly the tale of man’s ignorant injustice will be a bitter one when unfolded; yet there is the bright hope and confidence that to know the wrong will be to redress it. And it is by intelligent materialistic research that we can alone assure such knowledge, and by the destruction of all religions and priesthoods. For a main basis and element in the constitution of these is the subjugation of woman, enunciated in tacit and open assumptions and assertions of her inferiority and secondaryness to man, or in hideous and insulting fables proclamatory of her innate baseness, and exculpatory of the condition to which the wrong and selfishness of man has alone reduced her.

Further and very conclusive evidence in favour of development by interaction of these sets of motives and quests is offered by the nervous system in organised beings. This system comprises the organs of intellect and of action, and divides into two main conditions having these specific functions. In the lowest organisms little evidence of nervous structure is presented beyond dissected filaments, but with organisms of more experiences (and, therefore, development) the nervous system becomes an apparatus of filaments combined with knots or ganglia. And with division into sets we have the accession of a cephalic ganglion or brain, at any rate in the more advanced organisms. The minuteness of many intelligent organisms (such as ants, bees, wasps, beetles, &c.) throws greater difficulty in the way of obtaining precise statistics concerning their nervous structure, but in the vertebrata we have greater facilities. That the brain seems to be a special outcome of wider experiences and motives is evidenced by its greater bulk in proportion to

The spinal system, which we are assuming to be more specially developed by, and connected with, the narrower series of motives implicated in self-preservation alone, offers a similar confirmatory result in its proportion to the amount of brain, as in the ensuing fairly accurate table:—

This proportion of brain or mental power to spinal or active power shall be noted with the coincident sexual, parental, and social conditions, as follows:—

Fishes.—In general there is no approach of the sexes, and no indication of parental feeling, except in very rare instances.

Reptiles.—Approach of the sexes, and sometimes (as in the viper) fairly developed parental care.

Birds.—In general a greatly increased degree of parental care, with, in some cases, a steady companionship of two individuals of opposite sex, which may even endure throughout life.

Mammals.—Parental, or rather maternal, care has here evolved a special organ, affording food to the young; the degrees and conditions of parentage, and of sexual affection and companionship, vary greatly. In many birds and mammals a power of affection, outside sexual or parental feeling, has been developed. In animals which have been much cared for by man, and become domesticated, this affection may be so prominent as sometimes to override both the quest for food and sexual or parental affection. Instances are not rare of the dog or the horse who willingly refuses a meal in order to be with his master, or who will leave puppy or colt at the sound of the same dear voice.

Man.—The office and issues of parentage have been extended through simple paternal brute force, with subjugation of wife and child; patriarchism, with attendant slavery; autocracy, with attendant servitude; limited monarchy, with attendant subjection; to Republicanism, with recognition of equality of individual right. And
from some phase of these have arisen the vast majority of the existent relations between man and man. These form the subject of the further science of materialism called Sociology, and to that branch of the subject we must leave them, as also the wider discussion of the development of love in man to its grand phases of conjugal love, parental and filial affection, patriotism, and general humanity.

I need only draw attention to one further incident before bringing these papers to a close; the fact that the superiority of man's primitive culture over that of animals is mainly evidenced in three things—agriculture, the use of tools, and the use of fire, each of these having contributed its quota to the development of man's intellect. Agriculture would seem to be an outcome of the habit, common to many animals, of hiding a superfluity of food till a time of need, though there is, of course, a vast distance between the simple hiding of food and the sowing of seeds and the preparing of land for the purpose, yet it is not difficult to imagine that the accidental growth of a store of nuts or roots hidden in the ground gave to man the idea of providing for food in that manner.

Evidence of the origin of the use of tools is to be found in the habit of some birds in carrying to a height and dropping shell-fish which they have not the strength to break or open; monkeys, too, are known to break cocoa-nuts by dropping them. In these cases the earth itself is used as a hammer, and the unintentional dropping of a shell or a cocoa-nut offers an easy solution for the origin of the habit, which would readily spread by imitation and inheritance. The next step in the scale of mechanical progress is evidenced in some monkeys, who use a stone as a hammer, or a stick as a lever. Then follows man, with the adaptation of the lever (or handle) to the stone, and the use of sharp-edged stones (knives and axes), and with the advent of fire and the smelting of metals we gradually arrive at the whole series of tools and machines that may be found in an international exhibition.

There seems no glimpse of any approach to the creation of fire in any animal but man, though many animals willingly accept its artificial warmth, and prefer the food that is cooked by its aid. In primitive times the chipping of his flint implements must have afforded man many instances of sparks of fire, and possibly of undesigned conflagration, with attendant flame and heat. The observation of this may well have led some thoughtful man to turn the unexpected discovery to profit and to imitate it; and the evolution by friction of a heat similar to that caused by fire might suggest to him or to others the continuance and increase of that friction till flame would be the reward of their curiosity and perseverance. And all this would be the consequence of as clear and simple a train of reasoning as that which led Columbus to discover land to the west of the Atlantic, or James Watt to foresee that the force which could raise the lid of a teakettle could also drive mighty engines.

We do not now dignify either of these men with the title of gods, or suppose that they stole their knowledge from heaven, our times are already too materialistic for that; yet in a preceding age we have the invention of fire attributed to such agency, and the shrewd and patient woman who evolved the primitive art of the culture of corn and fruit figured as a goddess, whose name we still use when speaking of our cereal productions.

Yet, though we no longer dream of referring such inventions or knowledge to supernatural power, though we no longer place faith in fictions of the divinity of the inventors, we, as a majority, present the pitiable spectacle of still accepting such primitive and infantile explanations of all the phenomena that man's intellect has not yet had the per-severance or the opportunity to solve. The inquisitiveness and habit of research evolved in man's natural quests have led him to continually inquire into the origin and sequence of all the circumstances that he sees around him, and, where want of true knowledge has supervened there have not been wanting those who have offered all sorts of fictitious and baneful explanations. It is the evil of all religions, from that of Confucius to that of Comte, that they are, in the main, a compound of unverified assertions concerning man's physical and social condition, together with a series of self-styled moral aphorisms deduced from such assertions. It is only when the spirit of materialistic inquiry shall be carried into the region of ethics, when every action and idea and sequence of man's intellect and mind shall be accredited solely on the same terms as any other physical fact, that we shall arrive at any true morality, at any assured knowledge of living to the best for ourselves and for each other. Proceeding in this way we shall find that man's intellect will have power to find the solution of all that that intellect can suggest, and to speak of anything further is simply to speak of what is for man non-existent.

It has been my purpose to indicate somewhat of the line and method of thought which may be available in this further research, but each man must be left to travel by himself along that road. Sect and name-following can find no place there; open eyes for Nature's facts, open hearts for Nature's love, these will be our unerring guides to the ever-increasing knowledge, the ever-growing happiness, the ever-higher potentiality of life, and love, and humanity. Farewell.

Philosophic Atheism: a Bundle of Fragments.

By J. Symes.

Philosophic Atheism.

God or no God?

I.

It has been long my conviction—arrived at, I may say, against my deepest prejudices and the oldest tendencies of my mind—that Atheism is not merely a logical position or mental state, but as logical as any. It appears to me that, approach the subject from which side we will—the purely intellectual or the moral—philosophy leads inevitably up to Atheism. I can fully sympathise with the millions who look upon Atheism as a monster of absurdity and immorality, for I once had the same ideas and feelings myself, and no more dreamt of journeying to Atheism than to the moon. I have discovered several things in recent years which I formerly deemed impossible; among others, that Atheism is not in the least like what popular prejudice represents, and that Theism is as unfounded as Transubstantiation. Every argument yet produced in evidence of divine existence fails even to satisfy a previous believer. Judging from my own experience, I should say that the most unshaken faith in a God is found in him who never argued; the reasoner, even on the very smallest scale, starts doubts on the subject that can never be solved or destroyed. Once pass beyond the bounds of that innocent state of spontaneous faith, possible only to early life or to imbecility, and wrestle with a doubt respecting a God's existence, and I question if the struggle will ever terminate entirely, except in Atheism or death. It is true, Orthodoxy promises you peace and rest, a solution of your difficulties, to be found in certain arguments, which, if rightly conducted, will infallibly lead up to satisfaction. Alas! how fallacious the promise and the hope! I spent many years in following this will-o'-the-wisp; but neither logic, prayer, nor faith, nor all together could give settled satisfaction. This is not surprising, when the matter is fully examined. Let us see.

The teleological argument is no doubt the oldest of the so-called proofs of divine existence; it is, at least, as old as Xenophon's *Memorabilia*, and seems to have been used by Socrates. The argument, which is based upon a fallacy, runs thus:—"We see in works of handicraft and Art evidences of Design and adaptation of means to ends; we see similar marks of design, &c., in Nature; and as evidences of design in Art imply a designer, so do they in Nature." This, if logical, would be an exceedingly "short and easy method" of settling the dispute; but there is really not one point of analogy between Art and Nature, regarded either as a whole or in detail.

1. But for our education or experience in handicraft, &c., we could not possibly suspect anything like it in Nature. We could never have gathered the conception of design even from a work of art, were we not able, in some cases, at least, to see both the means and the end, and to watch the one resulting in the other. Now who can say what is the end of Nature in any one department, to say nothing of the final cause or ultimate aim of the whole? This I shall return to by-and-bye; at present I merely point to the want of analogy between an art production (whose whole theory and action, inception and results, we can grasp) and any particular part of Nature of which we know little or nothing beyond the barest phenomena.

2. The analogy fails in another and more serious point. We have seen and can see the maker of any human production. The identical man may be out of our reach, but we have thousands like him all around us continually; and though we may never have seen a given work in course of manufacture, yet we have seen artificers at work upon other artificial productions; and as all artificial things have certain points of resemblance, by the observation of which we can readily pass from the known to the unknown, we have little or no difficulty in recognising as a work of art even an article we never saw before. Now where is the analogy between this and any natural thing? In Nature the artificer has never once been seen, nor any one of his fellows; we never saw any one making a single natural product. Where, then, is the analogy? To establish it you must show us some natural thing in course of production, and the maker himself, or some part of him, must be seen at his work. Let this be done and our disputes end; but until we see some one making things in Nature—I don't say all things, but some—we have no right to institute an analogy between a thing we know to be made and one that may not be made at all.

3. It is idle to say that the "Great Artificer" is invisible; that begs the question. First prove your Artificer, and then we must perforce admit his invisibility until we see him. We see all around us the processes of Nature going on—the revolution of the planets, and alternations of day and night, storm and calm, summer and winter.
We see all this, but we never see the maker.

4. Not only have we never seen the Artificer of Nature, we may further say that we have never seen Nature's Art. Is there not necessarily a distinction between the two departments of Nature and Art? And is not that distinction essential? It is the height of linguistic impropriety to apply the terms of Art to the subjects and phenomena of Nature. We have the best of proofs that artificial things are made. Nature was never made; it is not in any sense a manufacture, it is an eternal existence as a whole, and its various phenomena are growths, not Art productions. To say the contrary is to abuse language and bewilder the reader. I ask any intelligent man to take a coat and a sheep, and say if there be any analogy between them. The animal was not made, it grew; the coat did not grow, it was made. The materials of the coat also grew; the act of putting them together was the making of something that did not and could not grow. Any more than the sheep could have been made. To talk, therefore, of animals being made is not less incorrect than to speak of coats, boots, chairs, &c., growing. A wise man will try to avoid such confusion of language, while the wisest will see in natural phenomena nought but pure growths, and will thus escape the need of looking for a maker where none is possible. Theology and false philosophy have done much to confuse people on these matters, but there can be nothing more incorrect, in the present state of human knowledge, than to speak of the making or creation of the earth or of any natural thing in it. Therefore it is not reason that desiderates a maker or creator, it is faith that both demands and supplies one or more, according to its whims or circumstances.

5. But more serious objections remain. If nature does manifest design we can discover the fact only by discovering both the means and the end. This must be apparent at once. In Art, did we not know why things are made, the notion of design would be impossible; I don't say in every case. We cannot tell why some things have been made, they puzzle us; but these exceptions prove the rule, for if we were not accustomed to recognize the end or object in the majority of cases, we could never feel either curiosity or doubt respecting the end to be answered by the few exceptions. Now where is the man who will pretend to tell why Nature was created? Consider its vastness, its intricacy, how small a speck of the whole is known to us, and the immense periods occupied in some of its processes. Who can guess the meaning and the end of such immense and intricate changes? Only the most consummate rashness would venture to attempt an explanation here. And if we cannot tell the final cause of the whole, by what right do we pretend to explain the design of a part? Every part must contribute to the total results, and must therefore be subordinate to the whole, and without knowing the final upshot, the end and aim cannot be guessed. Let the bold theologian show us Nature's means and her ultimate aim, or confess that, like the rest of us, he is in total darkness respecting them.

If we cannot discover the end and means of Nature in her immensity, let us try on a smaller scale. Take the solar system. Was it designed, or is it the result of accident?—that is, the interaction of the materials and forces of the system? If designed, why are some planets so much farther from the sun than others? All might have been accommodated at distances much more nearly equal. As it is there is a great waste of light and heat. If two thousand millions of globes, each equal to the earth, were placed round the sun, side by side, and all at the same distance (from 90,000,000 to 100,000,000 miles), they would form a complete (omitting interstices) shell, with the sun in its centre. Now with the present expenditure of light and heat, the sun would light up and warm the whole interior of that enormous shell as brilliantly and intensely as he does the earth at present. Think of what this means. The sun which could, with the present emission of energy, amply supply with light and heat an area of 100,000,000,000,000,000 square miles and more, actually supplies about 50,000,000 square miles! In this estimate I omit all the planets except the earth, for their aggregate receipts of light and heat are a trifle compared with the solar waste. If, then, the solar system does manifest design, it is not design executed by either wisdom or economy.

Then consider how unequally the distances of the planets are arranged. How hot must Mercury or Vulcan (?) be! how cold Uranus and Neptune! Besides, some of the planets have satellites, others none, as far as yet known. Where is the design here? Our earth has but one satellite, though it is well known we could do with more. What! do we not need moonlight as much when it is absent as when it is shining? If one moon is good, it is my firm belief that two would be twice as good.

Leaving the earth as a mere planet, let us descend to particulars, regarding it as a home for man and other animals. Look at the distribution of light and heat. In the tropics the people have far too much of both; in the temperate regions, the alternations are dreadfully severe; but in polar regions they are simply monstrous. A long day of six months' duration is by-and-bye replaced by a night of equal length! Does that show design and wisdom? Then consider the cold—land and sea frozen to an extent to us almost incredible. What is the object? Is it to test the enduring powers of seals and polar bears? or to give the Esquimaux an opportunity of displaying his voracity upon blubber and his dexterity in travelling over the snow? Is there one good thing accomplished by such exaggerated cold? Will the natural theologian explain? He sees the "hand of God" and the "footsteps of deity" everywhere, his eyes are so completely opened that he sees "good in everything." He might, therefore, enlighten us a little on these mysteries of nature. I have never yet heard of an Esquimaux praising God for his
will the divine secure his dogmas in face of this? And what is the final cause of an idiot?

truly natural— as much a portion of the original plan as those were which culminated in the philosopher. How blame upon parents or adventitious circumstances—the forces and conditions that resulted in that idiot are as when Nature turns out a Newton, they are silent when she produces an idiot. And yet, there may be as great an designed for good, and not evil.

to death with equal indifference. What were they designed for? Only stupidity can assert that they were with as much earnestness and effect as good ones; a fire made of them will boil the kettle for tea or burn a child to death, to manufacture cannon, torpedoes, and other deadly instruments. And those coals perform evil deeds into Nature's preserves, to burst steam boilers, and to drive machinery by which workers are maimed or crushed men, women, and children in extracting them, to exhale gases that should explode and kill the daring intruders thousands. (4) The coals stored up in the earth's strata were originally intended for—what?—to torture poor Herculaneum must have been intended for that work; and the earthquake that swallowed up Lisbon was equally show the wisdom and goodness of his deity in them. (2) The eruption of Vesuvius that buried Pompeii and ships, and drowning or killing men and animals are the chief works performed by those storms. Let the divine over large tracts of the globe must be designed for that purpose. Smashing houses, rooting up trees, sinking volcanoes, wars, and death! This the final cause of the world! What!—the lord of the estate knocked about in this fashion! He for whom all was made treated with contempt, get his bones broken, his blood corrupted, his person maltreated by the ill-arrangement of his natural and only home! How grotesque! How silly is theology! Was it worth while to expend all this care, pains, and thought in the production of man, if he was to be treated after all like the most worthless of beings?

It is here that theology most completely collapses; after going to the expense of producing what theology regards as the final cause of the world, the final cause is treated as of no conceivable value! Either, therefore, man is not the final cause of the world's creation, or the wisdom displayed in creation ends in a wretched farce. And if we cannot find the ultimate end aimed at, by what right can we assume that Nature shows any marks of design? And, further, is it not preposterous to speak of a final cause, or ultimate aim, in an endless series of natural and inevitable events? The natural theologian is neither scientist nor philosopher; he is a man of faith; and faith can find its basis anywhere—except in the region of fact and experience.

Let us grant then that Nature does undoubtedly manifest design. (1) A hurricane that spreads devastation over large tracts of the globe must be designed for that purpose. Smashing houses, rooting up trees, sinking ships, and drowning or killing men and animals are the chief works performed by those storms. Let the divine show the wisdom and goodness of his deity in them. (2) The eruption of Vesuvius that buried Pompeii and Herculaneum must have been intended for that work; and the earthquake that swallowed up Lisbon was equally designed for that purpose. (3) The malaria that rises from the swamp and breeds a yellow fever epidemic, is designed for that; else why does it exist? What else does it accomplish? The evaporation that by-and-bye distils in the fruitful shower is not more natural than the rise of the poisonous effluvia that cause the death of thousands. (4) The coals stored up in the earth's strata were originally intended for—what?—to torture poor men, women, and children in extracting them, to exhale gases that should explode and kill the daring intruders into Nature's preserves, to burst steam boilers, and to drive machinery by which workers are maimed or crushed to death, to manufacture cannon, torpedoes, and other deadly instruments. And those coals perform evil deeds with as much earnestness and effect as good ones; a fire made of them will boil the kettle for tea or burn a child to death with equal indifference. What were they designed for? Only stupidity can assert that they were designed for good, and not evil.

If design shows itself in one part of Nature, we must expect it in all parts. (5) Theologians recognise design when Nature turns out a Newton, they are silent when she produces an idiot. And yet, there may be as great an expenditure of force and pains in producing the one as the other. Is the idiot designed or not? It is idle to lay the blame upon parents or adventitious circumstances—the forces and conditions that resulted in that idiot are as truly natural— as much a portion of the original plan as those were which culminated in the philosopher. How will the divine secure his dogmas in face of this? And what is the final cause of an idiot?

(6) I once read of the birth of an animal—a dog, I think—perfect and beautiful in all things, except in one
interesting discovery that human parasites are the final cause of the existence of the earth, I must next proceed and a fate for the celebrated "argument from design"!

but the tapeworm, or some other human parasite, must be the great end of this world's creation! What an issue a worm has every want supplied, and is as happy as his nature and conditions permit. It seems then, that not man, cannot be doubted that the worm has the best of it. The man he inhabits is tortured with a horrible disease; the protective and feeds the tapeworm, or the tapeworm that dwells in and lives at the expense of the man? I think it sufficient to give one the horrors! But to the point—Is man designed as the habitation of the trichina and gives great pain to his guest and living habitation. The tapeworm is worse still—the very thought of it is except in an animal body. In the muscles of a pig or of a man he can make himself very comfortable, though he

less important parasites, let us ponder for a moment the case of trichina spiralis or "Other animals were designed for their parasites"? This is a puzzle, and no divine can explain it. Leaving the read Nature's declaration of design in these cases? Must we read it, "Parasites were designed for other animals," believe the true parasites cannot live except in or on the other living beings they inhabit Which way shall we

Was pain designed? If so, what can be said of its designer? Did he ever feel pain, or would he like to? One thing is certain, the animals that are eaten up by others show all the signs of pain that man shows except those of speech, and none but the perverse can doubt that they really feel pain. The question to be answered is, Was pain designed? If so, what can be said of its designer? Did he ever feel pain, or would he like to?

Turn we next to another class of topics. What is to be said by a believer in design respecting parasites? I believe the true parasites cannot live except in or on the other living beings they inhabit. Which way shall we read Nature's declaration of design in these cases? Must we read it, "Parasites were designed for other animals," or "Other animals were designed for their parasites"? This is a puzzle, and no divine can explain it. Leaving the less important parasites, let us ponder for a moment the case of trichina spiralis. This minute worm cannot live except in an animal body. In the muscles of a pig or of a man he can make himself very comfortable, though he gives great pain to his guest and living habitation. The tapeworm is worse still—the very thought of it is sufficient to give one the horrors! But to the point—Is man designed as the habitation of the trichina and tapeworm? If so, which is the greater, and which, after all, is the final cause of this world—the man who protects and feeds the tapeworm, or the tapeworm that dwells in and lives at the expense of the man? I think it cannot be doubted that the worm has the best of it. The man he inhabits is tortured with a horrible disease; the worm has every want supplied, and is as happy as his nature and conditions permit. It seems then, that not man, but the tapeworm, or some other human parasite, must be the great end of this world's creation! What an issue and a fate for the celebrated "argument from design"!

Having shown that the design argument, when fairly conducted to its logical conclusion, leads to the interesting discovery that human parasites are the final cause of the existence of the earth, I must next proceed
to attack Theism in other directions. I do not think the above conclusion in the least flattering to human vanity; but that reflection by no means militates against its correctness. I suppose no one will deny that the less, where adaptation prevails, is subservient to the greater. It cannot be denied, the theologian affirms, that Nature manifests design, and it will not be pretended that man is benefited by the trichina, or tapeworm; it is equally impossible to deny that these most interesting beings, like princes and priests, are furnished gratuitously with everything they desire by and at the expense of man. If those parasites are of a superstitious turn, no doubt they spend much of their time in chanting "Te Deums" to the Bountiful Parent of All Good, who has created such a delightful world as a human body for them to dwell in.

II.

But leaving this subject, let us next survey the doctrine of cause and effect. This doctrine I accept, though I deny emphatically that it logically conducts us to a first cause or to a final cause. I suppose the materials and forces of the universe—that is, the complete round of existence—to be eternal. I shall not just now attempt to prove the doctrine, or even to give any reason for my faith in it; the reader will please observe that I merely assume it here for the sake of argument. Whether it be true or not, no one can deny that we find ourselves in the very midst of an exceedingly long series of causes and effects. We also find ourselves in the very midst of infinite space, partially occupied, though possibly not entirely so; we are, further, in the very midst of infinite time or duration. I shall not stop to discuss the nature of these two infinities, but assume that most people are agreed respecting their existence, at least.

Now let me ask the theologian if he can put his finger upon the central point in space, or tell us how far off is the circumference or limit of space in any direction he may prefer. To say that this demand is absurd is no objection to it, for I make it for the purpose of exposing another absurdity, exactly parallel, though not quite so obvious. I may assume, I think, that none but an enthusiast, a circlesquarer, or a maniac will try to find either the centre of space or one of its limits.

Next, I ask, will the theologian find for me the middle, the last, or the first moment (or any other unit of time) in eternal duration? I need not press this either, since all must see its absurdity as soon as it is fairly propounded. But why cannot my demands be met? The reason is, Space has no centre, no limit; Time or duration no beginning, no end. We cannot conceive that, though we travelled in one direction for ever, we should ever come to a spot beyond which there was no space, or that we should be any nearer its limit than we now are. It is the same with time or duration; there never was a first moment, there never can be a last.

Well, is it not equally absurd to speak of a First Cause and a First Moment? There were former moments and former causes; but a first is inconceivable in either case. Had theologians set up a First Moment in capital letters, thrown round it an air of mystery, and spoken of it with bated breath, it would have been worshipped; temples and churches would have started up by thousands, and the priesthood would have grown rich upon devotion's offerings; gushing songs would have been composed to the Great First Moment, the Fount of Eternity, the Source of Being, and the Ever-adorable Mystery! I am afraid it is too late now; but had theologians begun in time, the Great First Moment would have brought them a world of wealth and influence. They have accomplished their purpose, however, by inventing and parading their Great First Cause, a fiction equally absurd with the Great First Moment.

The bewilderment of the theologian is really one of the most amusing features in the history of our race. He cannot account for the succession of events, or of causes and effects, as he sees them occurring around him; so he deliberately concludes that there must have been a Great First Cause, and this hypothesis seems to content him. But sober reason can never rest in such an assumption; for (1) Why suppose a First Cause? The sole reason is to account for phenomena you cannot otherwise explain, and which you think are explained by your assumption. Really, then, the First Cause is but a phrase invented to hide human ignorance, a mere fiction to save appearances, and to keep men from confessing frankly that they do not know what lies beyond the circle of their knowledge. (2) But it won't serve them. To say there is a First Cause is equivalent to the confession, "I don't know anything at all about the matter, and am too idle to inquire further." To assume the existence of a First Cause certainly does shift the difficulty one degree farther back, and affords a fictitious explanation of Nature's phenomena; but it is not logical. A is a mystery you wish to explain; B explains it; but what explains B? C will do it. True; but can we stop at C? "Yes, if we call it the First Cause," say you. But how can you know that D does not precede it?

Besides, as all must admit, if there really is a First Cause, the mystery of its existence must be far deeper than that of all other existences combined. It is not philosophical to explain a phenomenon by something still more inexplicable; to attempt it only deepens the mystery. What then must be said of the attempt to explain an inexplicable chain of causes and effects by the assumption of a great First Cause, which is infinitely more inexplicable still? The attempt may be the result of credulity and ignorance; most certainly logic never led
people to it. The mind can no more rest upon a so-called First Cause than it could on a pretended First Moment; in each case it demands what preceded the one, and what caused the other. This difficulty is not obliterated by calling the fiction God, or printing it in capitals; investigation may be forbidden for a time, but at length the human mind demands a sight of your First Cause, walks round, and finds an unexplored region at the back of it. Once tell us how your First Cause rose without a prior cause, and you will teach us to dispense with all causes; for if the infinite First Cause holds his being without cause, surely the finite phenomena of nature may be allowed a similar privilege.

Besides, if the infinite is without cause, why look for cause and effect anywhere? The doctrine is exploded if theologians are correct; and thus, in the discovery of the First Cause they demonstrate that no cause was needed, and they and their system fall together in the very success of their undertaking. If the doctrine of cause and effect be true, every cause must be the effect of some prior cause; if they find a cause that is not an effect, an uncaused cause, the doctrine they start with cannot be true; and thus success in either direction is destructive of their position. If the doctrine of cause and effect be true, no First Cause is possible; if it is not true no such cause is required. Let them take which horn they please.

III.

If Theists find no support from the Design Argument, and if their First Cause is shown to be a very late effect—of ignorance, what have they else to rest their faith upon? There is one more refuge to which they may run, but it it can prove nothing but a temporary shelter, for the pitiless "hail" of modern thought "shall sweep away the refuge of lies, and the water" of common sense "shall overflow the hiding-place." The case of orthodoxy, whether we begin at one end or the other, needs but to be stated in plain words to be refuted. Not willing to ascribe any inherent power to what is known and familiar to everybody, they credulously credit some totally unknown substance with all possible power, and assign to it the task of imparting to matter all its attributes and qualities. It is impossible, say they, that "blind," "dead" matter should move itself, and assume all the beautiful and wonderful forms we see. The world could not have made itself; there are to be seen in it beauty, splendour, intelligence; these could not have originated in mere matter; they must have been bestowed by a being who himself possesses them." All this is specious but hollow, prime faith but not logic.

Is matter so "dead" and "blind" a thing as they represent? Do not divines discredit matter to enhance the greatness of their fictitious deity? Those who divest their minds of prejudice find in matter food for ceaseless wonder; and it is quite gratuitous to tell us matter cannot think, feel, &c. How do you know? Matter has shown such marvellous properties, single and combined, that he must be reckless who will venture to say that he knows all its attributes. The facts of nature—the glowing of suns, the ceaseless revolutions of planets, the endless currents in the air and sea, the ever changing face of the sky, the resurrection in spring, the marvels of vegetation and animal life—all proclaim the power of matter, and rebuke the ignorance of those who call it "blind" and "dead." What! a thing that is in eternal flux, ever changing into shapes and motions more enchanting than all romances—this thing "dead" and "blind"! Because its mode of life is different from yours, dare you say it does not live at all? Because it sees not as you do through lenses, does it therefore not see at all? In sooth, you are fine judges of such profound mysteries!

We see the magnet attract steel; we see chemical action day by day; we observe the mutual attraction of the earth and bodies near its surface; this experience is our sole reason for supposing that the magnet and the earth do attract, that elements possess chemical cohesion. In organised bodies, on the other hand, we see all the phenomena of what we are pleased to call "life," and in the higher ones of intelligence. Why ascribe magnetism to that piece of soft iron, if you won't ascribe life to the tree or the man? The magnetism is an essential attribute of the magnet, the life is such of the man. Why suppose there is a living being who bestows the life, unless you also assume a magnetic being to bestow the magnetism? Really orthodox talk on this subject is mere trifling. They say that a being cannot bestow an attribute itself does not possess. Very well; if that be so, their God must be a curiosity.

Let us suppose that they are correct; then their God must have had, in his own person, all the qualities now possessed by all matter—weight, size, colour, shape, taste, odour, extension—he must be solid, liquid, and gaseous; freezing, boiling, burning; must be magnetic and non-magnetic, gravitating, attracting, repelling; must be both resting and moving, living and dead, blind and seeing, intelligent and foolish, good and bad, beautiful and ugly, rough and smooth, etc. These are but a few of the qualities we observe around us, they must be native or imported, belonging essentially to matter, or else imparted by some other substance which possessed them all before. The Deist may charge me with trifling and flippancy; but I am merely delivering his own doctrines, and trying as best I can to show their real absurdity.

IV.
I DO not think logic or common sense requires more than is given above, but orthodoxy is so slippery, so protean in its shapes; so unscrupulous, so plausible, and gifted with such astonishing powers of turning and twisting, that I feel impelled to track it into another region still. The best way to deal with divines is to admit (for argument's sake) their fundamental principles or assumptions, and then proceed to show their logical consequences. Now, the orthodox assure us that there exists a being whose nature is infinite, whose presence is everywhere; and these terms they use in their absolute or unlimited sense—at least they did in my orthodox days. Be it so, then; there is one infinite being; he must have or must be an infinite substance, no matter what that substance may be. Now every substance or being must necessarily occupy some space, since no real being can exist which is not more or less extended; and every being must fill space exactly commensurate with itself; indeed, we have no means of ascertaining or conceiving the size of anything except by ascertaining or conceiving the quantity of space it fills, that is, its extension in one, two, or three directions.

If the above be correct, an infinite being cannot occupy less than infinite space; all possible space must be so full of it that nothing more could be introduced anywhere; for if there be but space enough left for the insertion of one atom, molecule, or the smallest possible division of substance, the being we are supposing must be less than infinite, which is contrary to the hypothesis. Now since an infinite being fills by itself or by its own substance all possible space, there can be no space left to be occupied by any other being or substance whatsoever, and thus we are inevitably led to the interesting discovery that there is no existence, no being, except the infinite one; that the orthodox God is alone, is everything, that nothing but itself exists or can exist, for there is no unoccupied space for it to fill. The divine, therefore, is reduced to this dilemma; either he must give up his infinite substance or all other substances; he must renounce his God, or deny existence to Nature, including himself. If we say that it is past denying that we and other beings do really exist, and that we occupy space commensurate with our substance—that being so, we occupy some of that space which an infinite being must have occupied if he had existed; therefore no infinite being exists. There is but one refuge for the divine from this conclusion, namely, to say that all Nature is but a part of God; though I do not suppose that any one will permanently abide in such a mental condition.

But let us allow the theologian his infinite God, and doing so, let us analyse the conception. An infinite God! Such a being must be an absolute solid, for all space must be filled to its utmost capacity by its substance. It must also be immovable. It would take infinite time for an infinite being to move, no matter at what rate he did it. In an absolute solid there can be no internal motion; in an infinite being no external motion is possible, for there is no space except what it already fills absolutely. Such a being could not feel, think, will, or act in any way; for it would take a whole eternity for a throbb to pass through it. The thinking faculty or apparatus must be either located in a particular part, or else diffused through the whole; in either case thought would be impossible, except only a mere part of the being thought. There is no act, mental or physical, possible to any being but what takes time in its performance, and the said time must bear a certain ratio to the size, structure, organisation, or nature of that being. An infinite one, therefore, could not perform the most simple or elementary action without spending eternity in doing it, even on the supposition that it could do it at all.

An infinite God, then, must be helpless, thought-less, motionless; as void of sense as a block of marble. The conception is a conglomeration of the wildest absurdities; nay, it is not a conception, since none ever conceived it—it would take eternity to do so. The word God, as used by Pagans, generally meant something; in orthodoxy it stands for nought, a label covering the very darkest corner of the human mind, a word without meaning, a symbol symbolising nothing.

It is idle for the divines to appeal to spirit; for an infinite spirit must be a substance of some kind, and must fill infinite space, and must be infinitely powerless. Besides, What is spirit? "Breath, wind," say I. "Nay," replies the theologian, "it is something more refined; it has no weight, shape, colour, taste, smell, or sound." Exactly so; it is abstract. To find spirit I give the following receipt:—Take a man, remove his physical being—all that you can weigh, touch, taste, smell, see, or burn—in a word, all that is material. Next remove from him all that you can possibly conceive; persevere and exhaust the subject completely. Well, all that is left is spirit. Yes; that imponderable, immeasurable, intangible, inodorous, invisible, tasteless, soundless, and inconceivable nothing—this purest of abstractions is the spirit or soul. The believer is heartily welcome to his find. If his God is a spirit, we can only say, as Paul said of other Gods: "Now we know that an idol is nothing in the world," or, in the language of Jesus, we may say to the most devout: "Ye worship ye know not what"—in fact, Nothing.

If I am not vastly deceived, on all lines of intellectual inquiry, the orthodox belief leads inevitably to absurdity. I shall be glad to be corrected if I am in error, and if some one who is able will take the trouble to grind my notions to powder, I shall take it as a favour. I hate wrong ideas; they are amongst the foremost of human evils. Will someone, therefore, do his best to enlighten me, as I am sincerely trying to enlighten others?
V.

I am not sufficiently vain to suppose that what I have written previously on this subject has been exhaustive; I have merely touched some of the more important intellectual difficulties that surround and interpenetrate the Theistic position, and have endeavoured to show how absurd is the orthodox belief. Just now I shall turn from the purely intellectual aspects of the subject and point out a few of the Moral difficulties which meet the Theist—difficulties he either ignores or explains in a very unsatisfactory way.

The Theist proclaims a God who is infinitely good—goodness itself, in fact: whose "tender mercies are over all his works," who is Humanity's Great Father, and whose nature is Love. Now all this might have continued undisturbed in the world's creed, if, unfortunately, the facts of every-day life did not ceaselessly protest against such false doctrines.

If infinite goodness really existed, such a thing as evil would be impossible. I suppose no one will deny the existence of evil; even the most thorough optimist must sometimes be in doubt as to the correctness of his creed, except he be too stupid to reflect. A fit of the gout, sciatica, or a cancer would, I should suppose, convert the most devout optimist into something more or less rational.

In the esteem of most men both physical and moral evils exist in far too great plenty. Let us therefore reflect, I. If I had the power I would remove every evil out of nature and leave only what is useful and good. This I cannot do for lack of ability. Give me the power and I will undertake the task. But if I have the power to remove one evil and don't do it, you have the best of reasons for saying that I am not so good as I should be.

Now the orthodox preach a God who, they solemnly assure us, is infinite in being and in all his attributes; his power and knowledge are absolutely infinite, and his goodness equal to either. But this must be false, for such a being could never have suffered to exist any evil whatever, even for one moment. A being infinitely good must will the existence of nothing but good; if he has all power and knowledge these must be subservient to his will—if he be sane. But evils do exist: these are the result (1) of his design or arrangement, for nothing could slip in unawares to him; or (2) he had not power to prevent nor is able now to destroy them; or (3) he is careless about their existence, and so does not wish them to be destroyed; or (4) he desires their existence, and actively favours their continuance. Which of these hypotheses is correct? No matter which; any one of the four is fatal to orthodoxy. If he arranged for evils in the original creation, or introduced them subsequently, he must himself be evil in the direct ratio of his knowledge and power; that is, on orthodox showing, he must be infinitely evil, for he is infinitely knowing and able. Did a being of boundless power and knowledge create evils, or create materials and forces that in their "workings" must evolve evils? The orthodox creed fairly implies this, though believers shrink from its open and blank avowal. So be it—the conclusion is inevitable, that he who made Nature, supposing it ever was made, and had full knowledge of what he did, must be solely responsible for all that Nature evolves. Evils and goods are equally his offspring, not begotten by momentary impulse, but after an eternity's (a parte ante) deliberation. But herein lies a contradiction; goods and evils, or in the abstract, good and evil, are diametrically opposed and incompatible. Therefore, an infinite being could not will both goods and evils, except alternately; and in that case they could not exist simultaneously, for infinite power would instantly execute any wish such a being might have; the moment he willed evils goods would cease, and vice versa. If the orthodox prefer to suppose a God who wills both goods and evils simultaneously, I will not at present contend with such an absurdity.

Again, no Theist would aver that evils crept into Nature or sprung up in its midst without his God's knowledge or power to prevent, as that would involve the conception of ignorance or weakness. Nor could the orthodox suppose that he without whom "a sparrow falleth not," and who "numbereth the very hairs of your head," could be careless of the existence of evils—that would un-God the deity at once. Lastly, to suppose the creator and ruler of Nature to desire the existence of evils, argues such a wicked or malicious state of mind as really to shock the most callous dogmatist in the world. What, therefore, can the Theist say? Evils exist. How can he hold the doctrine of an infinitely good, powerful, and wise God, with these undeniable facts so constantly around him?

Of course, most believers resort to the fiction of a future life, and thus create a Utopian world to repress the woes of this; but that does not explain, it merely evades the difficulty. For the question is, not the continuance or redress of evils, but their existence. If the Theist could prove that evils existed but for one moment, he would still have to reconcile their existence with his God-theory—the length of time is quite another affair. If, again, the believer could demonstrate that all evils would be redressed and fully compensated, either here or hereafter, still that leaves the real point untouched: for the question is. How does he reconcile the existence of infinite goodness with the existence of evils? Compensation may make amends, it never can undo. Evils exist and the children of men groan under them. Bitter are the tears that daily run down sorrow's cheeks; deep are the pangs and woes of humanity. What! can they be compensated? Never. An eternity of unmitigated
bliss would not obliterate the furrows ploughed by some woes that last but for an hour; if it could, what of the existence of the evil, no matter how short its life?

It seems to me beyond dispute that logic and common sense require the Theist to prove that no evil exists or ever did, or else give up his belief in an infinitely good God. To talk of his "permission" of evil for wise but mysterious reasons is mere shuffling. He who "permits" a known evil he has power to destroy or prevent is so far guilty of wrong; but with an Almighty God, to "permit" is to do, since there is no power but his existing, and hence the evil that results from his so-called "permission" is as actively produced by him as any other thing he ever effects. When man "permits" he merely declines to check the operation of certain forces not his own; when Almightyness "permits" he as actively works as he ever does.

Besides, it is sheer assumption to affirm that the unknown purposes of the deity are wise. We can never know that a man is wise except from his words and deeds: he whose words and deeds are best we regard as the wisest. Now we can read the character of God only in his deeds, for his voice we never hear. It is only those works that strike us as wise that can argue the wisdom of the designer of nature and its ruler. If some of his deeds are wise, others very doubtful, and others exceedingly unwise, tested by our own and our only standard, we can but conclude that his character is similarly mixed, uncertain, or heterogenous. If the Theist will prove the existence and perfect wisdom of his deity by independent means, then we will readily admit that we have the best of reasons for supposing even the most perplexing and staggering processes of nature are all wise and good, only at present we are too ignorant to comprehend how they are so. But the Theist first proves the existence of his God from these very processes of nature, and then argues the absolute perfection of his character from the same data; whereas nature merely presents evidence of an imperfect, unwise, weak, and very evil-disposed or else unfortunate deity. To argue perfection of character from imperfect works; absolute goodness from a mixture of goods and evils, in which the latter predominate; and infinite wisdom from a course of action in which wisdom and folly are freely mingled, is to ignore logic and to perpetrate an outrage upon common sense. And that the "constitution and course of Nature" do exhibit evils and goods, and at least as much folly as wisdom, none can intelligently deny.

On the whole I cannot avoid the conclusion that the Theistic belief in a being of infinite goodness is entirely at variance with the evidence. There is not, so far as I am aware, a single fact or logical argument to support it; while on the other hand, we know for certainty that infinite goodness does not exist, for if it did, evils would be impossible. What should we say in reply to one who asserted the theory of an infinite light? The only reply necessary would be to point to one dark corner! this would at once destroy the hypothesis. Just so the existence of one evil is sufficient to destroy all rational belief in infinite goodness. It is surely time for the orthodox, if they wish to escape universal scorn, to bethink themselves, and furnish some reasonable basis for their faith. So far they have done nothing of the kind; their whole creed is subjective, a genuine picture of their own imagination, but as destitute of objective reality as witchcraft or astrology.

But I shall be told, perhaps, that to destroy the belief in a God is to annihilate the very basis and sanctions of morality! There are people, by no means insane, who still use this bugbear to frighten people into the orthodox fold. It is curious to note how in every proposed change, the timid and the designing raise the silly cry that reformers are opening the floodgates, bursting the bonds of society, and otherwise ruining the world! Alas! how often this world has been ruined by reformers, inventors, discoverers, and others. I suggest that the theologian should go a step further, and declare roundly that, without belief in a God men would not know how to make boots, to till the ground, to eat or drink, to build houses, and so forth. This would be no more absurd than their cry about morality. I once heard a man in serious debate affirm that we should have no era to reckon the flight of time from, but for Christ! This I heard myself, and I was the unfortunate being who had to reply to it. I further heard once of a monarchist who solemnly assured a republican, that if we abolished the present form of government we could have no current money! "for," he queried, with invincible logic, "whose head could we put upon the coins but the queen's?"

Many believers are astonished when you tell them that morality, like science, art, money, manners, language, etc., is a purely social growth or production, in fact, no more divine than the art and weapons of war, or the skill and weapons of the poisoner. And yet it would be quite as easy to prove that money came from heaven as to prove that morality did. It is not my intention at present to go into the abstract question of morality, nor shall I attempt a philosophy of ethics; I shall merely show that the Theist has no monopoly of morality, that his theory respecting it is incorrect, and that, whence soever its sanctions may be drawn, they do not arise from theology. Let us see:

I. The Bible is held by a very large number of European Theists to be a book inspired by God, and a sufficient moral and a religious guide for man. I say they hold these doctrines, that is, have them in their creeds and formulas, but the best of them in real life, ignore the Bible, and walk by higher rules than it contains. As to the divine origin of the Bible, that has never been proved; the so-called evidence is unsatisfactory in the highest degree; and it would be nothing less than a calamity if such a book could be proved to have had any higher
origin than other ancient works. It contains the silliest of stories—told, too, with all solemnity—the worst morality in the world; and we are assured it is all divine. Its precepts the churches them-selves never think of obeying; its examples they dare not follow, while large portions of it shock and horrify all civilised persons. The best morality of the Bible is commonplace enough, though paraded with such solemnity as to impose upon many tolerably enlightened people. The Bible is certainly not the source, nor can it ever be the standard of the world's Morality.

Let us next see if the Theist can draw lessons or elements of morality from Nature. I speak now of Nature apart from society, and I roundly affirm that Nature knows nought of morality, nor do ethics enter at all into her processes.

1. All through Nature the strong oppresses and eats up the weak, and the life of one being involves the destruction of another, often of thousands daily. This is not morality, and if done by the arrangement, or even connivance, of a being able to have prevented it, it must be characterised as monstrous iniquity.

2. Nature nowhere, in no way, manifests government. An overruling Providence finds a place in creeds—that is, in the fictions of the churches; but it exists nowhere else. Consider these few undeniable facts: (1) Nature has never yet been able to distinguish, in the very simplest cases, between right and wrong, crime and accident, sin and misfortune. For example—if a man jump down a precipice he is dashed to pieces—perhaps he deserves it; but if he should accidentally fall down he suffers to precisely the same extent; yes, if he is wilfully flung down by murderers, it is all the same in the end. Is that justice? Let us compare. A jumps wilfully off a house and is killed; B accidentally falls off, and meets the same fate; C is flung off by his enemies, and is also killed. The three bodies are taken before a coroner, and the jury, after being made acquainted with all the facts of each case, return the same verdict for all three. What should we say if they pleaded that, whereas A, B, and C did all come by their deaths by too precipitate a descent from the top of the house, therefore A, B, and C all alike deserved the fate they met? Such a verdict and defence of it would involve about equal quantities of truth, absurdity, and injustice. But Nature would justify that stupid jury, and they might plead in self-defence that, whereas the three died in consequence of their respective falls, it was evident that Nature regarded them as equally guilty, and they did not in the least desire to improve upon the ways of Nature. Now, if Nature must be taken as the exponent of deity, we can only conclude that deity cannot distinguish between right and wrong, for in the course of Nature, by which he governs (?) the sentient beings of this world, he treats accidents, mistakes, and the greatest misfortunes as if they were the greatest crimes, and oftener inflicts pain upon the innocent than upon the guilty.

(2) Further, if Nature teaches anything in the cases just supposed, it teaches that murder is an innocent deed, if not a commendable one; for, while the three who are the subjects of accident, suicide, and crime are killed summarily by the forces of Nature, those who murdered the one not only survive him, but possibly, as often happens, actually enjoy property and pleasures that honestly belonged to their victim. And it must not be forgotten that all natural forces are, if Theists speak truth, forces of God; in fact, mere results of his own will.

This is a point so often ignored that I must spend another sentence or two upon it to impress it on the reader's mind. All that is was created, so Theists say, by an Almighty and otherwise Infinite God. That being so, the forces of Nature are such only by derivation, nay, not derivation even—they are merely the power or powers of God himself, exhibited under certain circumstances or conditions. Now all natural processes must be nothing more than actions of deity—he does all that is done—if the premises of Theism are correct. This being so, the destructive processes of Nature, and those that give pain, are actions of God equally with those which evolve new life or mantle the face of man with pleasure. If all this is true, we have in Nature a clear, constant, and truthful exponent of God's moral character; and what a character! Justice and wisdom are entirely absent. Indeed, you look in vain to Nature, that is (indirectly) to God, for any one of those qualities esteemed among men, while many of those society everywhere punishes are very painfully and palpably present.

(3) To pursue this somewhat further, we may look for a few moments at some of the frightful evils that have and still do curse the world:

In an earthquake, a flood, or a storm, we see the deity roused to fury and venting his rage indiscriminately upon all who happen to be within reach. Not one of the victims deserves such treatment, as far as we know; certainly the infants don't; yet they are ground to powder, drowned or otherwise killed, as if they were the greatest offenders. Is that government? and moral government? The Turkish manner of ruling Bulgaria was a trifle to this!

Again, how deaf the deity is to cries and prayers! In railway collisions, falls of bridges, shipwrecks, and other catastrophes, you may call, no matter how passionately, to the ruler of Nature. He no more attends you than does the wind, the wave, the iron, the rocks that surround you. He might help without the smallest trouble or inconvenience, for he knows all, he hears all, is ever present, and has almighty power—so Theists say. A man who will not help when he sees calamity fall upon his fellows, is next to a murderer, and is justly execrated. Yet he may plead some seeming or partial excuses. What could we say, if we were certain there
really existed a God who could look coolly on in the direst calamity that ever befals men? The thought is so sickening I dare not dwell upon it. Yet that is only one part of the subject. Human calamity! It is all planned and executed by the deity; no wonder he does not move to the rescue. And what does he, can he gain? It is all for nought! The devil is said to torment for his pleasure; not so the Almighty—he can never want a pleasure.

There have been millions of occasions in the world's history when the worst government worthy of the name must have interposed to prevent or remedy mischiefs among its subjects. What priesthood ever existed that did not speak and act in the name, and professedly by the authority of God, the Great Ruler? Where was that ruler when Moses and Joshua perpetrated such horrible villainies in his name? Where was he when the Pope and the Inquisition were perpetrating horrid lies in his name, and burning Jews and heretics for his pleasure? Did he ever interpose to prevent or close a war, or famine, or pestilence? When?

One case stands out in glaring colours as I sweep the horizon of the world's history. A company of fanatics or knaves concocted a scheme for conveying letters to the Virgin Mary in heaven. It was the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, and the church of La Compañía, in Santiago, Chili, was crammed with 2,000 women, deceived in the name of Deity, and panting to communicate with the Mother of God. Thousands of lamps lit up the temple, and thousands of yards of muslin festooned the place. Suddenly rose the flames, and played in horrid sport along the drapery. There is a panic, wild and horrible! A stampede for the doors, which are soon choked with quivering, dying humanity, and all exit is stopped. The ceiling catches fire, and streams of molten lead pour down upon their living flesh! The paraffin lamps burst in the heat, and shower down their contents in sheets and jets and wreaths of fire!

What an opportunity for a God! Where was he that he missed it? The people across the street could look through the church windows and see the agonised victims running to and fro in that hell, wringing their hands, and calling upon men, and angels, and God, to save them. Not a person who saw that sight—except Ugarte, the fiend-priest, who saved the Virgin's image and his own carcase, while he left the women to seethe and burn—except him, no other being in the universe would have hesitated to risk his own life to snatch one of those women from perdition! But, Theist, where was your God? Your great ruler of the world? Your Father which is in heaven and everywhere? Whose tender mercies are over all his works? Did he know? Was he by? O, Sir! you are the blasphemers, not we! You invent a God and give him all power, make him all-knowing, and invest him with absolute and boundless rule—then you write history, every page of which proclaims your deity an infinite fiend! Sir, burn your creed, or destroy history! Confess your errors, or else reconcile the course of the world with the character of your God! At present you outrage our best sentiments. Be ashamed and blush! Your Bible tells us your God at one time could so far demean himself as to order Aaron a bran new suit of holiday clothes, giving minute directions for every article, even to the pantaloons! At another time he stood or sat in stolid indifference, watching the agony of 2000 burning women deceived in his name, whose bodies were roasting his own fire—for that fire would not have burned had he not supplied the power.

I might pursue this subject, but there is no need. I do not pretend to understand Nature; glimpses and broken gleams of truth are all that fall to my share. But what little I do know is all in favour of Atheism. The best light I have leads up that path; the purest and noblest feelings of my nature make me shudder at the broken gleams of truth are all that fall to my share. But what little I do know is all in favour of Atheism. The best light I have leads up that path; the purest and noblest feelings of my nature make me shudder at the
Christianity at the Bar of Science.

There are still many professed Christians who are not afraid to affirm that science is not contrary to the Bible: that "God's word, rightly understood, is in perfect harmony with the discoveries of science:" that "God's revealed will must agree with the facts of nature," etc., etc. Though this has been disproved in a variety of ways, we are still confronted with these assertions, just as if science had travelled on none but biblical lines, and made all its discoveries by fasting, faith, and prayer.

How often are we favored with the statement that Sir Isaac Newton believed the Bible, and was a humble follower of Jesus! But the assertion must, in the very nature of the case, be incorrect; for had Newton believed in Bible astronomy, he must have rejected the Copernican, the Copernican being no more reconcilable with the Bible than with Ptolemy's Almagest. This is a point too often passed over without reflection, and, therefore, I may dwell upon it for a moment:—

1. I admit that the great Newton was strongly attached to the Bible; and had he drawn his astronomical and mathematical inspiration thence, he would have told us so.

2. If the discoveries of Copernicus, Tycho Brahe, and Kepler had been according to the Bible, Newton must have known it, and must, under the circumstances, have proclaimed and illustrated the wonderful harmony.

3. Had those discoveries agreed with scripture, they would have been merely re-discoveries, owing more than half their credit to the Bible. Could Newton have overlooked anything so advantageous to his religion? Could the clergy of those days have missed so grand an opportunity of demolishing their enemies? In a word, if the Newtonian philosophy had accorded with Bible teachings, it is inconceivable that so great and so acute a man, who knew his Bible nearly as well as his Euclid, should have passed it by without notice. Could Newton have harmonised the scriptures with his philosophy, there would have been, most certainly, one book of the "Principia" devoted to that subject, and then we should have seen that harmony as carefully and logically demonstrated as the laws of motion. Since he did not write any such work, we may be sure it was because he was not able.

4. Newton's intellect, perhaps the greatest that ever existed, seems to have worked independently of his superstition in most fields of philosophy, but in divinity as his superstition's thrall. In the regions of nature he worked freely, erect, with eyes open, unshackled with prejudice, untouched by fear; but in theology he wrought upon his knees, with eyes tightly bandaged, and his heart quivering with religious emotion. In philosophy he was a man; in divinity a child. In the former he made grand discoveries; in the latter none. The man who, in science, laid a foundation for all future builders, in religion could only believe—an act the weakest and most ignorant could perform much better than he.

That Newton, in spite of all his intellectual power, was very superstitious is made evident in his "Life" by Sir David Brewster. It there appears that Newton, in common with Locke and Boyle, believed in alchemy (vol. i., pp. 34, 35). Not only did Newton believe in this pretended science, but he even copied and annotated perhaps the most contemptible book ever written upon the subject—viz.: "Secrets Revealed; or, An Open Entrance into the Shut Palace of the King.' Composed by a most famous Englishman, styling himself Anonymous or
Euræmus Philaletha, who, by direct inspiration and reading, attained to the philosopher's stone at his age of twenty-three years, A.D. 1645. By W. C., London, 1669." "The margin of this book," says Brewster, "is covered with notes in Sir Isaac's hand; and he remarks: "We cannot understand how a mind of such power ... could stoop to be even the copyist of the most contemptible alchemical poetry, and the annotator of a work, the obvious production of a knave or a fool" (vol. ii., p. 375).

It is clear that if Newton had employed his unfettered intellect in the case, he would have rejected the above-mentioned book with quiet contempt; but having bowed submissively to the Bible and the pretenders to divine revelation who wrote it, why should he question the claims of Euræmus Philaletha? Having accepted the Bible and its curious contents as the word of God, why should he reject the inspired trash of this later prophet?

The above facts are carefully withheld, if known, by those who boast of Newton as a Christian.

But leaving the great Newton surrounded by his well-earned and imperishable glory, I proceed to arraign the Bible at the bar of science; and the charge I bring against it is that of falsehood respecting the facts of nature.

I. Geography.—Modern discovery has demonstrated that the earth is a globe, or nearly such. This I need not stay to prove or illustrate, for even the Christians admit and teach it as one of the very common-places of popular education. But the Bible doctrine of the earth is very different from this.

1. According to the Bible, the earth has "foundations." "Where wast thou," says Job's God to his illused servant, "when I laid the foundations of the earth? declare, if thou hast understanding. Who hath laid the measure thereof, if thou knowest? or who hath stretched the line upon it? Whereupon are the foundations thereof fastened? or who laid the corner stone thereof." etc.? (Job xxxvii., 4—6.)

Job, poor man, seems to have known nothing about those "foundations" or this "corner stone" of the earth; and, as his deity did not enlighten him, we can only conclude that he too had merely heard the rumor of them; that he, like Job, was totally ignorant of their whereabouts. If some sceptic had ventured to put such utter nonsense into the mouth of deity, he would be denounced as a blasphemer.

In the 104th Psalm those foundations are referred to again, and declared to be so firmly fixed as to be for ever immovable (v. 5). "The Lord of Hosts," as reported by Isaiah, boasted thus: "Mine hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned the heavens: when I call unto them, they stand up together" (Isaiah xlvi., 13).

If Homer had put that passage into the mouth of Zeus, the orthodox would have been amongst the first to laugh at it.

On this subject the New Testament agrees with the Old: "Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundations of the earth" (Hebrews i., 10).

2. In biblical days the earth also had "pillars," somewhat like the legs of a table, no doubt. They belonged to the Lord, as the following verse declares: "The pillars of the earth are the Lord's, and he hath set the world upon them" (1 Samuel ii., 8). The Lord (or possibly Asaph?) says he bears up those earth-pillars (Psalm lxxv., 3). Occasionally God "shakes the earth out of her place, and the pillars thereof tremble" (Job ix., 5).

3. The earth had four corners, as the following texts declare: He shall "gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth" (Isaiah xi., 12). "I saw four angels standing on the four corners of the earth," etc., (Revelation vii., 1).

4. The earth also had "breadth" (Job xxxviii., 18) and "sides" (Jeremiah vi., 22); its length is not mentioned in the Bible, but its "ends" are (Job xxxviii., 13—xxxviii., 24). Its length is thus alluded to by implication, and there is evidence that the Jews, like most other nations, considered the earth's breadth to lie north and south, its length east and west. Two very interesting relics of this doctrine still remain in our geographical nomenclature—viz., latitude and longitude, the former denoting the earth's breadth, the latter its length, at least, such was their ancient import. That one Bible writer held this erroneous doctrine may be seen in the following: "As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us" (Psalm ci., 12). No doubt the Psalmist employs here the most expressive language he knew. He would have been astonished out of measure had he been credibly informed that east and west touch each other all the world around; and that the farther he went west the nearer he was to the east, and vice versa. This arises, of course, from the fact that the zero or starting meridian of longitude can be fixed only arbitrarily, there being nothing in nature to guide us here as there is in the zero of latitude—that is, the Equator.

5. The earth must have been a flat plane, though not a smooth one, in biblical times, else this text must be entirely unworthy of credit, a conclusion no believer can adopt for fear of consequent damnation: "Again the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him, all the kingdoms of the world" (Matthew iv., 8), "in a moment of time" adds Luke (iv., 5). This clever showman was, no doubt, very talented; but even he could not exhibit both hemispheres of a globe at once; and if he really did show Jesus all the kingdoms simultaneously, then the earth must have been at that time as flat as he who wrote the story, and also of much smaller dimensions than now.
Here I may sum up the earth according to the Bible. Behold it, an oblong plane, of unknown dimensions, diversified with hill and dale, mountain and valley, lakes, rivers, and seas. This plane has four corners, probably pointing nearly, not quite, N.E., S.E., S.W., and N.W. The whole plane is borne up by an unknown number of pillars or legs, like a huge millipedal table. The legs, in turn, rest upon the "foundations," no doubt a platform of concrete constructed for the purpose. Beyond this, I am sorry to confess, I cannot conduct my readers, for divine wisdom has not seen fit to reveal either to Job or me "whereupon the foundations are fastened."

Will any man dare say that Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, and Newton could or did believe the above quoted nonsense from the Bible? Christians-to-day are at their wit's end. They cannot doubt the truth of modern geography, and to save the credit of the Bible they resolve its geographical statements and allusions into figures of speech. But (1) none of them can tell what figures, nor yet what truth those figures are intended to set forth, to illustrate, or impress upon the mind. And (2) the ancient Christians took the Bible texts literally, and out of respect for their divine book, resisted the spread of correct geographical ideas for twelve centuries or more. Lactantius (fourth century), the most elegant writer among the Latin Fathers, says: "Is it possible that men can be so absurd as to believe that the crops and the trees on the other side of the earth hang downwards, and that men have their feet higher than their heads? If you ask them how they defend those monstrosities? how things do not fall away from the earth on that side? they reply that the nature of things is such that heavy bodies tend towards the centre like the spokes of a wheel, while light bodies, as clouds, smoke, fire, tend from the centre to the heavens on all sides. Now, I am really at a loss what to say of those who, when they have once gone wrong, steadily persevere in their folly, and defend one absurd opinion by another." (Quoted by Draper, "Intellectual Development of Europe;" revised edition. London, 1875. Vol. I., p. 315.)

It seems to me a misfortune and almost a crime to write a historico-philosophical work, such as this of Draper's, without giving one definite reference to an author he quotes. Such a writer may be honest, but the labor of checking or verifying his quotations is immense.

Augustine (fourth century) says: "It is impossible there should be inhabitants on the other side of the earth, since no such race is recorded by scripture among the descendants of Adam" (Ibid).

In the sixth century Cosmas Indicopleustes, an Egyptian monk, wrote his "Topographia Christiana sive Christianorum opinio de mundo." It is his great aim to prove the earth not spherical but a vast oblong plain; the length, east and west, being double the breadth. He argues from scripture, reason, testimony, and the authority of the fathers" (Mosheim's "Ecclesiastical History," edition, London, 1878, p. 219). Cosmas further argues that the earth was made on the model of the Israelitish Tabernacle, and quotes this scripture in proof: "It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in" (Isaiah xl., 22). Lecky's "Rationalism," vol. i., 268—72.

Had Cosmas been the author of this language, which represents an infinite God dwelling in a tent of his own manufacture, he would have been treated as a blasphemer; but an inspired prophet may blaspheme with impunity; nay, more, his wild utterances are still called sublime.

In the eighth century Virgilius, Bishop of Saltzburg, dared to utter his belief that the earth was globular; and Boniface, the "Apostle of Germany," called upon Pope Zachary to put down such heresy (Mosheim, p. 263, v. 3). Six hundred years later, 1377, an old man of seventy, Cecco d' Ascoli, or Ceccus Asculanus, a physician, was burnt at Florence for believing in the Antipodes.

Alphonso Tostatus, of Avila, in Spain, who died in 1454, proved syllogistically that there was no other side to the earth. He did it thus: "The apostles were commanded to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; they did not go to any such place as the Antipodes; they did not preach to any creature there—ergo (i.e., therefore), no Antipodes exist."

This conclusive logic ought to have sufficed, and Europe should have rested content beneath the benign shade of the Church, the Bible and general stupidity; but those restless pryers into nature's secrets, Columbus, De Gama, Magellan and others like them—men whose inquisitiveness was stronger than their superstition, men who rushed and sailed where angels feared to tread or fly—those tremblers of the Church's peace and discreditors of the Bible went and found the earth's lost hemisphere, and thus made a laughing-stock of infallible ignorance, and undermined the throne of the pope above and of the pope below.

Before proceeding further, I must meet one objection the orthodox sometimes urge—viz., that the Bible expressly declares that God "hangeth the earth upon nothing" (Job xxv., 7). 1. If the text in our version were correct it could surely not outweigh all those above quoted. "Every word of God is good" says the Bible, and one, I presume, as good as another. Shall we, then, explain this last text by the preceding ones, or the preceding by it? 2. The earth is not hanged at all, in any conceivable sense of that word. If it were, it would hang on something, for to hang upon nothing would be equivalent to not hanging at all. It depends from nothing; has nothing to hold it; is not hanging over anything; it has nothing above it. 3. The Hebrew word translated "nothing" is Hebrew text, belimeh, and according to some Jewish interpreters, is derived from Hebrew text,
belem, and signifies a cord, rope, band (Fürst's "Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon;" l. c.). And it must be confessed that the earth hung by a rope is better sense than hung upon nothing.

This part of the present paper may very well be wound up by an honest quotation from a modern orthodox source. "With regard to the earth's body, the Hebrews conceived its surface to be an immense disc, supported like the flat roof of an Eastern house by pillars, which rested on solid foundations; but where those foundations were on which the 'sockets' of the pillars rested none could tell" (Smith's "Concise Dictionary of the Bible," edition 1865, article, "Earth").

Thus I have shown that the Bible (1) does not teach any geography that accords with nature; and (2) that what it does teach respecting the earth is as far from the truth as possible. To teach that the earth is flat and supported by pillars is more ridiculous than the fable of the New Zealanders, who say that it is the shape of a cocoa-nut, with the broader end always uppermost. To say that science and the Bible agree is equal to the affirmation that modern geography (for example) agrees with that of the Edda, of the Iliad, or with any fabulous cosmography whatsoever. It seems astounding that educated men can, at this time of day, muster the courage, not to say the effrontery, to affirm that the Bible and science agree. Never were the words of the Bible more fully realised than in the case of such men—"given up to strong delusion to believe a lie," as is the unfortunate case of all who bow their necks to superstition.

But if the Bible has so blundered respecting the earth, its pretended inspiration is exposed; and its statements respecting heaven must go for nought.

II. Astronomy.—The astronomy of the Bible is as absurd as its geography. In the Hebrew cosmogony "the earth was regarded not only as the central point of the universe, but as the universe itself: every other body—the heavens, sun, moon and stars—being subsidiary to, and, as it were, the complement of the earth . . . . . It is clear that the heavens were looked upon as the adjunct of the earth—the curtain of the tent in which man dwells (Isaiah xl., 22), the sphere above which fitted the sphere below (compare Job xxii., 14, and Isaiah xl., 22)—designed solely for the purposes of beneficence in the economy of the earth. This appears from the account of its creation and offices: the existence of heaven was not prior to or contemporaneous with that of the earth, but subsequent to it; it was created on the second day (Genesis i., 6). The term under which it is described, rakia, is significant of its extension, that it was stretched out as a curtain (Psalm civ., 2) over the surface of the earth. Moreover, it depended upon the earth; it had its 'foundations' (2 Samuel xxii., 8) on the edge of the earth's circle where it was supposed to be supported by the mountains as by massive pillars (Job xxvi., 11). Its offices were (1) to support the waters which were above it (Genesis i., 7, and Psalm cxlviii., 4), and thus to form a mighty reservoir of rain and snow, which were to pour forth through its windows (Genesis vii., 11, and Isaiah xxxiv., 18) and doors (Psalm lxxviii., 23), as through opened sluice-gates, for the fructification of the earth; (2) to serve as the substratum (Greek text or firmament) in which the celestial bodies were to be fixed. As with heaven itself, so also with the heavenly bodies; they were regarded solely as the ministers of the earth . . . . . So entirely indeed was the existence of the heavens and the heavenly bodies designed for the earth that with the earth they shall simultaneously perish (2 Peter iii., 10); the curtain of the tent shall be rolled up and the stars shall of necessity drop off (Isaiah xxxiv., 4, and Matthew xxiv., 29); their sympathy with the earth's destruction being the counterpart of their joyous song when its foundations were laid (Job xxxviii., 7)."—Rev. W. L. Bevan; Smith's "Dictionary of Bible," article, "Earth."

In the above passage, with most of which I entirely agree, honest thought gets the better of credulity to such an extent that one is led to wonder how the writer can possibly believe in Bible inspiration after so mercilessly exposing its astronomical blunders.

Dr. Samuel Davidson has the following characteristic, manly note on the word "firmament": "The Hebrews certainly believed that the sky was a firm, hard, extended vault; and the etymology of the word employed by the Elohist agrees with that opinion, for the original verb involves the idea of beating out, or expanding by beating, something solid. Firmament is an excellent equivalent to the noun: expance requires the adjective solid; 'a solid expanse.' The sentiments of the sacred writers about the phenomena of nature were those of the age they lived in; and it is impossible to reconcile them with the scientific views of modern times" ("Fresh Revision of English Old Testament," London, 1873, p. 102).

Theology so perverts the mental and moral faculties that well-intentioned men, once enmeshed in this pseudo-science, follow fables as earnestly as benighted travellers are said to pursue a will-o'-the-wisp. To err is human; but none err so hopelessly and egregiously as theologians. Hence it is that when they speak out the plain truth, as the above-quoted gentlemen do, the effect is so refreshing. Not to spoil that effect by any remarks of mine, I next proceed to show in detail what Bible astronomy really is.

1. In Genesis i., 6—9, we are presented with the history of the creation and offices of the heaven or firmament. The name, as appears from the above quotations, fixes its meaning and shows us what to look for. The reader may see the natural phenomenon which the inspired writers allude to any clear night or day, bending as an immense vault above him, no matter to what part of the world he may journey, no matter how
high he may rise in a balloon. At night it is studded all over with stars, or filled with the pale radiance of the moon; by day the sun lights it up to excess; or gauzy mist, or morning or evening hours dim down the splendor, and leave the heavens in all their wealth of blue.

That sky, by day or night, is worthy of our deepest thought or our deepest wonder. The man who views it without emotion is beyond the reach of poetry; nature for him has neither grandeur nor beauty. Who knows not the hot fever of life? the rush? the hurry? the wild dreams? the strife of tongues and pens? the malice and the fraud? the endless struggle? the sultry sweltering heat in brain and blood? the overcharge of electricity that must escape or wreck the frame? Just as the earth relieves herself by flashing lightning to the clouds so may the tired and jaded sons of men relieve their throbbing brains by converse with the skies. Not as theologians and theosophists pretend, by converse with the unseen, but by a study of those real lights scattered through the mighty space around us. Tracing out the constellations or natural groups of stars with the naked eye, or peering through the telescope upon mountains, crags, and craters in the moon, upon the spots and faculæ of the sun, on Jupiter's satellites and belts, on Saturn's marvellous rings, or, infinitely further still, upon the double and multiple stars, or upon Orion's nebula—an hour at these dispels the fever-heat, obviates all the ills of life, and braces up and tones again the nerves for any duty or danger that may come.

That firmament puzzled all the ancients in every quarter of the earth. Everyone who saw it was prepared to swear that it was real, a solid thing. We know better, it is true; but we have no room to boast. Science, the growth of centuries, the secured results of the labors of earth's great ones, has taught us its nature. We have truth and experience to guide us; the Bible writers had nothing better than "the inspiration of the Almighty" to conduct them; and when we remember this we shall not be disposed to treat them severely for the folly they displayed. Our best scientists would soon be as foolish as Moses, if they followed inspiration. The pity is that men of to-day, who might, if they would, avail themselves of all the advantages of science, bow down to the transmitted errors of those who lived in the very dawn of human reason, and treat them with profounder respect than they show to the established facts of science.

The word translated firmament in the authorised version of the Bible is, in Hebrew, Hebrew text rekia; of which Dr. Fürst ("Heb. Lex.") says it is properly a thing spread out; an extended surface, either a pavement, a floor, or an upper vaulted arch. It was conceived to be solid; hence the Septuagint, Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion

These three men each translated, so it is said, the Hebrew Bible into Greek, in the second century. all trans-late the word by the Greek Greek text (stereoma), which signifies a solid body. The Latin Vulgate translates it firmamentum, a word with similar meaning, and followed by the English translators. Luther renders it Veste—veste des himmels, the stronghold, or fastness of the heavens. This view was in strict keeping with ancient Greek notions, for Homer speaks of the arch of heaven as Greek text (sidereon), the iron (sky)—"Odyssey." xv., 328. In the "Iliad" (17) he calls the sky Greek text (chalkeon), the brazen, or the firm, rigid vault. "Scripture represents rekia as a solid cast metal-mirror, (Job, xxxvii., 18,) borne up by the highest mountains as its pillars." I have not quoted Fürst verbatim, except in the last sentence.

I have no doubt the clergy themselves would object if we attributed to Homer correct notions in astronomy; and they would laugh at the attempt to reconcile modern science with the views of that immortal bard. Yet I beg to pledge myself to do that for Homer, if they can do it for the Bible.

Gesenius, under rekia, says: "The Hebrews supposed the firmament to be spread out like a solid hemispherical arch over the earth (Exodus, xxiv., 10; Daniel, xii., 3). Above was the celestial ocean (Psalms, civ., 3; cxlviii., 4); they also knew the correct state of things" (Genesis, ii., 6; Job, xxxvi., 27, 28).—"Heb. Lex."

This quotation is curious. Gesenius admits that some of the Bible texts are erroneous—inspiration and infallibility have erred. How can we trust the Bible when unsupported by science or profane history, then? But "they also knew the correct state of things." This is very serious. What! did those men who wrote the geographical and astronomical nonsense now found in the Bible know that they were mis-representing the facts of nature? I charge them with errors, Gesenius charges them with wilful falsehood.

Besides, if they knew the truth they are guilty of setting the Church on a false track; and are, therefore, to blame for all the persecution the Church inflicted upon scientists. Where was the Holy Spirit of truth when the inspired penmen wrote wilful untruths respecting nature, that he did not correct them, and thus prevent that 1,000 years of utter gloom, the millennium of Bible and priests, which preceded the revival of learning? When he permitted his amanuenses thus to write, did he not foresee how Cecco d' Ascoli and Giordano Bruno would breathe their last in murderous flames for uttering truths that he had withheld? What would be said of a man, a mere man, who wilfully or carelessly dictated a lie that eventually led two good and noble men to the stake? If the Bible writers merely blundered, as I charitably suppose, we merely regret the consequences of their mistakes; but, if Gesenius be correct, they become criminals, not blunderers.

No doubt it requires a little temerity to contradict Gesenius, and therefore I will merely quote the texts, to which he refers in evidence that the Hebrews "knew the correct state of things," and leave the reader to form his
Mists do not go up from the earth. Water-vapor is raised into the atmosphere, where it condenses into mist, rain, etc.

from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground" (Genesis, ii., 6). "For he maketh small the drops of water: they pour down rain according to the vapor thereof: which the clouds do drop and distil upon man abundantly" (Job, xxxvi., 27, 28). Even lexicographers require looking after—specially if they are religious.

2. But the firmament was not only solid, not only did it serve as a roof for the earth, it was also the floor of an immense reservoir of water, or rather, a celestial ocean which, before the Flood at least, existed above it. "And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament: and it was so" (Genesis, i., 7).

The upper waters were intelligent—or else the Psalmist could not have been very much so—"Praise him, ye heavens of heavens, and ye waters that be above the heavens" (Psalms cxlviii., 4). The firmament had "windows," or trap-doors, or sluices, or flood-gates:—"I will open the windows of heaven, and pour you out a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to contain" (Malachi iii., 10). There was far too much of a "blessing" vouchsafed through those windows in Noah's day; for then they were opened to let the water down in catacacts upon the poor earth (Genesis vii., 11).

How could windows be fix'd in an "expanse" of nothing? For that is the absurdity they reduce themselves to who say that the firmament is merely the "expanse." There are no people that contradict, misrepresent, and distort the Bible so much as its professed friends.

It may add to the interest of this paper to insert here a few facts respecting the Chaldæan cosmology. According to Diodorus Siculus, they held that the universe was of the form of a boat turned upside down. The kind of boat referred to is of peculiar form; it is nearly round. And it is said that an orange with its top cut off and then placed upon its cut surface will very well represent what the Chaldæans thought the universe to be. Imagine an orange thus cut and all but its rind removed. Then place it on the cut surface, and you have a kind of miniature tent. On the top outside, which represents the convex surface of the earth, men dwell. The interior was the abyss where the dead were housed, and where the sun shone at night. Above the earth extended the sky, revolving with its stars around an eastern mountain. The heavens were regarded as a hemispherical skull-cap, and the "foundations of the heavens" rested on the extremities of the earth, beyond what Homer called the "Ocean stream," or the great water that was supposed to encircle the world. The firmament, here as in the Bible, supported a celestial ocean called Ziku.

But the Chaldæans carried their speculations further.. Hea, their great spirit of the world, the soul of all natural phenomena, though he had no father, was eternally begotten, and emerged from the celestial ocean which was personified as the goddess Ziku. Hence, no doubt, arose the queer story told by Berosus of Oannes, the fish-god, who taught the Babylonians their religious and social laws. In Berosus' days the myth had lost its primal sense. Hea, or Oannes was the God from the ocean above, and hence the Great Fish, or fish-god. In later times it was supposed that he combined the form of a fish with that of a man; and literally emerged from the sea below. (Lenormant's "Chaldæan Magic," pp. 153—7.)

The Christ is called a fish in Ecclesiastical iconography and symbolism. Is this the origin of the epithet? He too is descended from the celestial ocean. I am not aware that any archaeologist has yet satisfactorily explained the symbol. (See Didron's "Christian Iconography," vol. I. 344—367.) The celestial ocean myth may also have given rise to the notion of the "river of the water of life," and of holy water.

After this digression, I must return and finish my task. The firmament having been fashioned and spread out, the stars were fixed into or on it, the Sun and Moon especially to light the earth, and rule the day and night, and to mark out the seasons (Genesis i., 14—18). Here in the story the Sun and Moon are both treated as "lights," whereas the Moon is no light, any more than looking-glasses or reflectors are lights. The Sun is a luminous body, not on fire, properly speaking, but its surface, to an unknown depth, is intensely incandescent. Hence he shines with his own incomparable splendor, and floods us and other planets with his light and heat. The Bible writers never suspected that the Moon, like the earth, received all her light from the Sun, and merely reflected it. It was almost infinitely too great a task for inspiration to guess that those stars which unceasingly wandered through and through the Zodiac—Mars, and Jupiter, and Saturn—or those two that swung, pendulum-like, now to the east and again to the west of the Sun—Mercury and Venus, were not stars brilliant with native light, but only planets like the earth, reflecting the solar splendor. Prophets and priests never soared so high—at least, not in Judæa. Not to inspiration and prayer, not to divine visions and angelic hints and messages, do we owe this knowledge; but to the uninspired watchers and workers of Ancient Chaldæa, Egypt, and other lands. How the writer of Genesis would have stared with wonder, or smiled with incredulity, or foamed with fury, had he been told that that lamp, the Sun, made as he says to light the earth, was as large as the earth itself! Had he been informed that that Sun was more than a million times the size of the earth, as is really the case, he might well have given up the ghost with astonishment. And the same catastrophe might have
happened, had he been informed that the Sun was as heavy (to use a popular term) as 310,000 bodies like the earth. These stupendous facts, part of the harvest of thousands of years' of hard toil, were "for ever hid from the eyes" of inspiration.

What a grotesque story the first chapter of Genesis appears when examined in the light of science! It is but the babble of the world's childhood; a fragment of ancient folk-lore; a scrap from the world's great nursery: worth its weight in diamonds to him who loves the past, as all such stories are. But to ascribe it to the pens of men who understood science is to insult their memory; to ascribe it to an All-wise God is too laughable even to be blasphemous.

Would not the man be an idiot who should propose to make a lamp as big as all London merely to light one ordinary dwelling house? Yet his notion would be just parallel to that of the ancient story-teller who gravely wrote that the sun was made" to give light upon the earth."

The sun, moon and stars were fixed or set in the firmament, else, to be sure, they would fall to the ground! And, alas! for us, this will happen at last, though not in "our day" perhaps. Prayer and faith will, no doubt, postpone the dire event, but not for ever. Warning has already been given repeatedly. Thus, in Daniel's day, there lived a he-goat, such as even that redoubtable lion-tamer could, I should presume, scarcely control. This remarkable beast, at first, had but one horn, between its eyes; later on, he got four "notable" ones instead of this, and out of one of the four (which, is not said) there sprouted a little one that "waxed exceeding great," aye, "even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them" (Daniel viii., 10). The only other beast that I ever read of, capable of a feat like that, was Fenris, a famous wolf rather too well known to Odin, Thor and the other gods of ancient Scandinavia. I do not remember that Fenris ever did "cast down" any of the stars; but I presume that he could if he had been sufficiently mischievous, for I read (Mallet's "Northern Antiquities") that when this beast opened his mouth his lower jaw rested upon the earth while his snout touched the sky! By the way, Daniel's four nameless beasts, his ram with the two unequal horns, his he-goat, along with Fenris, the old serpent of Eden, Aaron's rod, Balaam's donkey, Job's leviathan, Ezekiel's cherubs, Jonah's whale, the many- headed beasts that John saw, and those before the throne all over eyes, as Job was all over boils, would make the finest menagerie in existence. I wonder if any angelic Barnum or Wombwell is now making the tour of the universe with those valuable specimens of the animal creation, or, if not, whether geologists will ever secure their skeletons, skulls or antlers, or their foot-prints in consolidated sand or slime! Should such discoveries ever be made, theologians will run wild with joy, and sceptics must hide their diminished heads. And should one of the stars also be discovered which that terrible goat poked down with his horn and then furiously stamped upon—should one of those be found with the "marks of the beast "still upon its surface, then woe to unbelief!

If the inspired writers may be trusted, the stars must have been set or fixed in the firmament more than once. For in Revelation vi., 13, we read that, when the sixth seal of the curious old book was opened, "The stars of heaven fell unto the earth, even as a fig-tree casteth her untimely figs, when she is shaken of a mighty wind." Yet they seem all right and in their places at present. Possibly, though, the fig-tree has produced another crop, and the firmament followed suit with a new eruption of stars.

Jesus, if rightly reported in the gospels, shared to the full, as might have been expected, the astronomical notions of his day. Though he "came down from heaven," he knew no more of the stars he passed on the way than of the globe on which he dwelt. He thought eclipses of the sun and moon were "signs," or miracles, portents hinting at coming disasters (Luke xxi., 25). Speaking of his own "coming," he says: "Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken," etc. (Matthew xxiv., 29). How can an educated clergyman read this solemn rant without laughing?

Judging from his hymns, I should say that Charles Wesley fully swallowed the Bible astronomy, and expected the stars to tumble down upon the earth in the day of judgment. Hence he says:—

"We, while the stars from heaven shall fall,
And mountains are on mountains hurled,
Shall stand unmoved amidst them all,
And smile to see a burning world."—57th Hymn.

These lines give a hint of the callous and selfish feelings that Christianity instils; but the following hymn unblushingly declares them:—
"Stand th' omnipotent decree:
Jehovah's will be done!
Nature's end we wait to see,
And hear her final groan;
Let this earth dissolve, and blend
In death the wicked and the just;
Let those ponderous orbs descend
And grind us into dust.
"Rests secure the righteous man!
At his Redeemer's beck,
Sure to' emerge, and rise again
And mount above the wreck;
Lo! the heavenly spirit towers,
Like flame, o'er nature's funeral pyre,
Triumphs in immortal powers,
And claps his wings of fire.
"Nothing hath the just to lose,
By worlds on worlds destroyed;
Far beneath his feet he views,
With smiles, the flaming void:
Sees the universe renewed,
The grand millennial reign begun;
Shouts, with all the sons of God.
Around the eternal throne!
"Resting in this glorious hope
To be at last restored.
Yield we now our bodies up
To earthquake, plague, or sword:
Listening for the call divine,
The latest trumpet of the seven,
Soon our soul and dust shall join,
And both fly up to heaven."—61st Hymn.

I quote an edition of Wesley's Hymns dated 1863.

In this hymn the Bible astronomy is adopted entire, by implication, if not in a formal way; and what Charles Wesley wrote John endorsed, for he published the above hymns "for the use of the people called Methodists;" and, therefore, the Methodists of to-day, if they follow Wesley, must accept the science of the Bible. In the hymn just quoted there is seen all the fanaticism of an early Christian; a fanaticism that renders the heart indifferent to suffering, however horrible and revolting: a fanaticism which would drive its victim to risk "earthquake, plague and sword"; that would send him in rapture to the stake, to burn there himself or to burn a heretic; a fanaticism that bids a man shout for joy while a universe turns to ashes, and triumph in his own victory and reward while countless millions are destroyed and doomed to endless torture! This is the very spirit of Jesus, of his apostles, and of him who wrote the Revelation. For the sake of heaven's reward they dare, they face, they endure anything; and they pity the damned as much as a miser pities the starving!

I do not pretend to have exhausted my subject; but I do claim to have gained my point—no hard one to gain—and to have demonstrated that the Bible is false to the facts of nature. It is not necessary. I presume, to show how utterly preposterous is the notion of the stars falling from heaven. Those who understand astronomy will be able to appreciate the idea of one star, not to mention thousands, falling upon the earth; and those who do not must study the science fairly to comprehend how desperately ridiculous the conception is. The Bible is scientifically false, unmistakably so. And it remains for Christians to show how the author of nature could have inspired nonsense respecting his own handiwork. If the Bible be regarded as an old book, written by men who had nothing but their own dim, semi-barbarous notions to guide them, we cannot complain; to criticise it, in that case, with any severity, would be very unfair. But if the book be God's, there can be no excuse; for God, if Christians tell truth, can be no wiser to-day than he was thousands of years since; and it is inconceivable that one who really understood nature could have written or dictated the astronomical and geographical references and statements of the Bible. In a word, there is no better evidence that Homer and other ancient writers
blundered on those sciences than there is that Bible writers have done the same. There are no geographical and astronomical notions that have come down to us, whether among Chaldeans, Egyptians, Hindus, Scandinavians, or South-Sea Islanders, more untrue to nature than those of the Bible. Modern science has dissipated both Jupiter and his mountain throne; and it has done the same office for Jehovah. He who created heaven and earth in a week and rested and refreshed himself on Sunday is no more; and the universe he made is not that we occupy, but a mythological fancy. The real universe never was created, and the real earth has never yet been "finished." Our earth is a globe, circulating round the sun, running an endless geological race, too, and speeding on from change to change; our sun never stops to light villains on to massacres or to please the whims of kings in their dotage; our heavens have no windows; our earth no corners, pillars or foundations. And what is true of Bible science is equally so of its theology: its pillars and foundations are as mythological as the others. Unstable as a balloon, the Church is "carried about by every wind of doctrine." It has no foothold, no point d'appui, no place to stand and move the world; but, meantime, the world puffs and blows the Church, now up, now down, now to every point of the compass in quick succession, till the poor brains of its occupants are bewildered and dizzy. The winds of infidelity are altogether too strong and pitiless for them; and my advice to them is: "Leave the old balloon as soon as you can; leave it to its fate; and instead of floating about in terror in the unsubstantial air, descend to the solid earth; build your hopes upon it; make the utmost of life for yourselves and your fellows; and never attempt again to fly away, till you have really discovered a better place and a practicable method of reaching it.

As I am not, in this case, either judge or jury, but merely the prosecuting counsel, I shall not presume to pass sentence on the prisoner at the bar,—that is not my function. I merely give way now to the counsel for the defence, and shall be happy to hear what he or they have to advance in defence of Christianity, or in extenuation of its faulty teachings.


A Burial Service.

The following is designed as one of the services for the little Manual of Secular Ceremonies. Having lost the nearest and dearest relatives a man can know—having passed, I may say, through a baptism of bereavement, I know but too well the agony of the grave side. I have endeavoured—but very inadequately, I am sure—to produce a short service which shall afford consolation and reconciliation to the sorrowing, from a Secular point of view. The service as it now stands is suitable to be said over the grave of an adult male; it may, with slight effort, by altering the gender, be made suitable for a female also. It is almost impossible to write that which would be applicable to all persons of all ages. It can always be sufficiently individualised by some friend of the deceased introducing a few remarks of a personal nature.

We, this day consign to the earth the body of our departed friend; for him life's fitful dream is over, with its toils, and sufferings, and disappointments. He derived his being from the bountiful mother of all; he returns to her capacious bosom, to again mingle with the elements. Me basked in life's sunshine for his allotted time, and has passed into the shadow of death, where sorrow and pain are unknown. Nobly he performed life's duties on the stage of earth; the impenetrable curtain of futurity has fallen, and we see him no more. But he leaves to his sorrowing relatives and friends a legacy in the remembrance of his virtues, his services, his honour, and truth. He fought the good fight of Free Inquiry, and triumphed over prejudice and the results of misdirected education. His voyage through life was not always on tranquil seas, but his strong judgment steered him clear of the rocks and quicksands of ignorance, and for years he rested placidly in the haven of self-knowledge. He had long been free from the fears and misgivings of superstitious belief. He worked out for himself the problem of life, and no man was the keeper of his conscience. His religion was of this world—the service of humanity his highest aspiration. He recognised no authority but that of Nature; adopted no methods but those of science and philosophy; and respected in practice no rule but that of conscience, illustrated by the common sense of mankind. He valued the lessons of the past, but disowned tradition as a ground of belief, whether miracles and
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the coming night. Peace and respect be with his memory. Farewell, a long farewell!

of humanity. As we drop the tear of sympathy at the grave now about to close over the once loved form, may

away, beyond the clouds; but here on earth, created by the fireside, and built up of the love and respect of

his life, when he was gazing as it were into his own grave, it procured him the most perfect tranquil-

ity of mind. There were no misgivings, no doubts, no tremblings lest he should have missed the right

path; but he went undaunted into the land of the great departed, into the silent land. It may be truly said of him,

that nothing in life became him more than the manner of his leaving it. Death has no terrors for the enlightened;

it may bring regrets at the thought of leaving those we hold dearest on earth, but the consciousness of a

well-spent life is all—sufficient in the last sad hour of humanity. Death is but the shadow of a shade, and there is

nothing in the name that should blanch the cheek or inspire the timid with fear. In its presence, pain and care

give place to rest and peace. The sorrow-laden and the forlorn, the unfortunate and the despairing, find repose

in the tomb—all the woes and ills of life are swallowed up in death. The atoms of this earth once were living

man, and in dying, we do but return to our kindred who have existed through myriads of generations.

[Here introduce any personal matters relating to the deceased.]

Now our departed brother has been removed, death, like a mirror, shows us his true reflex. We see his

character undistorted by the passions, the prejudices, and the infirmities of life. And how poor seem all the

petty ambitions which are wont to sway mankind, and how small the advantages of revenge. Death is so

genuine a fact, that it excludes falsehood, or betrays its emptiness; it is a touchstone that proves the gold, and

dishonours the baser metal. Our friend has entered upon that eternal rest, that happy ease, which is the heritage

of all. The sorrow and grief of those who remain, alone mar the thought that the tranquil sleep of death has

succeeded that fever of the brain called living. Death comes as the soothing anodyne to all our woes and

struggles, and we inherit the earth as a reward for the toils of life. The pain of parting is poignant, and cannot

for time be subdued; but regrets are vain. Every form that lives must die, for the penalty of life is death. No

power can break the stern decree that all on earth must part; though the chain be woven by affection or

kindred, the beloved ones who weep for us will only for a while remain. There is not a flower that scents the

mountain or the plain, there is not a rose-bud that opes its perfumed lips to the morning sun, but, ere evening

comes, may perish. Man springs up like the tree: at first the tender plant, he puts forth buds of promise, then

blossoms for a time, and gradually decays and passes away. His hopes, like the countless leaves of the forest,

may wither and be blown about by the adverse winds of fate, but his efforts, springing from the fruitful soil of

wise endeavour, will fructify the earth, from which will rise a blooming harvest of happy results to mankind. In

the solemn presence of death—solemn, because a mystery which no living being has penetrated—on the brink

of that bourne from whence no traveller returns, our obvious duty is to emulate the good deeds of the departed,

and to resolve so to shape our course through life, that when our hour comes we can say, that though our

moments of his life, when he was gazing as it were into his own grave, it procured him the most perfect

triumphantly established. His belief sustained him in health; during his illness, with the certainty of death

the great ones of the world, who have benefitted their age and race by their noble deeds, their brilliant thoughts,

of that bourne from whence no traveller returns, our obvious duty is to emulate the good deeds of the departed,

and to resolve so to shape our course through life, that when our hour comes we can say, that though our

sentiments which have their source in human nature—which impel and ennobles all morality—which are

grounded upon intelligent personal conviction, and which manifest themselves in worthy and heroic actions,

especially in the promotion of Truth, Justice, and Love. For worship of the unknown, he substituted Duty; for

prayer, Work; and the record of his life bears testimony to his purity of heart; and the bereaved ones know but

too well the treasure that is lost to them for ever. If perfect reliance upon any particular belief in the hour of

death were any proof of its truth, then in the death of our friend the principles of Secularism would be

succeeded that fever of the brain called living. Death comes as the soothing anodyne to all our woes and

struggles, and we inherit the earth as a reward for the toils of life. The pain of parting is poignant, and cannot

for time be subdued; but regrets are vain. Every form that lives must die, for the penalty of life is death. No

power can break the stern decree that all on earth must part; though the chain be woven by affection or

kindred, the beloved ones who weep for us will only for a while remain. There is not a flower that scents the

mountain or the plain, there is not a rose-bud that opes its perfumed lips to the morning sun, but, ere evening

comes, may perish. Man springs up like the tree: at first the tender plant, he puts forth buds of promise, then

blossoms for a time, and gradually decays and passes away. His hopes, like the countless leaves of the forest,

may wither and be blown about by the adverse winds of fate, but his efforts, springing from the fruitful soil of

wise endeavour, will fructify the earth, from which will rise a blooming harvest of happy results to mankind. In

the solemn presence of death—solemn, because a mystery which no living being has penetrated—on the brink

of that bourne from whence no traveller returns, our obvious duty is to emulate the good deeds of the departed,

and to resolve so to shape our course through life, that when our hour comes we can say, that though our

temptations were great—though our education was defective—though our toils and privations were sore—we

never wilfully did a bad act, never deliberately injured our fellow-man. The reward of a useful and virtuous life

is the conviction that our memory will be cherished by those who come after us, as we reverence the memories of

the great and good who have gone before. This is the only immortality of which we know—the immortality of

the great ones of the world, who have benefitted their age and race by their noble deeds, their brilliant thoughts,

their burning words. Their example is ever with us, and their influence hovers round the haunts of men, and

stimulates to the highest and happiest daring Man has a heaven too, but not that dreamed of by some—far, far

away, beyond the clouds; but here on earth, created by the fireside, and built up of the love and respect of

kindred and friends, and within the reach of the humblest who work for the good of others and the perfectibility

of humanity. As we drop the tear of sympathy at the grave now about to close over the once loved form, may

the earth lie lightly on him, may the flowers bloom o'er his head, and may the winds sigh softly as they herald

the coming night. Peace and respect be with his memory. Farewell, a long farewell!
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Secular Ceremonies. Naming of Infants.

By Charles Watts.
Naming of Infants.

The public identification of a child with the Secular party, may be accepted as an indication of its parents’ desire to give their infant the advantages afforded by unfettered thought during the formation of its character. As diversity of organisation precludes uniformity of belief, we cannot of course guarantee that in after life our young friend shall profess any particular class of opinions. Still, by keeping its mind free from the influence of theological creeds, we enable it the better to acquire a more liberal education than is permitted by the conventional faith of the Church. During infancy, the imagination frequently revels in the ideal; too much care, therefore, cannot be taken to protect the child from the beguilements of superstition. For it is in the sunny days of childhood, when the heart knows no care, when sweet innocence beams on the cheek, and hope sparkles in the eye; when the mind in its purest simplicity is unable to detect the snare, it is then the seeds are sown which in after years bear such unfortunate fruit. Let the faculties be fairly developed before the judgment is taxed with the mysteries and perplexities of theology. Endeavour to place before the young the true and the beautiful in nature, assuring them that to understand and appreciate such realities, should be the real aim of their lives. Theological prejudice and religious bigotry, are ever the great obstacles to the realisation of this object. Children must be protected from their evil influence.

Viewing this emblem of innocence, we here recognise lineaments of love and simplicity, which are an index to the goodness of its nature. The germs of virtue are here awaiting judicious cultivation, they will then probably bud forth and ripen into moral fruit. Youth is impressionable. The conduct of children, in after life, as a rule, is a reflex of their early education. Encircle them with pure influences, place before them examples of integrity, control them with love and discretion, foster the desire for excellence which is allied with human affections at the dawn of life, and you will thereby open the avenues to the purest instincts of their nature, and knit a bond of union between them and their parents which all the turmoil of life and strife of the world will fail to sever. Seek to win the affections of children with love, not repel them with fear; inspire hope and joy, awaken not dread and despair. The infant mind is sensitive, and requires to be irradiated with smiles, not darkened with gloom. Parental indifference, harsh treatment, and cruel frowns, produce stultified intellects and unpleasant dispositions; but kindness, care, and forbearance evoke intelligence and cheerfulness of conduct.

Henceforth the object of our present solicitude will be known as—

[Here name the child.]

And we sincerely hope that in after life he may have reason to rejoice in his fellowship with us. May the principles of Freethought enable him to brave successfully the battle of life. And as he sails o’er the billows of time, may experience increase his guiding power, that when arriving in the harbour of maturity, he Shall have acquired sufficient knowledge and skill to regulate his further voyage. And when the evening of his existence has arrived, may he obtain consolation from the knowledge that his conduct has won the approval of the wise and the good, and that to the best of his ability, it has been faithful to the mission of life.

Price one Halfpenny.
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There are large numbers of people, both in America and Europe, and throughout Christendom, who are quiet and at rest in their religious ideas. They seem to be unconscious of the disturbing forces that are at work unsettling the foundations of old ideas. They seem to be unconscious of the new movement of things in the air, that threatens to disintegrate the structures that have stood so long. If indeed it be so, that the rest which is mere quiescence be a blessing, then blessed are these people! But to me it appears to be true that there is a higher and nobler form of peace than that which is simply quiet and stagnation,—the peace of the eagle poised on balanced wings, sweeping through the air; the peace of the mighty steamship, in spite of lowering cloud, or threatening wind, or buffeting wave, holding straight on her resistless course; the peace of the brook running and rippling, running itself clear by its own motion, and singing ever as it goes. These seem to me to symbolize that kind of peace which is more desirable than mere quiescence. But, however large this number of people may be to whom I have referred, there is, on the other hand, a still larger and an increasing number of those who are not at peace, who feel the upheaval beneath them, who hear the whisper of change in the air. This class is constantly on the increase. Already it is in the majority, and that majority is growing.

This class, for the purposes I have in mind, may be accurately enough divided into two parts. On the one hand are those who believe that religion is something that pertains to the childhood of the race, and that, with the childish things of the past, it is to be put away when man has grown to his perfect intellectual stature. They tell us that religion is fathered by ignorance and mothered by fear; that it is twin-born with superstition, and is finally to be outgrown: it is like a belated ghost, that, when the cock crows and the sun rises, fades away, not able to stand the light of the coming morning. And this class of people rejoice in this belief. Religion to their thought means superstition, credulity, ignorance, the separation of nations, of peoples, of families, of sects. It means bitterness, heart-burnings, false conceptions of God, horrible anticipations for the future. Holding this conception of it, I do not wonder that they are glad to believe it is destined to pass away.

The other class is made up of quite a different sort of persons. They claim to believe that the religious ideas which they hold, and to which they cling with such tenacity and love, are God-originated and God-given to man; that they are divine, and that on them hinge the welfare and the prosperity of the world. And yet, strange as it seems, these very persons who profess so firmly to believe that the ideas they hold are divine, and
therefore eternal, do in fact betray a deep-down infidelity that holds possession of their hearts. For they tremble and are afraid; they fight against criticism, they despise and cast contempt upon modern science and the new light of investigation; and anything that threatens to look into the foundations of things gives them tremors of the heart, and anticipations that these things which they have asserted to be divine and eternal are really in danger.

If I had a piece of jewelry that I was very anxious to believe was gold, and yet that I did not feel quite certain about, and if somebody came along with a chemical test by which he proposed to settle the question, very likely I should button that bit of gold up tight in my pocket to keep it out of the way, preferring my comfortable belief to what might be a very uncomfortable certainty. But, if I really believed that it was gold, would I fear subjecting it to any, even the extremest conceivable test? If, then, I really believe that my ideas are divine, that the truths, as I call them, are God-originated, God-given, and as eternal as God himself, then I welcome the light of clay, welcome all research, welcome the broadest, freest; deepest investigation. Let me bring them forth into the open arena of debate and conflict, confident that their divine strength cannot be overcome, but that they will come out of the severest trial, and fully vindicate their divine origin and their power to go forth making conquest over all the earth.

These two classes then, those who believe that religion is false and destined to pass away, and those who still claim to believe that it is true, but are yet afraid that somehow their divine truths are going to receive injury,—these two classes are increasing. But if they, and we all, would only take the trouble to get into our minds a clear and consistent definition of what religion means, it would show the folly of the fear on the one hand, and the folly of the hope on the other.

For what is religion? I believe that my definition is so broad, so inclusive, so far-reaching, that it is capable of consistently covering every form and manifestation of religious life that the world has ever seen. Religion is simply man's thought—including the emotion that springs out of and accompanies the thought and the ritual expression with which man clothes this thought,—religion is man's thought of the universe and the relation in which he supposes himself to stand to the powers, or power, that controls it. So long then as the universe stands, and so long as there is an intelligent being in the universe, so long there must be religion. As well might the shipmaster think to out sail the horizon that encompasses him on every hand: as well might the lark rising into the morning air think to outfly the atmosphere in which it flutters its wings, and the movements of which constitute the liquid beauties of its song, as humanity think to outlive religion.

Religion, then, is eternal in its nature; and, whatever changes its external manifestations may pass through, that which is at its heart, its essence, must endure just so long as intelligence and the universe abide. But, as if to contradict this statement, all those things that to the popular mind, and to that mind that does not analyze very deeply, seem to constitute all there is of religion,—all these things, I say, are perpetually changing, and they do pass away.

Let us look for a moment at the three main elements that to the popular mind constitute all there is of religion. First, there is the dogma, the creed,—that is, the intellectual theory as to the nature of things. However creedless you may call your church, every man who has brains enough to think, and who ever does think, has his creed, and must have it now and forever. But the dogma perpetually changes. Man's thought about the universe and the relations he sustains to it is perpetually undergoing modifications. Old systems and old theories have passed away by the dozens, if not by the hundreds, in the past; and others still shall grow old and die.

The second element, that to the common thought, seems to constitute that which we call religion, is the emotional attitude in which man stands to the object of his worship. That is, if a man thinks of the power that is around him as a pitiless power, he stands in awe, he is afraid. If he thinks of it as kindly and fatherly, then a corresponding emotion of trust and love is called out. Out of the thought then, the dogma, springs of necessity the emotional attitude in which man will stand toward this power that he thinks of as holding his destiny in its hands.

The last element is the ritual manifestation of man's religious life. This is constituted by architecture, by painting, by statuary, by rites, by prayers, by processions, by sacrifices, by all that man has ever done from the beginning of history until to-day in the way of setting forth in external forms his thought and his feeling about God. That which is meant by ritual covers all these. Is it not a fact that these, the thought, the emotion, the ritual, constitute almost all that is commonly thought of as making up religion? And is it not true that religions in this sense do grow old and pass away? Religions are born. Religions grow old, decrepit, die, and are buried and forgotten. But,—and here is the important distinction,—though religions pass away, religion is an immortal, and never dies.

To illustrate what I mean, take a parallel truth in regard to governments. Governments are born. They grow old, become decrepit, die, are buried, and are forgotten. But government remains. Government is not necessarily the supremacy of a chief, not necessarily the dominance of the despot, not necessarily a monarchy,
not necessarily a representative republic, nor a pure democracy. There are govern-ments,—manifestations of this power of social self-control; but government survives the toppling thrones of crumbling monarchies and the decay of dynasties. These do not touch the eternal youth and the eternal progress of government. Another thing, striking in its bearing on the theme we have in hand, is suggested by this illustration: that is not the best government which makes the largest display of itself. By the common consent of all wise men and philosophers, that is the noblest type of government which governs the least, which makes the least display of itself, which has the fewest court-houses, the fewest jails, the smallest standing army, the smallest police, which makes the slightest external demonstration of its life. That is the finest, truest, noblest government where the laws are written in the intelligence and the heart of the people, where it simply governs itself. So that religion is not necessarily the best, not necessarily the most intense, where there is the largest external manifestation architecturally, the most elaborate ritual, the most costly sacrifices, processions, and external displays. That is the grandest and divinest development which the world has ever seen, where the laws of God, of truth and right, are written on the fleshy tablets of the heart; where there is the least display of external power, for the simple reason that it is not needed.

All these external manifestations that I have named change, grow old, and pass away. But the essence, what is that? It is time to raise that inquiry, which is central to my whole discussion. What is this thing that endures, which survives the decay of dogma, which survives the decay of the emotional attitude in which man stands toward God, which survives the decay of ritual? We shall find, as the result of this inquiry, something which, while extremely radical in its sweep, is at the same time grandly conservative and constructive, and full of encouragement and hope.

Before I point out just what this thing is; I wish to draw a few outline etchings of some of the contrasted types of religious life which find their manifestations in the history of man, that we may be the more struck and impressed by the fact, which at first you might not be ready to believe, that there is at the heart of all these, however divergent in manifestations and forms, one essential purpose, one essential and unchangeable power.

Glance then for a moment at some of these contrasted pictures. Look at the fetich worshipper standing terrified and afraid in the presence of a stone, a stick, a frog, a snake, anything to which the veriest accident may have called his attention and made him afraid of, as the residence of some mysterious power. Look at the Indian, or the lowest type of barbarian above the fetich worshipper. Look at him as he brings to the grave of his ancestor a little tobacco, a few grains of rice, a part of some animal that he has slain in hunting, bringing it as veritable food for the spirit of his ancestor, or to the dead chief of his tribe, whom he thinks of as still hungering. Standing by this grave, he chants some words of praise over the remembered chief or the departed ancestor, which is the first crude beginning of what has grown to be the Christian hymn. He asks the spirit of this dead chief to help him in the hunt or in war, or at least not to be vindictive and injurious to him; and here is the beginning of what has grown to be the Christian prayer. How far away such a religion seems to us, and how unlikely, at first thought, that we should find an element in it which we should recognize as having anything in common with that which we hold to-day!

Pass from this to the valley of Gehenna outside the walls of the Holy City. Here is a metallic image of the horrid god Moloch, hollow within and heated like a furnace. The parents that stand in awe of its terrific and superhuman majesty bring their little, tender children, and lay them across the red-hot arms of the monster, and beat their drums and rattle their rude musical instruments, and send their shouts to heaven to drown the feeble wail of the little life that is consecrated to the abominable worship. Pass from that to the Quaker meeting, where they simply sit in quiet awe, waiting for the movement of the divine spirit. Then from the simplicity of this Quaker meeting, which is almost utterly devoid of form, pass to Rome, and witness a grand procession on some great fête day; see the pope crowned, and carried on the shoulders of his devotees, passing through the streets thronged with those that look upon him as the very vicar of God on earth, and who bend themselves into the dust as he passes by. See them, as with song and music they enter the great cathedral, there to go through the solemn celebration of the high mass, until that crowning moment when the veritable God himself, as the worshippers believe, is lifted in the consecrated wafer in the sight of the awe-struck throng. From this turn to the severity of our common Puritan worshippers in our meetinghouses, where there is the carefully prepared essay or discussion, doctrinal or practical, of what is regarded as divine, the simple prayer, and singing of simple hymns.

But there is no room nor time to outline the one-hundredth part of the many forms of worship that have been assumed in Asia, in Africa, in ancient Egypt, among the Buddhists, among the Mohammedans, and the followers of Confucius, among the Parsees, and all the ten thousand devotees that, have worshipped under all forms and all names. Is it possible that at the heart of these lies some common element that we can recognize as permanent and held by ourselves to-day? This seems to me to be the grand, wide, sweeping, all-inclusive truth,—*religion at heart is one*. The fetich worshipper, the follower of Moloch, the Puritan, the Papist, all are seeking one same thing, from the lowest, crudest development of superstition, up to Jesus talking with the
woman of Samaria, and saying to her: "The hour Cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father. God is a spirit, and seeks such to worship him as are capable of worshipping him in spirit and in truth." From Jesus talking with the woman of Samaria, on to the least anthropomorphic development of modern science,—that science which dares not say God, which only says power, law, life, which stands awe-struck before the infinite mystery of the universe,—all the way, I say, through highest and lowest, there is one line running which is binding all in unity. What is it? It is the purpose, the impulse of life forever at the heart of man, the purpose to find and come into right relations with God. This is what the witch-worshipper seeks; this is what the worshipper of Moloch sought; this is what the followers of Confucius seek; it is the object of the Buddhist's search. It is what the Parsee, the Quaker, the Papist, the orthodox, the liberal, the scientist, are seeking. The scientific man says that the one end and object of human life is to bring about a complete and perfect adjustment between man and his environment. Religion says, meaning precisely the same thing, the grand end and object of human life is to become reconciled to God. This, then, is the one thing in common, the one thing that is eternal in religion. For, as I have shown you, the dogma, the emotional attitude, the ritual, change: this purpose only is eternal, and abides forever.

Now, then, it will be apparent to you, I trust, that since the essential thing is this purpose; since this purpose endures and is eternal; since man by his very nature must forever seek that which he regards as his highest good, must seek to come into right relations with the Power on which his very existence depends, that holds his destiny in his hands; since this abides forever,—it follows naturally, of necessity, that the form which this purpose will assume, the method by which man will seek to work out this purpose in practical life, will depend entirely on his intellectual development. It will depend upon his thought. For at the heart of all these religious developments of the world there is a theory about God which is simply man's intellectual conception of him. And he must, so long as he holds that theory, live in accordance with it, and attempt to work it out. Therefore, you find all these forms, developments, and manifestations. If man thinks of God as cruel, his worship of him will be cruel. If he thinks of his God as sensual, his worship will be sensual. If he thinks of his God as spiritual, his worship will be spiritual. If he thinks God wants a sacrifice of a bullock or a goat, he will make that sacrifice. If he thinks God demands the life of his first-born, the first-born must die. If he thinks God demands righteousness and mercy and truth, then all these cruder and rougher forms of the religious life will be sloughed off, cruelty will be left behind, and man's religion will become the doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with his God. It all turns on his thought of God.

If man started, as we believe, away down on the borders of the animal world, if he started crude, ignorant, animal, barbaric, the first form of his religion must have been crude, animal, barbaric; and so we find it. But, as he takes a step ahead in intelligence, as he rises to a higher degree of civilization, his thought about God changes, and his religion becomes more refined.

Religion, even in its lowest expression, has three or four theories which I must notice briefly. There is first the theory of the universe. Then man must have a theory of himself, some sort of idea as to what his own nature is, and his needs are. Then he will have a thought in regard to the relation in which he actually stands to God, whether God loves him or cares for him, whether he is a friend or an enemy, or whether he is indifferent to him. He will have some sort of thought about it. He will have another thought, and he cannot avoid it, concerning the relation in which he ought to stand to God. Think of it for a moment; grasp the idea clearly. Religion in its practical development in all ages is nothing more nor less than man attempting to bridge over the gulf between the actual and the ideal. It is an attempt to turn the fact into the ought, to change the relation in which he really does stand to God into the relation in which he ought to stand, either by changing God, if that is conceivable, or himself, or both.

Now, then, as briefly as I may, having made clear the principles that underlie these changes, and the fact that these changes are necessary, I wish to indicate in rough outline the grand essentials of the changes through which we are actually passing.

Of course, since this universe is infinite, and since man is finite, we can never conceive of the human race as having gotten through, as being done. God must forever be only a human ideal to us. He is the eternally pursued and the never completely found. For to say that we can comprehend God is simply to assert an absurdity: it is to say that the finite has suddenly developed to the size of the infinite. If, then, man makes any progress, if he takes a single step ahead, it must be by changing from the old to the new. It must be by abandoning old and accepting grander and nobler ideas.

What, then, are the essential changes through which we are passing? First, we are changing most radically our conception of this universe in which we live and of which we are a part. Do you know there has never, from the dawn of human intelligence until to-day, been so radical, so revolutionary a change going on as that in the midst of which we are and of which we are a part? When men surrendered the Ptolemaic conception of the universe and accepted the Copernican, even this did not work so great a revolution as that which the conceptions of modern science are forcing on our acceptance to-day. The universe to us now, instead of being
a little, contracted thing, created by almighty fiat in six clays, out of nothing, in the darkness of infinite space, the whole of it not so large as we know the orbit of the moon to be; instead of this little thing that God created outside of himself, impressed with its own stamp, and set going with its own laws and by the machinery that he constructed, made to run of its own accord, or by his coming now and then to adjust or change this way or that to suit his purposes, when it doesn't run exactly as he intended:—instead of this we think it infinite. And, as there cannot be two infinites in the universe, we conceive of God no longer as a carpenter outside of the house that he has builded. We conceive of this universe, in every part and parcel of it, from star to dust grain under foot, as alive. From blossoming constellations to blossoming roses it is alive, as I am alive from the crown of my head to the sole of my foot. And God is its life, as I am the life of my body.

Where, then, is God? Everywhere,—in this flower; in the cloud floating in the sky; in the most distant sun; in my pulse-beat; in the brain that now generates the thought to which I am giving utterance,—God, the life, the light, the power of all we see. Touch the universe anywhere, and you touch divinity. Look at its mechanism and operations anywhere, and you behold the creative work of God. This changed conception of the universe, do you not see how radically it alters our conception of God?

We have also changed our conception of man. Instead of man being created a perfect being six thousand years ago, so perfect that the greatest philosophers of the world are only fragments of his broken perfection, he started,—as you know very well, I believe,—not simply on the borders of the animal world, but beyond the borders. I believe that one chain of development of life connects us with the lowest and simplest particle of living matter on the borders, and in the midst of the ooze of some primeval sea millions of ages gone. There came a time when the human burst through the brutal in the face; when this creature stood on its feet, and said, "I am a man"; when he looked in the face of the sky, and thought of a power not himself; when he lifted up his hands in worship, and said, "God." And, from that time to this, he has climbed, until he says of himself now, "I am a son of God, and it does not yet appear what I shall be." He looks on and on, and sees no limit to his possible progress.

This new conception of man awakens a new conception of what it means to be saved. Man is not fallen. There is not a child in the common schools of America who has not the means in his hands of knowing that the whole story of Adam and Eve, of the garden of Eden, of being cast out, and of the earth being cursed by God, is an Oriental myth, born, so far as we can trace it, in the midst of a people that inhabited the valley of the Euphrates before Babylon was built, and thousands of years before the Hebrew people had an existence or a name.

As, then, man has not fallen, he does not need to be redeemed in the theological sense of the word. He does not need to be saved, in the theological sense of the word. There is no need of an incarnation; there is no need of a suffering God; there is no need or fear of endless hell. These are all crude, barbaric conceptions, born of these myths of the night, having no foundation in the rational thought of the scientific world.

The conception of salvation that we must hold to-day is not the old one of deliverance, but of growth, education,—not in the sense of crowding the brain with facts, but in the sense of leading out and developing all the possibilities latent in the individual and in society,—growth, leaving all the old ideas, gradually sloughing off that which clings to us from our former nature, and going up into and grasping that which is divine.

I do not wonder that men are startled, that men are afraid and tremble in the midst of changes so revolutionary as this. I do not wonder that these ideas make progress as slowly as they do. I only wonder that they grow as rapidly as in fact they do grow. Sometimes, we liberals allow ourselves to be discouraged at the slow progress of our thought. But there never was a religious movement on the face of the earth that grew so rapidly. It took Christianity, in its old form, over three hundred years to climb to the throne of the Caesars. In fifty years, the liberal thought of the world has made more progress than Christianity did in two centuries. Already, it has climbed to the intellectual throne not only of one people, but of all Europe and America, and of the civilized world. It is growing as rapidly as it is healthful that it should grow. I do not wonder that men shrink from these marked changes. I do not wonder that people are homesick in this wide, new universe, that, as it seems to them, is without father and without mother. No matter whether the change be good or bad, this love for the old must still abide and work in us. A new couple, husband and wife, build themselves a quiet, small home in an obscure part of the city when they are young and poor and are beginning their way in life. And here they live for years, until the whole house is redolent with perfumed memories of the experiences through which they have passed. By and by, they are prosperous, they are rich. Children have been born and grown up. The necessity of the home has widened and enlarged until the nest is too small, and there must be the building of a more commodious one. So they buy or build a grand new home on the square or on the avenue, and move out of the old into the new. Is it any wonder if the mother goes over the old house for the last time, and says, "In this room, those that I love so dearly were born. Here, night after night and week after week, I watched over the cradle of the little one that died so many years ago, and is thus the only little one that the growing years have not taken away from me; and here stood the son and daughter when they were married, and went away to build
for themselves a new home”? And thus she passes through the halls and up the stairs and into each chamber, and in every nook and corner there are memories that tug at her heart and that bring tears to her eyes. And yet she knows perfectly well that the new home is a great deal better. It is a larger house and finer, and everything in it is an improvement on the old; but this does not touch and never will touch the fact that the old memories cling to the old home, and she will never be able to shake them off so long as she lives.

I do not wonder then that it is very hard for people to leave their religious ideas. God knows how hard it was for me to leave the thoughts of my childhood, the memories that I gained at my mother’s knee, the prayers, the hymns, the thoughts of God and heaven, the dreams of the place where I believed my brothers had gone when they left me. I have no hard words to say for men who feel deeply the homesickness on leaving their old ideas, their old religious domicile, to go into the new. But yet, on the other hand,—and let me say it as forcibly and strongly as I can,—if a man is ever to make a step ahead, if he is to grow, if he is to become better, wiser, if the world is to advance, then these changes must be gone through with, and this homesickness must be borne. The chrysalis must be burst through and left behind. And I believe, in spite of these memories that tie us to the past, that we shall find in future years that to fly in the air is better than to lie quietly in the chrysalis. And I wish to record, as the result of my own experience, although it was a bitter process of years, that to-day I am unspeakably gladder and more hopeful both for myself and for the race than ever I was before.

It follows then that he who stands in the way of these changes, he who allows the sentiment and the feeling and the tenderness of his old associations to stand in the way and to block the progress of the world, is really committing a crime against God, against man, and against his own soul. Any one who clings to or attempts to create an orthodoxy,—I use this word in its most general significance,—whether it is an Orthodox orthodoxy or a Unitarian orthodoxy; whether it is a physician’s orthodoxy in regard to the method of treating disease; whether it is a school-teacher’s orthodoxy in regard to the education of children; whether it is a political or social orthodoxy,—any man who attempts to create and defend this hardening and stiffening process that shall forbid the world to grow and move and live is a traitor to man. He stands square in the way of progress, of growth, of any hope of the world’s becoming larger and better in the years that are to come.

What is needed then, in order that the world may reach its noblest and its best? I believe the answer, in view of the line of thought that we have followed, and to which it is a fitting crown, is a simple one. This impulse, this desire to find that which is good, this purpose to come into right relations to the universe, this desire for human progress, is just as natural, just as ceaseless, just as eternal in its working in the human heart, as is the impulse of the heliotrope to turn to the sun from the darkness of the room where it is growing, as natural as it is for the rootlet of the flower to reach down and out after water and food. This impulse is eternal. What, then, does it need? It needs only one thing: it needs guidance, it needs light. The only thing needful to lift up and lead on the world is light. Men are ready to move: show them the way. They desire the perfect kingdom of God: where is the path that leads to it? If the time shall ever come when the world shall be agreed as to the answer to this question, men will march side by side, shoulder to shoulder, step by step, one vast army of progress, to take possession of the kingdom of God.

It needs then that religion bear in her hand the torch of knowledge; and that, with this torch to light her way, she dig down into the mines and quarries, and shape her blocks of eternal truth and bring them up, and with them lay the foundations and build the walls of the coming city of God, which is the city of man on earth. Truth for foundation, truth for material with which to construct these walls; knowledge for master-builder, justice for square and to level; knowledge for light to shine in it; love for atmosphere to breathe,—this is the perfect city of God. And this is to be built—where? Here on earth. The old conception was that it was to descend by miracle from the sky. The new conception is that it is to rise from the ground.

"From God down out of heaven"
John saw "the city" fair
Descend in gorgeous vision,—
A city of the air.
By human labor founded
On rock-hewn truths below,
To God, up toward the heavens,
I see the city grow.
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Reorganisation of English Institutions.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,

I have chosen a formidable title for my lecture this evening. I hope I shall not weary you. I cannot be short and summary on so great a subject. I would rather speak than read: but I then should not be concise enough. I shall have to set forth the greatness of existing evils, in order to show the necessity of new organs. I beg you all to remember that when skill in a workman makes up for bad tools, it is at a vast expense of labor. The superiority of civilised to barbarian work turns chiefly on superior tools. Every prudent manufacturer seeks for the best machinery; and augurs that what is simple and old-fashioned ill competes with what is new and more elaborate: so too is it in political organisation. For the permanent welfare of a population which grows in numbers and complexity, its social and political organs must also grow—that is, must become more numerous and complex, however simple in principle.

But since William III. became king of England, the Parliaments of Scotland and Ireland have been annihilated, and no subsidiary organs have replaced them. For 150 years we were so busy with wars, Continental or American, that our domestic institutions went into decay; India at the same time fell into our embrace—an enormous incubus. To subserve base intrigue, our boroughs were crippled and degraded; nor have they ever recovered their ancient powers. Parliament meanwhile is immensely aggrandised and immensely overworked. A debt of 800 millions was contracted by wars, and very little of it has been paid off in the last 60 years, though full 40 of these have been years of great prosperity. Until centralisation is admitted, permanent debt is not incurred.

Our population is four times as great as William III. knew it; yet the people are more than ever divorced from the soil and cramped into towns. Notoriously during war our Parliament is incapable of domestic reform. Lord John Russell, with actual tears in his eyes, laid aside his intended Reform Bill when he saw the Russian war impending. No wonder-then, that our warlike period of a century and a half under a dominant Parliament was ruinous to our social state. Since the peace with France, serious efforts have been made for reform in detail, especially in repealing laws which ought never to have been enacted; vast efforts also to obtain a miserably small amount of organic reform. Things might be far worse; yet looking to the intelligence of the age, the advances of foreign nations and the energy of our own people, very many think that things might be far better; and therefore ought to be. But I add, our dangers from India and Asia are great and ever increasing; yet Parliament is unhelpful, and Ministries postpone everything that can be postponed. No great move seems possible, except after hideous calamity. Can this be a wisely ordered Constitution?

The reforms carried by Lord Grey in 1832, by Mr Disraeli in 1867, have been exaggerated to the imagination by the long struggle needed to get them. Lord Grey destroyed many rotten boroughs. Good; but the chief positive change in each case was to extend the Parliamentary suffrage to new electors. Even so, the extension is very incomplete. The peasants have no [unclear: vot], nor have wealthy and intelligent women; and when it is proposed to admit peasant householders, Whigs as well as Tories see grave objections; nor can I blame them. The last extension of the suffrage has hitherto done that which was predicted—it has virtually sold us into the hands of the richest men. Even the largest of the new constituencies consider chiefly who are their most liberal neighbours—liberality being the virtue which common minds best understand; hence the local rich, if ambitious enough to compete, gain the elections prevalently; and this makes some of the judges look
askance on liberality. To have built almshouses or to have distributed coals is a highly suspicious act: it may soon be accounted virtual bribery if candiﬁcy follow. Indiscriminate generosity may become a crime, even when it is unconditional and without political professions. If we were to extend household suﬀrage to the rural districts, elections must be still more expensive. Already it is only by care exception that a man of very modest income, however independent, can aspire to sit in Parliament. Mean while the suﬀrage is of little value to us, if among several candidates not one excites in us a particle of enthusiasm.

The mode also of taking votes is fundamentally vicious, and gives scope to mischievous intrigue. If one seat is competed for by three candidates A, B, C, of whom A and B are alike far more acceptable to the constituency than C, yet by the splitting of votes between A and B perhaps C is elected, though he would be rejected decisively, if the question were proposed, pure and simple, ‘Will you have C?’ The system of plumpers, when there are two candidates, equally fosters intrigue and uncertainty. The only plain and fair way is to divide the constituencies so that each may have but one representative, and then make them vote for or against each candidate separately. Whichever of the candidates has the greatest number of aﬃrmative votes is evidently the least unacceptable to the constituency.

To disfranchise all because some have been bribed is truly wonderful, when the pure have no power whatever to restrain the impure. To unseat a member because an ardent friend or even agent has bribed, exposes him to ejection by a secret enemy who pretends friendship. Surely it needs to be shown that the candidate connived, else it suﬃces to strike off from his list the number of votes illegally won. But I shall, before I end, suggest a far shorter and more eﬀective remedy for all the evils of our Parliamentary elections.

Probably all of us agree that the nation collectively has a right to the best government, legislative and executive, which the intelligence of the age can afford; also, that only when Power or Privilege conduces to good government ought Power or Privilege to be held by individuals or classes. These are among the AXIOMS from which I reason. Yet since the word Privilege, in a lecture on Organic Reform, may suggest to you the House of Lords, I at once drop a few words on that topic. I have very long believed that that House ought to be reformed, and I have more than once printed a scheme for so reforming it, that England may become proud of the House. But, whatever the cause, I ﬁnd English Reformers positively determined not to touch the topic. Therefore I have resolved this evening to omit it. Yet, before I close, I intend to make one brief remark on this subject.

In order to obtain the best legislation which the intelligence of the age admits, the ﬁrst requisite is, that intelligent, upright, wise men be elected; next, that they shall legislate with fresh and clear minds, not wearied out with overwork, not distracted by topics too numerous, not heated by wine, not sleepy from the hour of the night, not hurried by the whipper-in of the party. Nay, how is any party inﬂuence consistent with the solemn duty of a legislator? He does not, indeed, like a juryman, take oath to give a true verdict; yet he is not less urgently bound in conscience to vote for the right and the just. The juryman’s unjust verdict may make a single life or a whole family miserable: a bad law, such as very many of our laws have been, may ruin thousands of families, and worse, a bad vote of Parliament may entail a horrible war. How any member of Parliament can regard himself conscientiously pledged to vote with a party I never could understand. A right organisation of the United Kingdom would destroy Party Legislation; but, alas! Party Legislation, under the specious name of Parliamentary Government, is exactly the thing which our existing Parties glorify, and uphold as the essence of English wisdom. None of the Reforms hitherto put forward or pretend to touch, this cardinal mischief.

As a broad basis, to justify a large change, you must allow me to set forth at some length numerous undeniable facts.

The business which, session by session, comes before Parliament, is overwhelming in magnitude. Every year, from mere want of time, numbers of half-advanced bills are arrested, with much labour and expense lost, often with much hope disappointed; hence the phrase, Slaughter of the Innocents, has been stereotyped. Long hours of talk are given to a few measures which excite party zeal, or concern the pecuniary interests of the powerful, and but scant time remains, in which other measures are sculled by, with very insuﬃcient debate. This is no accident; it cannot be called an abuse: it inheres in the routine of the system. As a natural result also, measures of the utmost importance are decided by a late vote—even after midnight—and in a thin house.

Attendance of members is not compulsory. Forty suﬃce to constitute a house. Forty! say one-sixteenth part of the whole. Indeed, if there are but twenty, and they choose to connive, then no one demands that the House be counted; so that any number, however few, can pass valid laws—even penal laws—aﬀecting our liberty and our honour; and the thing is done—it is no mere possibility. Penal laws are thus made, and whatever indignation they cause, yet, once passed by trickery, they are very diﬃcult to repeal. Numbers of Bills become law unknown to a majority of the House; indeed, the topics on which the members have to vote are so various that few can possibly understand them. This reconciles so very many to vote as a whipper-in requests them.

The Acts are called laws, but most of them are administrative edicts, setting forth, not broad clear principles, but numerous minute details, very diﬃcult to grasp collectively and appreciate. Instead of all
citizens knowing the laws which they have to obey, it is an arduous and special study to know just those which are most needed. The Acts are often of immense length; some have two hundred or two hundred and fifty clauses, and fill twenty or thirty folio pages. Amendments introduced into a Bill are apt so to mar its unity that the judges themselves fail to understand it when it comes forth as an Act. Hence nothing is commoner than Acts to amend Acts. Who can deny that a grave internal reform in the procedure of Parliament is needed?

An internal organisation used by some Parliaments would much lessen these evils. If the House established standing committees for the leading subjects, selecting each committee and its chairman for special acquaintance with the questions concerned, every measure which is allowed a first reading might be referred to the appropriate committee, who would lay before Parliament a report with reasons. After that, discussion would be more concise and more profitable. The chairmen of committees would virtually superintend, as ministers are now expected to do.

This perhaps is precisely the reason why nothing of the sort is proposed. Ministers covet the credit of conducting legislation, as political capital and as a means of patronage. Standing Committees, appointed without reference to party, would spoil their party schemes. Permanent able chairmen would check their ambition disagreeably.

But here I come to another and a very great grievance—the fact that executive ministers have any legislative place at all.

To unite executive, legislative, and judicial power, is the definition of the most complete despotism, such as in the worst times of India or Rome.

The Turkish Sultan does not claim judicial nor yet legislative power. An Arab Chieftain accepts the customs of his tribe as a fact, and does not dream of legislating, though he is at once administrator and judge.

The qualities which make an able administrator in the Executive Government are so different from those needed by a Legislator in a popular assembly, that they can rarely be united in the same man. Our system excludes even the ablest man from our ministry, unless he has (what is called) a "power of debate and of reply," to which readiness, fluency, and ill-nature signally contribute.

But the deepest reason against this plurality of functions is, that the duties are essentially inconsistent. The elected legislator owes candour and openness to his constituents, but the minister is pledged to secrecy. He has undertaken duties to his colleagues which forbid freedom and truthfulness in Parliamentary discussion. Scandalous to say, at present it is a received principle, that, if out-voted by his colleagues in the Cabinet, a minister is bound to argue publicly in favor of that which he opposed privately, and to pretend approval. This undermines public honor, and sanctions ministerial hypocrisy.

Moreover, the executive, by claiming the initiative in legislation and pre-occupying the time of Parliament, have degraded the mass of the House, who are now called private members. It is the very policy whereby Augustus Cæsar reigned despotically under the cover and name of the Senate in Rome. The relative position of the Executive to Parliament is reversed by it. As the old Roman Senate used to set the policy, and intrust the execution of it to the Consuls, so ought Parliament to set the policy now, and give instructions to the Executive. Such in theory are all Parliamentary statutes. Parliament passes them, ministers and judges have to enforce them. In theory the legislative power is supreme: the executive and the judicial powers obey it.

Our constitutional lawyers talk grandly of the plenary supremacy of Parliament. But the executive here, as so very often elsewhere, has grasped at a double power, and does not relish subjection. Once it tried open defiance; now ministers are generally too prudent to talk high, yet they have a sharp scourge for Parliament if it dare to act the master. By dissolution they can inflict on every member a pecuniary fine, varying from £500 to £3000 or £4000, with contingent loss of his seat, if a vote be carried disagreeable to the minister. Lord John Russell called it a penal dissolution, when in 1856 Lord Palmerston inflicted it, in punishment of the vote which censured our bombardment of Canton—a bombardment executed without declaration of war, without communication with the Home Government, or even with the Chinese Emperor. The censure fell principally on Sir John Bowring; but a Prime Minister does not allow Parliament to censure one of his subordinates separately, especially for conduct towards foreign powers. This would entail personal responsibility for making a war; but they choose to have their responsibility only collective, and thereby nominal. To this end they construct a trade-union, unknown to the laws and constitution, they call it a "Cabinet:" it virtually supersedes the Privy Council, which they have perverted and degraded. Of old they used to sign their advice as Privy Councillors, then the Sovereign could make each responsible, in or out of office they bind themselves now to collective action against the Queen, and against Parliament, on such a question as "Who shall be Prime Minister?" In fact, if Parliament firmly control them, they make a collective strike, and dictate the conditions on which alone they will work. Such are the arts by which they prevent Parliamentary government from growing into a reality. Since each faction plays the same game, Parliament is paralysed, and will be so until ministers cease to have double functions.

It is pretended that the dissolution of Parliament at the will of a minister is a reasonable constitutional mode
of allowing the country to declare its will on a special question. If a plebiscite were sincerely desired, the way is plain. Do not dissolve Parliament, but require of every constituency to vote Yes or No on the matter under debate, as: "Do you approve of the Chinese War?" But that would not at all have suited the minister. He wanted to punish the members for their vote. He did not desire to risk double defeat by a plebiscite. He knew that the Radicals were so hot after what they called "Parliamentary Reform," that they would not elect on the issue of the Chinese War; and when, by affecting to favor Reform, he had got a new House unpledged concerning war or peace, he scornfully declared that of course the electors had voted solely on the question, "What Prime Minister shall guide the destinies of England?"

Now I need to insist that this stifling and confusing of the public voice is no unfortunate accident. It is systematic. It recurs at every general election, as a result of that usurpation, or coup d'état, called the Septennial Act, which more than anything else takes the guidance of affairs out of the hands of electors, and makes elections a game of chance. Few of us keep in mind the utter illegitimacy of that usurping act which still oppresses us. Parliaments used to be elected year by year. Because Charles I. had dispensed with Parliaments for many painful years, the House, to guard against the recurrence of this royal misconduct, passed a very stringent law which, in compliment to Charles II., was softened into a new enactment, that Parliament shall never be intermitté for more than three years. This was strangely interpreted to mean that each Parliament must sit three continuous years; so triennial Parliaments became the rule, until a Parliament elected for three years voted that it would sit seven! Such is the Septennial Act, which is still nailed down upon us permanently, though the reasons pleaded for it were transitory. As legitimately may the existing Parliament vote that it will sit 21 years. There is little chance now that any Parliament, except under terror, will go back to the three years' term, if it be claimed separately. It would not please ministers so long as they can hold the scourge of a dissolution over the members; and it certainly will not please the members individually. As things now stand, at every general election we choose men to be our supreme authority for seven years. The moment after they are elected, they are for that long period our complete masters. We may humbly petition, or we may clamour with irregular demonstrations; the vassals oven of the Turkish Sultan may do either. But before the election, in providing for seven years, topics far too numerous crowd on each constituency. Even those who desire the same measures range them in a different order of value, so that they are liable to be split into small bands with different flags; or, to avoid this, they sacrifice all measures but one or two. In this way, Extension of the Suffrage, with perhaps the Ballot as a postscript, became the favorite ticket with Reformers as soon as the abolition of the Corn Laws was gained. Conservatism then, by opposing and delaying as long as possible the most popular of the national demands, keeps the Parliament irresponsible to the People, just as are the Ministers to the Parliament.

A stable despotism, like that of Russia, propped by several trained officers of departments, has many solid advantages for the lower people, as indeed Prussia has well shown from Frederick the Great downwards. Such a despotism dares to act against the aristocracy and the rich for the public good. But the despotism of an English ministry is so short-lived that it has no permanent stake in the country. I compare its despotism to that of a Turkish Pacha. Its own stability is the paramount object of its common interest, and it knows itself to be eminently unstable; hence it is the most timid of political clubs. It dares not to look far forward; it has to manage for the moment. It dreads to incur enmity with the powerful. It cuts down its legislative proposals, not to offend the squires, or the Church, or it may be, the Cardinals, or, not long back, the West India planters, the East India Company. Unless some grave national movement drives it on, it thinks most how to linger in office, to offend the squires, or the Church, or it may be, the Cardinals, or, not long back, the West India planters, the East India Company. Unless some grave national movement drives it on, it thinks most how to linger in office, not quite ignobly. "Rest and be thankful," is its advice, except when political capital is to be gained.

For any great measure, as Earl Russell said, a ministry needs a popular gale to carry the ship of State over the bar. But united national enthusiasm cannot come every day: Conservatism knows that perfectly well. We necessarily fret out and waste our energies in many different directions, chiefly owing to the seven years' term. Hence all our reforms, working against a stiff current, sail over the bar fifty or one hundred years too late. Martyrdoms innumerable have to be made, and attested in blue books, before Parliament can discover that something must be done; then, like a despotic prince who finds business too tiresome, it gives itself over to a favorite minister, makes him for the moment despotic in its stead. Believe me, I am not blaming the individual members; it is the system which overpowers them and condemns itself. The mats of business is so vast that every member is helpless. Unless you lessen that business, all reforms are delusive. If you overtask Nature, Nature will revenge herself. From wearied brains you will not get vigilance, discernment, and wisdom. In average sound intellects you will not find wide and various accomplishments.

I must ask you to consider in detail the duties of this hard-worked house. First, it has to control the action of the whole Executive Government, central or local, and to protect the public from the undue use of Executive power. Next, it has the sole right to direct the public taxation, and apportion the proceeds to definite purposes. Thirdly, it has to control the action of the ministry towards foreign powers, which includes treaties, alliances, and possible war. Fourthly, it has a similar function towards colonies and military posts, the army and navy.
Fifthly, it is responsible for all India, with a population of two hundred and forty millions, and for the action of the Government alike towards Indians and towards foreign powers around India; and it is the only court of appeal to Indian princes who believe themselves wronged by the Queen's representatives. Sixthly, for nearly everything that needs expense, the ministry has to gain leave from Parliament. This is a very large head. Seventhly, no other authority can repeal bad law, or enact new laws for the general public. Eighthly, what are called Private Bills—that is, local or personal—are an enormous item of ordinary legislation. Nthly, it ought to review our hereditary institutions and perpetually reform them, especially those which are founded on conquest, so as to harmonise them with universal justice. But, for this last arduous duty no one has time or energy.

It has been asked again and again, What business has Parliament with any Private, that is, Local Bill? I lately read that in the last session 96 General Bills were passed, and 256 Private; which at once shows how immense would be the relief if Parliament wore rid of the latter. It is seldom that any Chamber, Board, or Court is willing to lessen its business; for this always appears to be a parting with power. But hero no real power will be given up. Whatever the local authority that relieves Parliament of Private Bills, a Parliamentary confirmation will be reserved, implying a contingent VETO. No severe struggle therefore need be anticipated from this cause, if the matter were gravely taken up. The question then arises, What local authority shall play a subsidiary part, and exercise the powers of a local Parliament.

To guide us in the reply, let us look back to the past of England, and also across our coasts to other nations.

In the past our chartered cities and legislative courts of our shires were in activity before Parliament existed. They then taxed themselves at their pleasure for all local purposes; but now, lawyers have ruled that they cannot do so except by permission of Parliament. Then they were the source whence Parliament drew its authority: now they are made out to exist and move, only by life derived from the central organ. Two centuries ago, each city kept at pleasure "trained bands" of its own, of which its Mayor had the command; now, a Minister in London is to hold everything military in his hand, even volunteers. The Municipalities were first stripped of powers and corrupted for centralised intrigue; next, when undervalued by ambitious men, their elections were managed in pothouses for personal objects, or elsewhere through malversation of the Crown were invaded by a local clique; finally, their work was derided and despised, and their weakness used as a pretence for weakening them still further. The old institutions of the shires are known only to students of ancient law: they have been overridden by justices of the peace, county lieutenants, or other functionaries. Two out of three Parliaments have been destroyed. From this general decay of local institutions centralization has grown up, so that we walk in the fatal steps of France, though following at a timid distance.

In contrast, look first at Germany. For ages she had, and again she has, a central legislative organ of the empire; but this never superseded very respectable subsidiary Parliaments, each appropriate to a smaller kingdom—Hanover, Baden, Brandenburg, Saxony, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Austria, Silesia, Moravia, Bohemia, &c. Look again at Switzerland. Environed by ambitious neighbours far superior in power, her institutions have well stood the severe trial of time. She has her central Diet and Ministry vigorous enough; but also in her several Cantons she has local legislatures, each with well-trained soldiers, simply because every many is bound to learn the use of arms, as Englishmen used to be; therefore they need no standing army. Free Switzerland is respected by all and is feared by none. Italy also has local legislatures which belonged to independent states—Sicily, Naples, Piedmont, Tuscany, and so on, besides her National Parliament. Spain is similarly made up of constituent kingdoms, which have so keen a sense of their local rights that the statesmen who desire Union are somewhat afraid lest the limbs be too powerful for the centre. In Hungary notoriously the national spirit has been maintained for three centuries and a half against an unscrupulous and usurping dynasty solely by the independent energy of the local institutions. The Seven United Provinces of Holland similarly prove the vitality of freedom and good order when free local power is combined with a strong centre. And on a far greater scale we have an illustrious promise from Russia, and an illustrious example in the United States—a mighty monarchy and a mighty republic. Russia is divided into great regions, each transacting its local affairs, and destined to exercise in interior separate action in harmony with the general laws of the empire. The American Union started in that advanced stage. It is a cluster of some 37 States, each with its own legislature, for all which, and for the outlying Territories, the Federal Parliament also legislates. Contrast their condition with ours. Only of late has their population outrun ours. They have 38 legislative systems; we have one only. Surely our system is a barbarous simplicity. France alone goes beyond us. Nay, our Indian centralisation is worse still. No virtue, no wisdom in rulers can make up, when the defect of organs lays on them enormous duties.

The conditions under which Central and Local powers act harmoniously are simple and clear.

First. The Local powers must be to the Central like Planets round a Sun, each weak compared to the centre; therefore also not too few. If three equal powers are federated, the central force, which is only the sum of the parts, is dangerously weak. But if the separate parts (I will call them Provinces) are not very unequal, the union of ten or twelve would ordinarily be quite stable.
Next. For constant and rapid action, each side must know and loyally respect the duties of the other. In the American Union indeed, the Central Federal power has no rights or functions but those formally ceded to it by the States: with us any Province now organised would only have such rights as it received from Parliament.

All new unforeseen business would fall to the central power, which in all cases would undertake—1. The Public Defence; 2. Communications with Foreign Powers; 3. The Principal Highways; 4. Shores and Habours; 5. Crown Lands; 6. National Money and Weights; 7. National Taxes. Some other matters may be made either central or local.

When the necessity of lodging high powers in local authorities is pressed, one often gets the reply: "True we are moving vigorously for this—Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, and many other towns have erected noble Town Halls and display a rising municipal spirit." This is all right; yet it is not at all to my purpose: the towns do not contain the counties, and cannot possibly attain dignity adequate to the need.

Our Provincial institutions ought to be on the scale of petty kingdoms—such as Tuscany, Sicily, Bohemia, Hanover—not of mere town population. Our impending Church and State questions will be solved in this island with least convulsion, if local variety of sentiment be allowed free play. The States of the American Union legislate for themselves even on Marriage and Inheritance and Penal Law, subject only to a few broad principles. This freedom gives them a great advantage over us in experimental legislation, for it is wiser to experiment on two million persons than on thirty million. If a law succeeds, the other States can imitate; if it fail, to undo is far easier. By dealing with high moral interests a Province acquires dignity. By a full power of taxation it is made impossible for the rich and fastidious to despise the local organs. If the province be on a sufficiently large scale, its pecuniary resources are able to reward the highest talents, and its concerns are adequate to engage life-services even from the active-minded and ambitious. All parts and ranks of the local community are then forced to take interest in local concerns. Each province becomes a normal school for Parliament, and a ladder by which all high talent of poor men may arise. If the population of a Province varied from two to three million, which I think sufficient, sons of noblemen would accept its high posts as an honor—no sinecure indeed, nor to be won without popular manners and sound talent.

Ireland on this scheme would have her own historical Four Provinces, though they cannot at present have an average population so high as two millions. The Principality of Wales is not at all too populous or too rich for one Province; indeed one might throw in, not only Monmouthshire, but Herefordshire and Shropshire. The Scottish Islands and Highlands might make one Province, and Southern Scotland (chiefly Lowlands) a second.

Thus seven Provinces are made up; and England would easily make seven more. The number fourteen would secure that none should be too strong for the centre, yet they would be strong enough and wealthy enough for their own necessary dignity. It is not at all difficult to suggest such a grouping of our English counties into seven Provinces as may fulfil the conditions; but I am now pressing the principle only.

To give content and stability, and save the need of after-struggles, the elective system should be self-adjusting. Beginning from equal electoral districts as near as may be, suppose forty thousand to be the normal population of each district, which is to send one member to the Provincial Chamber. Household franchise of course would be the rule, and I trust women householders would not be arbitrarily excluded. Perhaps three years as the term of election would be approved. Then in a province whose population is 2,400,000, the chamber would have sixty members. Each should receive from the provincial treasury a moderate salary, fixed by Parliament, to save the chamber from the odium of voting its own pay. Parliament would also by its contingent veto uphold all necessary imperial principles. Yet in the vast majority of cases the confirmation would become a mere form, and the relief to Parliament immense.

But a few words are needed concerning the relation of the town municipalities to the provincial chambers. To save complications from lodger franchises and shiftings of residence, every municipality of larger population than forty thousand might elect one or more members to its provincial chamber by the vote of its town council. Only on account of its huge size and other obvious reasons, it may be requisite to make LONDON an eighth separate and independent Province, with special protection against nominal citizens.

Vast problems in English legislation must soon be under-taken by Parliament, if we are to avoid the greatest calamities.

Pauperism has become an English institution ever since the reign of Henry VIII.; that is, ever since the land-tenure was put upon its present footing. No country Can be healthy and thriving, where the land, which naturally and reasonably belongs to the nation and is under the rule of the State, is converted into the private ownership of wealthy grandees.

Perpetual invasions of common land have been allowed by a landlord Parliament to landlords, under whose regimen the rural districts are emptied out into the towns. Caledonia and Ireland have to be re-peopled. All the rural places must be made not only to maintain their new births, but to receive ample colonies from the towns. English fields will abundantly repay English capital which is now sent abroad.

A vast and beneficial revolution awaits us—a necessary revolution, which the upper classes, unless unwise,
must promote. The Queen's Government, however it may be composed, covets soldiers. Landlords of old were bound to furnish troops to the King: they now have somewhat got the power of driving out men, and putting sheep or deer in their place. With an armed Europe confronting us, chronic alarms from Ireland, and need of constant recruits for India, great changes are inevitable.

We need legislators who can grasp broad principles, not mere administrators and men of routine. We want simple and short laws, not lengthy edicts. The qualities needed for a wise and energetic member of our Commons' House are now so great, that to judge of candidates is not a task for ordinary honest men. To argue from antiquity and precedent, is here a pernicious fallacy. What if the suffrage had been strictly universal under our Edwards or Henries? The functions of the House were then comparatively simple and easy: domestic experience and tradition, with sound good sense, sufficed. Ordinary house-holders may choose well the men who are to manage their local concerns, but not those who are to govern a great empire. As before observed, poor men will generally elect the rich and liberal. Where indigent voters have imperial power, an oligarchy of wealth is sure to bestrde them. No such reforms as alone our routine parties talk of can give us the needful wise rulers. We want new principles and new organs for an imperial condition, as well as for our great increase in population. We have suffered much from postponing radical change, and the longer we postpone, the more we shall suffer. Our reforms have been always superficial, never radical.

What then do I propose to replace our Parliamentary system of election? Simply, that every Provincial Chamber shall send its delegates—virtually its ambassadors—to Parliament with instructions and with a proper salary, for a three years' term, but reserving the power to recall any delegate earlier by a two-thirds vote, and to replace him, like an ambassador, by a successor.

This would establish a real effective responsibility of every member of Parliament to his Provincial Chamber, yet would make his position more honorable than ever. He would be free from all popular canvassing—he would be elected without candidacy and without expense. The Chamber itself would look out for able servants. Confusion and intrigue would be lessened. Drunkenness and publicans, beer and bribery, would vanish from Parliamentary elections. There would be no dissolutions of Parliament—no convulsive interruptions of public-business. Meritorious men would be elected, and great wealth would never weigh too heavily. Attendance in Parliament ought to be enforced by Parliament itself, but each Chamber would be able to withdraw its delegates if they neglected public business. All difficulties about universal suffrage, and many other entanglements, would be swept away.

In the Provincial elections the stake played for would be far lower; therefore evils would not press in on at all the same scale as now. Of course each Chamber would be allowed delegates proportioned to the population of the Province. To allot one delegate for every 200,000 heads would give ten delegates to a Province of two millions, and send to Parliament about 160 members from the United Kingdom. Surely 160 picked men, with only half the business, would be immeasurably better than our present House.

Further, this scheme would settle our harassing Irish difficulties. English statesmen, whether Whig or Tory, will not endure an Irish Parliament, because no promises made by its advocates can bind it not to claim to be co-ordinate with the English Parliament. Co-ordination implies an equal right in regard to Foreign Policy, and virtually a double Foreign Office. Besides, the same ministers cannot be responsible to two Parliaments at once. I do not think that any such enthusiasm for an Irish Parliament is possible in England as shall overpower both Whig and Tory statesmen. Yet it is wholly inexpedient and unjust that Ireland should not have local legislation, especially when it is so very common with English members to a vow that they do not understand Irish questions. By means of four Provincial Chambers local legislation may be effectually given to Ireland, without any danger to imperial interests. The Parliamentary veto would abundantly protect Protestants from any unfair use of Catholic majority; and no local evils arising from inexpience can compare with the substantial advantages which will accrue when Irishmen feel that Irish affairs are in their own hands. Those who have agitated for an Irish Parliament will of course be discontented and cavil at Four Chambers as an evasion; but when our sister island begins to experience benefit from the change, and sees that she is treated exactly as Great Britain in the matter, I fully expect that Irishmen will become as loyal, as intelligent, and as useful citizens in the United Kingdom as they are in the United States.

So much of Provincial Chambers and Parliamentary Elections. But as above urged, these changes will not lessen the importance of excluding the Queen's ministers from being elected to a seat and vote in Parliament.

Am I then proposing to degrade Ministers? Certainly not. They are not degraded in the Federal Government of the American Union. But two excellent results would follow not yet alluded to.

First. Ministers would be more stable in their places, and attain far higher skill in their separate departments. Our Executive now cannot possibly compete in accomplishment with that of Prussia or Russia. Men no sooner have gained experience in special duties than the Cabinet is liable to collective ejection from some general reasons of policy, and untried successors step into their places. To remove officers of the army or navy or the head of the police because of party politics, is hardly more absurd than to remove the Secretary or
Viceroy of India, or the Head of the Post office, or the Home Secretary, or the Keeper of the Finances, because of some political question remote from his duties. Whatever tends to the accomplishment and stability of ministers tends to their honor and to the public welfare.

**Secondly.** The removal of Ministers from Parliament, with free access for Chairmen of Committees to the documents of the Foreign Office, will alone enable us to get rid of that SECRET DIPLOMACY which constantly involves us in war. This is a signally important topic. I have not time to dwell upon it. I will merely say, *five wars out of six in my memory would have been prevented by a previous free debate in Parliament.* But ministers stifle debate by withholding information, which always comes too late. Even now [1875] I fear we are drifting into a new Chinese War with incalculable contingencies.

A mere seat without vote and without election might be granted to ministers; but, for the danger of old habit yielding to them an initiation of business, each in his own department. For the dignity and independence of the House, and to help it to restrain ministers (which even in the United States is difficult enough), it is far safer to dispense with ministerial oratory, and make the Standing Committees the sole medium of communication between ministers and the House. Then the Chairmen would be raised in dignity; the Executive would not need to be good speakers—good administrators they ought to be, but principles and instructions would be dictated by the House.

In fact it would no longer be necessary that ministers should be *all of one-party any more than were those of Queen Elizabeth.* Party Government would no longer be identical with Parliamentary Government. The Government might then represent the whole nation to foreigners; now it represents one side only. The Marquis of Salisbury would not then be ejected from the post of Indian Secretary for a difference of opinion with Mr. Disraeli about English suffrage. Nay, the very reasonable regulation might be adopted that every minister's diploma be inscribed with the words *by appointment of the Queen, and by consent of the House.* Then the House would be able to make each minister separately responsible to it by withdrawing its consent, and if the Cabinet struck as a body, the House would know how to punish the ringleaders effectually.

I have left an enormous topic, vital to our safety, untouched, because it concerns the reorganisation of India, not of England; yet I must ask leave to allude to it, since it is a new and weighty argument for *not delaying* to reorganise England. Ever since the last renewal of the Company's Charter in 1853 very serious grievances of India have been so testified as to be undeniable. Yet they remain unredressed. Parliament, by its empty benches when an Indian appeal is brought before it, passes sentence on itself as an unfit tribunal; hence it is not likely, while constituted as it is, to reorganise India. Will the ministry do the work by its own free initiative? It *might,* but for twenty-two years it has *not.* I believe that it fears the Indian Civil Service too much. But delay is our great danger. The fatal words, *too late,* may suddenly ring in our ears. Give quickly, give graciously, without compulsion, and you earn gratitude; delay, and you may be scorned. If it were possible for us to earn Indian loyalty, it would be our duty to quit the soil of India as quick as may be. But it is certain that the PRINCES would be loyal as soon as they find their honors and estates safe, like those of English dukes, under the shield of an impartial Judicial Court; the PEOPLE will be loyal when their crying grievances are removed. Of course it is not my place to suggest How? Sir Bartle Frere (I do not strike out these words in a second edition, but the reader must not forget that they were written before the wicked Zulu war), no wild enthusiast or democrat, has promulgated an elaborate scheme for Indian internal government. Whenever the Supreme power of England pronounces that India herself must take a large share in governing India, there will be no lack of talent to show *How.* That which we lack is Will to undertake the task, and unless we get a Parliament with fresher eye and less preoccupied, the danger is, I think, very great that England may be wise TOO LATE, with calamity on a prodigious scale. Our vexatious and michevious jealousies of Russia turn altogether on the belief of Indian disaffection; but with India loyal to the Queen, fear of Russia would be an insanity.

Finally, concerning the House of Lords, I briefly say, the opinion grows rapidly, that to have two Legislative Houses is a fundamental mistake; that an Upper House is generally an obstruction, never a safeguard. If this opinion prevail, then the thirty or forty Peers who love public business and have high talents for it, would have a far nobler career in the elective House than where they speak, as now, to a scanty audience. They would have an accession of honour without the unpleasantness of a popular canvass, if freely selected as delegates (or, I may say, ambassadors) from Chambers of such dignity as would preside over our Provinces.

"Quotations".

Shortly will be published (6d, by post 6d), QUOTATIONS: Second Series. How the Union with Ireland was done—Land Tenure—Palmerston and Disraeli—Unshackled Commerce and Trade—Untaxed Labor—Extension of Municipal Powers—Duties of Legislators—Mind-Destroying Results of Centralisation—Direct Taxation—Secularism by a Secularist—Banking Systems—Miscellaneous. A few Notices of First Series.
"Quotations" is the title of a little pamphlet compiled by Mr. Tucker of Nelson—well read and scholarly—a dear lover of books for the good that is in them—a keen seeker after bright thoughts hidden in musty tomes—a finder-out of pearls even among literary trifles. Evidence of his keen research are given in the collection of "Quotations" which he now produces in a modest form. He has gathered up fragments from a host of authorities, being mainly in this, his First Series, on political and financial topics. The extracts are for the most part terse epitomes of healthy sentiment and honest thought; and we hope that the efforts of the compiler will be practically appreciated, so that he may fulfil his expressed interest to bring out a second series speedily.—New Zealand Times (Wellington).

"Quotations."—This pamphlet contains the sentiments and opinions of many writers of eminence on many topics.—Tablet (Dunedin).

"Quotations" is the title of a little brochure—more useful than pretentious. * * * * The public will gladly hail the appearance of many successors to the little venture now under notice. * * * * The selections are jewels in their way: they are not only the result of thought in their author, but are likely to lead to reflection to those who read them. The present collection has chiefly a political and financial bearing; and singularly enough many of the quotations are apropos of questions that are agitating the mind of the world at the present moment.—Chronicle (Wellington).

* * * * Sells at the moderate price of sixpence, and is worth reading. * * * * The extracts mainly deal with politics, and show a wide knowledge of English politics and political questions.—Echo (Dunedin).

Book of Quotations.—We have received from New Zealand "Quotations," First Series. An interesting "omnium gatherum" of moral, religious, and political maxims from the writings of Bentley, Selden, Urquhart, Anstey, W. Fox, Emerson, Kossuth, F. W. Newman, &c. We seem to recognise in the compiler an old friend and Urquhartite.—Trübner's Literary Record (London).

West Coast and other papers have likewise published favorable notices; and in several private letters from eminent statesmen similar sentiments have been expressed.

THIRD SERIES.—Universality of Trinity in Unity—Unbelief and Belief—Various Views of Islamism—Religion, Practical and Doctrinal.

"THE ROSERY." H. BUDDEN & Co. Wholesale & Retail Nurserymen & Seed Merchants, BRIDGE STREET, NELSON. ONLY such SEEDS as cannot be grown in the Colony are Imported, but all imported ones are Tested previous to being sent out. Bulbs. Our Collection is very LARGE & BEAUTIFUL, including many of the Newest and most recently introduced Kinds. Roses. (A Specialty) Of this, the Queen of Flowers, we keep an immense Variety. We have this Season added about 80 of the Newest Varieties to our previous very large Collection. PRIMULA. FRUIT AND FOREST TREES. EVERGREEN AND FLOWERING SHRUBS, STOVE AND GREENHOUSE PLANTS. GARDEN REQUISITES OF EVERY DESCRIPTION. CATALOGUES of PLANTS and SEEDS Post Free on Application.

NELSON. W. M. STANTON, Commission: and General Agent, AND IMPORTER.

BOOKS, STATIONARY, PAPER, AND PRINTING MATERIALS. PIANOFORTES & MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS OF EVERT DESCRIPTION. MUSIC AT HALF PRICE.

Theatrical Requisites—Wigs, Whiskers, Imitation and Real Gold and Silver Laces, Gauze, Braids, Fringes, Cords, Gimps, Spangles, Concaves, Gold and Silver Cloth, and Stage Properties in General. MASONIC CLOTHING, JEWELS, & LITERATURE.


AMOUNT OF BUSINESS £150,000,000. INSURE WITH THE INDEPENDENT LOWEST RATES OF PREMIUM. UNQUESTIONABLE SECURITY. NORWICH UNION FIRE INSURANCE SOCIETY PROMPT SETTLEMENT. NO DISPUTING FAIR CLAIMS "CONDITIONS," INCOMPARABLE. W. M. STANTON, AGENT & ATTORNEY NELSON, MARLBOROUGH, & WEST COAST. Agency also of Hanseatic Insurance Company of Hamburg.

The Western Farmer of America.

BY Augustus Mongredien,

Author of "Free Trade and English Commerce."


These Pages Are respectfully Inscribed
To the Farmers of America
By Their Sincere Friend,
The Western Farmer of America.

Chapter I.

Introductory.

The golden rule for successful trading is "to buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market." Strange to say, the American farmer

The word "farmer" will be used throughout these pages as meaning the producer of all articles derived from the cultivation of the soil, whether grain or cotton, meat or tobacco, &c.

reverses this rule. He sells in the cheapest and buys in the dearest market. For what he raises he gets a lower price, and for what he consumes he pays a higher price, than the land-tillers get and pay in any other country in the world. This is a very singular state of things, and is well worth thorough examination.

While the Western farmer himself neither receives nor seeks any legislative "protection," he is compelled by law to supply his wants, not from the cheapest sources, but from certain privileged establishments to which he has to pay extravagant prices. While he requires no State subvention, because his occupation is of itself a profitable one, he is heavily taxed to support unprofitable manufactures in the Eastern States, and has to make good their losses out of his profits. That this is hard upon him everybody must admit, but no one can realise how really hard it is, or how vast a sum is year after year wrung from him in this way, without resorting to figures and setting it forth in dollars and cents. This we shall proceed to do as accurately and as briefly as we can.

For this purpose let us inquire—

• How much is actually taken yearly out of the pockets of the American farmers by compelling them to buy dear, instead of allowing them to buy cheap, goods.
• What becomes of the enormous sum that is yearly drained from them in this way.
• How this dreadful and wanton waste can be avoided.

Chapter II.

How Much is Actually Taken (Yearly) out of the Pockets of the American Farmers by Compelling Them to Buy Dear, Instead of Allowing Them to Buy Cheap, Goods.

BY the census of 1870 the population of the United States was found to be 38,600,000; and the number over ten years of age was 28,229,000. Of these, 12,506,000 were engaged in various kinds of occupations, the rest being women, young persons of both sexes, idlers, &c. What were the respective employments of these 12,506,000 workers? According to the census returns there were—

In round numbers, there were two millions of persons engaged in manufactures, and these were exclusively privileged to supply nearly all the physical wants (except food and lodging) of the other ten and a half millions of workers and their families.

As in these pages we only profess to represent the case of the American farmer, we must confine our attention to the six millions of persons and their families who are engaged in the cultivation of the soil. It is quite true that the remaining four and a half millions engaged in professions, in trading, in mining, and in personal service, are sufferers to quite a proportionate extent, but they do not come within the scope of the present inquiry.

Now let us see what is the actual amount which the farmers (that is, soil-workers generally) spend yearly on the goods produced by the manufacturers.

In the first place, the six millions of agriculturists of 1870 must by this time have increased to at least 7,500,000, as will no doubt be seen by this year's census. To be within the mark we will call them 7,000,000, nearly all of them having wives and children. Now, what is the average annual expenditure on all articles of consumption, except food and drink, of each of these families? On careful investigation, and consultation with conscientious inquirers and with persons most competent to judge, we feel confident that we are within the scope of the present inquiry.

Now let us see what is the actual amount which the farmers (that is, soil-workers generally) spend yearly on the goods produced by the manufacturers.
female, as also sheets, curtains, blankets, carpets, &c. 2. Iron and steel manufactures, and therefore all iron-work, wire, cutlery, tools, farming implements, farriery, agricultural machinery, as well as railway conveyance on iron, which cost very much more than it would have cost had it been imported from abroad. 3. Leathern fabrics, and therefore boots and shoes, saddlery, gloves, &c. 4. Earthenware and crockery, tinware and glass, and numberless other household necessaries, all of which come under the price-inflating influence of the Customs tariff. It is on these objects that the greater portion of the agriculturist's outgoings is expended, for he is but at little expense for his food. Moreover, this yearly average of 200 dollars per family comprises a large number of rich and well-to-do persons, and it may safely be assumed as rather under than over the reality.

Having now cleared the way thus far, it is easy to calculate the total sum annually spent on manufactured goods by the farmers and agriculturists generally of the great Central and Western States. The amount being 200 dollars to 7,000,000 families, is, therefore, 1,400,000,000 dollars in the aggregate.

The next step is to ascertain what portion of that amount the Western farmers would save if, by the abolition of import duties, they were left free to supply their wants from the cheapest market, wherever that might be, whether in America or in Europe, whether in New England or in Old England. This question is easily solved, as, fortunately, we have the guidance of positive facts supplied by the official returns of the United States Government. From these we learn that prices are so high in America and so low in Europe, that, in spite of the enormous duties levied on them, considerable quantities of European goods are imported into the United States, where they must, of course, leave a profit to the senders, or they would not be sent. Let us enumerate some of the leading articles imported in the year 1878, stating their amounts and the rate per cent, of duties which they had to pay:—

What do these figures mean? They mean that the prices which the Western farmers (and the American people generally) now pay for their woollen cloths and stuffs are so excessive that the British woollen manufacturers can afford to pay from 54 to 77 per cent, import duties for the admission of their goods into the States, and still get a profit. That is to say, that (taking the average duty at 66 per cent.) the Western farmer could, if he were allowed to buy where he could buy cheapest, get the same quantity and quality of woollen and worsted stuffs for 12 dollars for which he now has to pay 20. Eight dollars out of twenty thrown away!

They mean that the prices which the Western farmers now pay for their cotton and linen goods are so excessive that the British makers of the same goods can afford to pay from 30 to 63 per cent import duties for the admission of their manufactures into the States, and still get a profit. That is to say, that (taking the average duty at 50 per cent.) the farmer's wife could, if she were allowed to buy where she could buy cheapest, get the same articles for 6 dollars for which she now has to pay 9. Three dollars out of nine thrown away!

They mean that the American railways are constructed of iron which cost so dear that the British makers can afford to pay 30 to 50 per cent import duties for the admission of their goods into the States, and still get a profit; so that the railway companies are compelled to charge the Western farmer a proportionately excessive rate for the conveyance of his produce to a market. The burden of the difference, of course, falls on the patient back of the Western farmer!

Those figures mean, in short, that the same enormous artificial inflation of natural prices runs through every article (except food) with which the farmer has to provide his family.

The American has extraordinary advantages over the British farmer. He has, first, a soil so fertile as to produce freely with cheap tillage and no manure; second, a climate highly favourable to agricultural operations; third, abundance of land so cheap that the fee-simple costs less than is annually paid for rent in England. But, on the other hand, the British farmer enjoys for the present one decided advantage: he sells his produce in the dearest, and buys his clothing, implements, &c. &c., in the cheapest market in the world.

Let us, however, continue our inquiry as to the total annual amount taken out of the pockets of the Western farmers by exorbitant protective duties. These duties have a very wide range. They are as low as 10 per cent, on diamonds which the Western farmer does not use, and as high as 93 per cent, on cleaned rice which he does use. They are levied on no less than 1,600 different articles, some of them yielding less revenue than it costs to collect it, and the whole producing a complexity which gives comfortable employment to swarms of clerks, &c., at every seaport. The heaviest percentage rates are those imposed on articles of general and necessary consumption by the people, which accordingly contribute very nearly three-fourths of the total amount collected. But let us strike an average. By a careful comparison of the total value of the chief dutiable foreign articles imported in the year 1878, with the total amount of duties levied in that year on the same articles, it has been clearly ascertained that the average rate of duties paid on their value was 42 ¾ per cent. Were the average confined to the articles named in the table at p. 9, it would no doubt much exceed 42 ¾ per cent., but, to be within the mark, we will adopt the general average. This average, then (42 ¾ per cent), is the measure of the difference between the prices which the Western farmers now pay for what they consume, and those which they would pay were foreign articles admitted duty free. The prices which the manufacturers in the Eastern States make the American people pay for their goods are not, and cannot be, less, but are, and must be, something
more than 42 ¾ per cent, in addition to British prices, or else how could the Britisher pay an average of 42 ¾ per cent, duties, and still make a profit on what he sends to America? If the prices paid by the Western farmer to the manufacturers of the Eastern States only exceeded British prices by, say 25 per cent., no British goods, having to pay 42 ¾ per cent, import duties, could possibly be sent to the United States. The very fact of large imports being poured in, year after year (as shown in table at p. 9, for 1878), in spite of the 42 ¾ per cent, duty for admission, makes it clear that the prices in America must be at least 50 per cent, in excess of those current in England, or else those sendings would leave a loss, and would be discontinued. These importations, be it noted, are not fitful or intermittent, but are, though fluctuating in amount, constant in their recurrence. The continuous importation, however slight, of a tank is clear evidence of its being full; and, in the same way, the continuous importation of goods burdened with 42 ¾ per cent, duty is clear evidence that the ordinary prices of such goods in the importing country must keep sufficiently high to make such importations profitable.

However, to err on the side of caution, we will instead of 50 per cent, or 42 ¾ per cent., take 40 per cent, as the overcharge which the Western farmers have to pay for the goods which they require to supply their wants. Now, we have shown at p. 9 that their annual expenditure on the supply of those wants amounts in the aggregate to 1,400,000,000 dollars. Let us see what proportion of that sum is unnecessarily squandered. If the American farmers were allowed to buy, as they could buy, for 100 dollars what they are now compelled to pay 140 dollars for, it is clear that they could buy for 1,000 million dollars what they now pay 1,400 million dollars for, and consequently they would save 400,000,000 dollars every year. In other words, by being left free to buy where they could buy cheapest, they would benefit to the extent of 400 million dollars, which they now lose by the operation of the protective duties.

Truly a startling sum! A stupendous sum! That such a pile of wealth should year after year be unnecessarily and wantonly flung away and wasted seems utterly incredible, and yet it is literally true. "What!" we can imagine a Western farmer exclaiming, "do you mean to say that we farmers, our class alone, are every year, out of our hard earnings, needlessly and heedlessly throwing away 400 millions of dollars, and that we could, if we would, save in our yearly expenses a sum large enough to defray the whole of the national expenditure nearly twice over?" "Yes, sir," we reply, "it is a fact. We have clearly shown that the same articles of consumption that you could get from the Britisher for 100 dollars, you have now to pay 140 for. Now, if you, one with the other, rich and poor, spend 200 dollars a year on such articles, the common rule of three shows that but for your heavy Customs duties you need only spend 143 dollars for the same things instead of 200, and that, while living just as comfortably, you would on an average save fifty-seven dollars a year. Now, as there are 7,000,000 of you agriculturists, multiply that number by the fifty-seven dollars which each would save, and you will find it comes to 400,000,000 dollars. The fact is, that you never realised the amount of your loss—never put it into figures. It is so mingled up in small doses with your daily spendings that, though enormous in the gross, it does not strike you in the detail. You go on paying thirty cents for a knife instead of twenty; or fifty cents for a piece of canvas instead of thirty; or ten dollars for woollen clothing instead of six; or your wife buys a printed calico gown for three dollars instead of two, and so on throughout the whole range of your requirements; but you do not stay to inquire how much you are overcharged at each step. Now, this has been calculated for you. For every seven dollars which you now spend you ought only to spend five; the other two dollars are simply thrown away in consequence of your import duties."

It has been said the American farmers actually prefer paying seven dollars to the Eastern State manufacturers to paying five dollars for the same thing to the Britisher, especially as the extra two dollars do not go out of the country. Well, if the two dollars do not go into another country, they at all events go into another pocket, and surely the farmers can hardly be persuaded that it is the same thing to them whether they pay seven dollars to a man in Massachusetts, or five dollars for the same article to a man in Lancashire. We believe, on the contrary, that the hardworking Western farmer prefers getting as much as he can for his money. But if we are wrong, and if it be really true that the farmers are content, knowingly and voluntarily, to pay out of their pockets a yearly contribution of 400,000,000 dollars as a free gift to the Eastern States manufacturers, to enable them to carry on a losing business, which, without that assistance, would have to be given up, we can only admire and wonder. And we wonder all the more as this immense sacrifice is made in vain, and is of very little or no benefit to any one. This we shall show in the next chapter, when we examine what becomes of the 400,000,000 dollars which the farmers lose.

At all events the farmers ought surely to have a voice in the question, whether they really do (as it is stated they do) prefer losing, or whether they prefer saving, the 8400,000,000.

Again, it is said that the American farmers have flourished and prospered; that they have profitably extended, and are still extending, their operations, and that therefore they cannot have suffered the yearly loss alleged. That does not at all follow. No one contends that an average loss of $57 per annum sustained by each agriculturist could turn the scale and make farming a losing business. It does not destroy the farmer, but it sweeps away so much of his profits. By the census of 1870, the total value of (cereal) farm productions
amounted to $2,448,000,000. Out of this farmers could afford to throw away a certain portion, and still thrive and make money. But that is no reason why they should persist in throwing that portion away. A man with an income of $2,500 may live on $1,000, muddle away $500 on rotten speculations, and still lay by $1,000 a year, but he would certainly be richer if he did not muddle away the $8500. A waste of $57 a year multiplied 7,000,000 times does none the less amount to $400,000,000 in the aggregate.

Again, it is said that the prices of some of the Eastern States' manufacturers are not so much higher than those of the foreigner as we make out. But, if so, why keep up such heavy import duties. And, again, if so, how it is that, in spite of those heavy duties, foreign goods can still afford (see p. 9) to come in? The Western farmer might say, "Come, I do not mind paying 10 per cent, dearer to you than to the foreigner. Reduce the import duties therefore from an average of 42½ per cent, to 10 per cent. If your prices are, as you say, moderate, surely, with a bonus of 10 per cent, besides freight and charges, you can withstand foreign competition! But if not, and if the condition of your existence as manufacturers is an import duty of 42½ per cent., which means that we farmers, as a class, are to subscribe out of our earnings $400,000,000 a year to keep you gentlemen of the East pegging away at a losing business, we protest against it. It is paying far too dear 'for a whistle.' We will withdraw from a game in which we are to find the stakes (and heavy ones too) for others to win, and we will go in for buying where we can buy cheapest."

It should further be observed that the more freight the Western farmer has to pay to get his produce delivered into the European markets, the smaller the net residue that comes to him; for the European buyers' prices include freight. Cheap freights from America to Europe, therefore, mean large profits to the farmer, and dear freights small profits. But as the enormous American import duties prevent heavy and bulky goods, such as iron, coal, &c., from being freely sent from Europe to the United States, and as ships must make a certain amount of freight on the round or cease running, what happens? They make up for getting little or no freight from Europe to America by charging nearly double freight on the cotton, grain, and other farmer's produce which they convey from America to Europe. This surcharge of freight from, to compensate for the absence of freight to, American ports, amounts in the aggregate to a very large sum, which comes out of the pocket of the Western farmers, and constitutes another heavy burden inflicted on them by the present oppressive tariff.

But the mischief done to the American farmers by heavy import duties is not confined to the immense direct losses inflicted on them. Their interests are also vitally injured in another way. The very essence of their prosperity depends upon their having large and increasing outlets abroad for the large and increasing amount of their produce. They grow far more grain, meat, cotton, &c., than their own country can consume, and must look to their foreign customers to take off the surplus. But the protective duties step in to thwart, cripple and restrict the farmers' dealings with their foreign customers. How are the farmers to export their produce? It is now well established and universally admitted that debts between nation and nation are not paid in specie (beyond the merest fraction), but in commodities, and that all commerce is substantially barter. If you will only take from the foreigner such of his goods as he can make a profit on after paying 42½ per cent, import duty, you limit his power of buying from you, and consequently your own power of selling to him. It becomes a necessary condition of your dealing with him that you should get so low a price for your produce and give him so high a price for his goods, that the margin shall make up for the 42½ per cent, import duties. These, therefore, cut against you both ways. Not only you pay more for what you consume, but you get less for what you produce. You may not feel the pinch so much just now, but average harvests in Europe would make it absolutely necessary for the United States to secure free sales by making free purchases. If you aspire to feed the world you must take in payment what the world can give you."

Let us now look at another branch of the subject.

Chapter III.

What Becomes of the $400,000,000 Yearly Taken Out of the Pocket of the American Farmers?

The amount of Customs revenue which the United States Government derived in 1878 from duties on foreign goods imported was $130,000,000. To this amount, the agriculturist, being rather less than half of the total population of the country, contributed about $60,000,000. This was, therefore the proportion of the $400,000,000 overcharged to the American farmers on their annual expenditure that went to the legitimate purpose of national revenue; and so far, $60,000,000 of the total is satisfactorily accounted for. But what of the remaining $340,000,000? Who are the lucky men whom this mighty sum, drained year after year out of the farmer's earnings, goes to enrich? Strange and incredible as it may appear, careful examination and analysis will show that all this money has been, and is being, absolutely wasted, squandered, and spent as uselessly as it would be in hiring an army of men to dig holes and fill them up again. It has neither enriched, nor even
benefited anybody. While it has to that extent impoverished the farmers, it has only served to fill up the gap and make good the losses occasioned by the misapplication of capital and labour in the Eastern States to the wrong kinds of production.

Let us trace where these $340,000,000 go. They form the extra sum paid annually to the manufacturers of the Eastern States over and above what the farmers would have had to pay for the same articles were they allowed to make their purchases from abroad. If the Eastern manufacturers were able to produce their goods as cheaply as the foreigner, all that money would be saved to the farmers; but as they cannot, the farmers are made to pay the difference. Nothing whatever is got by anybody in return for those $340,000,000; and that sum is simply thrown away and sacrificed to make up for the want of skill, or of capital, or of whatever else it may be, by reason of which the Eastern manufacturer makes no more profit by selling an article at $140 than the Britisher does by selling the same article at $100. If, indeed, the Eastern manufacturer could produce the article for $100, and if he did get $140 for it, he would be benefited and enriched; and it might be some consolation to the farmers for their loss of $340,000,000 a year that it went to form large accumulations of wealth in the pockets of their fellow-citizens in the Eastern States. But this consolation does not exist, and we shall presently show that, in spite of the enormous sum overcharged to the farmers, the profits of the Eastern manufacturer are precarious, fluctuating, and by no means above the average of other occupations. His charge of $140 for what the Britisher can afford to sell for $100, only leaves him a bare living profit, because it costs him $40 more to produce the article than it costs the Britisher. Why this should be the case we cannot here stay to inquire, but such is the fact. Indeed, how else could British goods be largely imported into the States in spite of the 42 ¾ per cent, import duties which they have to pay?

It is these $40 uselessly spent out of 140, which, added up, form the $340,000,000 which the farmers of America are called upon to throw away every year without any benefit to themselves or to anybody else. It is sheer waste; just as it is sheer waste to pay one man exorbitantly for doing the same work (no more and no better) which another man, more expert, will do cheaply;—just as it would be sheer waste to go on thrashing with a flail instead of using a machine, merely because the man with the flail was a neighbour, and the machine-maker was a stranger. We can fancy a shrewd Western farmer saying, "A man down East makes a article which he can't afford to sell me under $140, while a man over the water offers me the same article for $100. I want to deal with the latter, but to prevent that, they clap $40 duty on to the 100, and then tell me that, as now, in either case, I shall have to pay $140 for the article, I may as well buy of the man down East, because he's a kind of brother, whereas, the man over the water is only a cousin. All I see in it is, that I am done out of $40."

That the Eastern manufacturers only make the average profit, and their men the average wages, of other occupations, is the necessary result of internal competition. No trade can for any length of time maintain higher rates of profit or of wages than the average, because people soon flock from other trades into that, and thus they all settle down to about the same level. There does, indeed, at intervals occur a sudden spurt of demand, causing for a brief period high prices, high profits, and high wages, but these bright, short flashes of prosperity cost the manufacturers and their men dear. Fresh capital and fresh labour are thereby freely enticed into the trade, and when the spurt is over there is not sufficient vent for the increased supply. The result is, ruin to many, loss to all. Such a spurt occurred in 1872-1873. In 1874 the reaction came, and there followed five years of commercial depression and suffering. An immense body of American workmen were thrown out of employ, and in the course of those five years (mostly in 1877 and 1878) upwards of 600,000 persons left the East to seek a living in the West. During those five years a large number of industrial establishments closed their doors, and in the iron trade alone 250 blast furnaces were blown out, and 60 to 70 rolling mills ceased work. In the six years 1873 to 1878, the average number of commercial failures in the United States per year was 7,866 against an average of 2,889 the previous seven years. In short, those five years were the worst that American commerce had ever experienced. Yet during all that time the farmers were yearly disbursing $340,000,000 to support the manufacturers. So far, however, from enriching them, this large sum was engulfed in their losses and was squandered in vain. It is abundantly clear that, as we said at p. 19, "the profits of the Eastern manufacturers are precarious, fluctuating, and by no means above the average of other occupations."

Just now (1880), the iron manufacturers are enjoying another temporary spurt, owing to the wealth created by the farmers and the consequent necessity for more railways; and this leads to another question of vast importance to the farmers. At what cost are those new railways to be constructed? Is the farmer's produce to be conveyed to the sea-board on cheap rails at a fair rate, or on dear rails at an exorbitant rate? Are the railway-makers to pay Pennsylvanian prices or British prices for their rails? If the former, the cost of the required iron and steel will be nearly twice as much as if the latter.

The import duty on steel at this time amounts to 120 per cent.

Now, as the rates of freight must be in proportion, every one who may use the railways about to be constructed will have to pay high fares and freights for ever, because the legislature interdicts cheap iron and
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$11,500,000 in 1878, a paltry increase of $500,000 in eighteen years! In England the increase within the same

"Why, gentlemen, should you not, with raw cotton at your doors, compete with the Britisher, to whom it goes across the ocean? Yet whereas in 1860 your export of cotton manufactures was $11,000,000, it was only $11,500,000 in 1878, a paltry increase of $500,000 in eighteen years! In England the increase within the same period was $60,000,000. There is no doubt that had you been left unencumbered by the fatal boon of Protection you would have made infinitely greater process, and you might by this time have proved formidable rivals to the Britisher in neutral markets. Again, in three years 1866 to 1868, agricultural exports formed 74 per cent, and manufacturing and other exports 26 per cent, of the total exports. In three years 1876 to 1878 the agricultural exports formed 80 per cent., and the manufacturing and other exports only 20 per cent, of the totality. No doubt

that, but for the fatal boon of Protection, you would not have lagged behind in the race, and that your relative proportion of exports would have shown an increase instead of a diminution. Again, in spite of the vast expansion of the world's commerce, the tonnage of the United States mercantile navy is actually less now than it was twenty years ago. From 1855 to 1863 it was upwards of 5,000,000 tons; from 1874 to 1878 it was little more than 4,000,000. English tonnage in 1861 was 4,350,000 tons; in 1877 it was 6,115,000. Within the last twenty years English tonnage has increased by 2,000,000 tons while yours has diminished by 1,000,000. Formerly your mercantile navy shared the carrying trade of the world with England; now, not only that is lost, but your own produce is carried away from your own ports in foreign bottoms. Is it that the American of to-day has degenerated in energy, skill, or enterprise? Not a bit of it. But here also Protection has shed its baneful influence. Iron has superseded wood in the construction of large ships, and your tariff makes iron nearly twice as costly to the American shipbuilder as it is to his British rival. Abolish your import duties, and you will speedily see your mercantile marine restored to its former splendour."

To sum up, the vast amount yearly wrested out of the earnings of the American farmers is simply a useless and wanton waste. It makes them by so much the poorer, without making others one whit the richer. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that we have in these pages only calculated that share of the general loss which accrues to the agriculturists. These barely form half of the total population of the United States, and the other half suffers a fully proportionate loss on their yearly expenditure, from the same causes and with the same results. What steps should be taken to put a stop to these extravagant and unjustifiable losses shall be examined in the next chapter.

Chapter IV.

How to Put a Stop to the Intolerable Losses Which are Year After Year Inflicted on the Farmers of America.

Fortunately, great as is the grievance, its removal is easy. The remedy is in the farmer's own hands. It lies in the exercise of his voting power. It is simply this: let the American farmers give their support to no candidate for a seat in the House of Representatives who does not pledge himself, if elected, to propose, or at least to vote for, "a reduction of 5 per cent, every successive year on the import duties, till the whole are abolished." Never mind what party he may belong to. The relief of the farmers from an intolerable burden is not, cannot be, and must not be, a party question. It is a paramount and inevitable measure which comes before, overrides, and casts into the shade all party distinctions. To refuse the abolition of the tariff is to refuse justice to the agriculturists. It amounts to a persistence in the iniquity of confiscating the farmer's property. Up with the tariff means down with the farmer!

If it be said that abrogation of the tariff would suppress one of the sources of State revenue, the Western farmer's ready reply would be, "Out of the $400,000,000 yearly taken from us, only $60,000,000 go to the revenue. There are plenty of ways of raising $60,000,000 of revenue without resorting to the clumsy, wasteful, roundabout process of inflicting on us a loss of $400,000,000 to enable the State to get $60,000,000. You might as well say that there is no other way of roasting a pig than by burning down the house. We shall be all the better able to pay the taxes necessary to replace the import duties if our earnings are left with us intact."

The farmers, by insisting on justice being done to themselves, are at the same time fighting the battle of the American community at large. All are sufferers from the same fiscal absurdity, and all ought to join the farmers heart and hand, in enforcing the redress of a common grievance.

Every farmer should hold this language to the candidates: "I will only vote for you if you will vote for me; and voting for me means voting in the House for A reduction of five per cent, every successive year on the import duties till the whole are abolished." If this were done pretty generally, the tariff, in its present shape, would not survive the first sitting of Congress. The voting power of the farmers is overwhelming, and will further increase after the next census. They hardly know their own strength. They are the backbone of the great American Republic. They own most of its soil, they have created most of its wealth, and they form the most numerous and influential body among its population. The exercise of their voting power would forcibly influence the commercial policy of the government, and if they choose to exercise it an end will be put for ever to the yearly exactions from which they are now suffering. In other words, they have but to signify unmistakably by their votes that they wish to be freed from the unjust burdens laid upon them by heavy import duties, and those duties will speedily cease to exist. Is it possible to imagine that they should feel the evil, know the remedy, and hesitate to apply it?

It is doubtless true that many, perhaps most, of the American farmers are unaware of, or have given little attention to the facts set forth in these pages, and hence their silent endurance. But if every farmer who reads this concurs in our views, would order from the nearest town ten or twenty copies of this little paper, and would distribute them by hand among his neighbours, or by post among his friends at a distance, a spirit of inquiry
would rapidly be roused, and a definite expression of public opinion would soon be elicited. By such means each man would con-tribute to the good work, and, with little trouble and little expense, the exact state of the case might be laid before every farmer in the Union. It would be for him, after obtaining a knowledge of facts so interesting to his class, to decide whether he would continue to endure the grievance or insist on its removal.

Meanwhile, all honour, Western farmers of America, to the brave and blessed work which your indomitable energy and brawny arms are accomplishing! While in Europe millions of able-bodied men are dragged from the plough and the loom to be trained to bloodshed and destruction, you are pursuing your beneficent conquests over nature, and converting barren wastes into orchards and cornfields. Surely the least that you can demand in return is that your earnings should not be wrung from you by unjust laws, and that you should be allowed to enjoy undividedly the fruits of your unremitting toil.

IT IS FOR YOU TO DECIDE, AND TO ENFORCE YOUR DECISION.

Appendix.

In order to ensure all possible accuracy in the estimate of the yearly expenditure of the American farmers and their families, the writer printed and distributed among those persons whom he deemed most competent to judge, fifty copies of the following memorandum:—

"Estimate of Expenditure in America.

"It would greatly assist the undersigned in the completion of a little work on which he is engaged if you would kindly give him the best estimate in your power in relation to the following subject.

"By the census of 1870 there were in the United States of America, out of a population of 38,600,000, a total of 12,506,000 persons engaged in various occupations. Of these 5,922,000 were engaged in agriculture, which number has by this time (1880) increased to at least 7,000,000.

"An estimate is wanted of the average annual expenditure of each of these 7,000,000 persons (most of whom have families) on all articles of consumption, except eatables and drinkables. Those articles would comprise every description of clothing, household ware, tools, agricultural implements, railway conveyance, &c. &c.

"Of course, strict accuracy is unattainable, and all calculations must necessarily be conjectural and approximative.

"It may be noted—

• That by 'agriculturists' are meant, not only the cereal farmers, but the producers of all articles derived from the soil, whether grain or cotton, meat or tobacco, &c. &c.

• That there are in the United States 2,600,000 farmers, who, most of them, own the soil which they till, and whose annual expenditure must be considerable.

• That the wages of farm labourers in the North and West range, (see an article in the Times of 26th August, 1879) from $19 69c. monthly ($236 per annum) to $38 22c. monthly ($458 per annum). In the South, under the competition of negro labour, wages are only $15 monthly ($180 per annum).

• That, as food and lodging cost the farmers and labourers but little, most of their expenditure falls on the articles of consumption comprised in this inquiry. The question therefore is, 'What is the average yearly expenditure, on such articles, of each of those 7,000,000 persons in the United States of America, who are engaged in agricultural pursuits, some of whom are single, but most of whom have families?' It will be esteemed a favour if you will address a communication at your earliest convenience to

"A. Mongredien,

"Author of 'Free Trade and English Commerce.'

FOREST HILL, NEAR LONDON.

"8th March, 1880."

The answers received (and they were not many) ranged from $150 per annum up to $5 per week ($260 per annum). In the work we have taken $200 as a fair mean. But, even upon the lowest estimate the sum is so vast, that it really matters very little which valuation is adopted. If any reader thinks that $200 per annum is too high an estimate let him boldly strike off 25 per cent., and the balance will still be found amply large enough to justify all our conclusions.

For our American statistics we are chiefly indebted to that valuable compilation, "The American Almanack for 1879," by Mr. A. R. Spofford, to which we beg to refer those who may doubt the accuracy of our figures.
The Proletariat and the Land.

The Proletaire.

By far the largest part of the English people is born in the ranks of the proletariat. The proletaire is a man without a recognised right to an honorable livelihood. He has no legal claim to anything except poor relief. He finds all the material wealth of his native country bespoken, so that he has no opportunity of laboring on his own behalf. No one is required to employ him, or to give him a yard of standing-ground. He may not obstruct the highways, dead or alive. The very seas are appropriated for fisheries. He cannot die in a ditch without trespass. But for the union, that immoral institution so exactly fitted to cast unjust reproach on honest want and to encourage profligacy, he would be legally bound to annihilate himself or vanish when not wanted as a drudge. As Malthus says, he must take himself away; but by what chemical process ought he to evaporate himself? Good Queen Bess hung her surplus subjects, understanding that they required to be provided for; the Roman Caesars fed the Roman plebs at the cost of the provinces; the Catholic Church sanctifies mendicancy; other societies have practised abortion or infanticide, while Plato and Aristotle, both of whom have been all but canonised by the Christian Church, proposed to regulate child-bearing. It is a peculiarity of the modern Protestant, on the most vital questions, to have no policy, and not to see the need of one, while a school of economists has actually formulated a science of imbecility. Accordingly, the well-fed philosopher pats his fat stomach after dinner, and, having mumbled through his catechism of supply and demand, thinks he may consign the starving to oblivion.

Competition.

In speaking of the proletariat it is a common disingenuous trick to class or name together the ignorant, idle, and incapable, as if those adjectives were synonymous, or little more than merely complementary. Far from that, no fact more urgently demands the attention of just men than that a defect of nature or the fault of others may easily entail upon a proletaire precisely the same suffering, want, and degradation as his own vice, or idleness, or folly.

The inferior or less able man, in piteous plight, is cheered on by Manchester, Mr. Smiles, author of "Self-help," and the Gospel of the Almighty Dollar. He must have a becoming pride. He must engage in a free field of competition, and take his fair chance with the rest. The trouble is that he has no chance to take, there being no chance at all about the matter. Visit a race-course where two horses of known and tried capacities contend for the same stakes, the one swift and the other slow, and try to back the swift horse. You cannot do it upon any terms. Any odds bar one! So bawl the book-makers. Such is the slang of the trade. Just so when a dull man and a smart man compete, the smart man's victory is assured. Philosophically there may be room for doubt, but the discomfiture of the dull man has that high degree of probability which is vulgarly called certainty. However, the idea is that, as the saying goes, the world is wide and there is room for all; but there lies the fatal error. It is only in the best of times that there is room for all. Perhaps there may not generally be a very large percentage of hands out of employ, but there is usually a larger increment upon insufficient wages. At any rate, it is a ghastly fact that numbers of people annually perish of starvation. That such is the case may easily be proved. For instance, a severe winter always largely augments the death-rate, yet bright frosty weather is
healthy for the well-fed and well-clad classes. Were it not for this circumstance, that multitudes of men prefer
depth to degradation, State poor relief would be impossible.

If hard be the lot of the inferior man, much worse is that of the inferior woman. The poor girl without
advantages, what a prospect is hers! She is to be crucified between two thieves. She must either marry any sot
or ruffian who gives her the opportunity, or else commit herself to the tender mercies of a mill-owner, who will
treat her as the knackers do old horses—work her to death in order to line his own pockets. It needs not to be
said that girls of the most delicate age are often wholly unfit for severe and wearing drudgery.

THREE POLITICAL, AXIOMS.

It is an axiom in America: "No taxation without representation." The propriety of the converse seems
equally clear: "No representation without taxation." But there is a third, which strikes me as being more
axiomatic in a free State than either of the others—namely, "No adult without property."

If this could be effected, if all could thus be placed upon an equal footing, then the most proper and
convenient of all taxes would be a poll-tax. A poll-tax as a variable tax would be the best of all guarantees of
the public economy, and it would in a manner compel everyone of common ambition to acquire a knowledge of
State affairs such as every citizen should possess. Public business would be dragged into the daylight. Indirect
taxation has not these advantages, and yet it may press quite as burden somely on the poor, or more so, besides
which it contravenes the principle of Free Trade, and complicates business.

Mr. Greg has proposed to levy a poll-tax on proletaires. The proposal is no less ludicrous than wicked. It is
squeezing the dry sponge or else leasing the atmosphere. People who read the Liberator sometimes supposed
that Garrison was a negro. No one, from reading Mr. Greg, would take him for a proletaire.

The proprietary classes are always justly called the Conservative and order-loving classes. I shall submit for
the reader's consideration whether that supernumerary inhabitant of a State, that pariah, that proletaire, or that
one who, for whatever reason, loves not order and finds no interest therein, be not one man too many in that
State.?

PROPERTY.

It is a commonplace that all wealth consists of two ingredients—the material of it and the labor put into it.
Of course, no one can make or create any material; and, although a person may discover, or appropriate, or
manipulate, or alter the form of it, making it by such means more serviceable, or, if it be land, may plough, or
plant, or fence it, or if a new region may plant a flagstaff on it, and thereby may lay claim to have earned or
won it; yet it certainly is not apparent that society, whether the Republic of nations or a particular State, is in
any manner bound to admit such a claim in all cases indiscriminately, or to concede the exercise of such a
privilege to persons without limit or restriction, and, in fact, no State or society ever did so. It does not appear
 equitable for a person to take advantage of either chance or skill or any sort of capacity in order to possess
himself of more than his fair, even share of the material of production, any more than it is equitable to use force
for the same purpose; and violent robbery is just as natural as any other mode of selfishness, nor is it more
painful to the victims of it.

Wealth gets apportioned among the citizens of a State in this wise. In the scrimmage of half-barbarous
times, or, later, through the diverse operation of talent or of fortune, A secures 10, B 20. But A's offspring A
inherits A's 10, whereas B's offspring B inherit of B's 20 only 5 each. Passing to the tenth generation, 50 A10
have each 100, but they are imbecile; 200 B10 have 0, but they are capable, while 40 C10 inherit debts, vicious
moral, and diseased constitutions (enough for all); 50 D10 have 100 each like the A's, but they are capable; but
50 E10 are rich, imbecile, and vicious. And so we find wealth with and without capacity or merit, and vice versa
in every degree and variety. At this point the rich ask with Cain: "Are we our brother's keeper?" The reply
is doubly yes, both in righteousness and from the necessity of the social state. To let a man die is as wicked as
to kill him, and often more injurious both to him and to the republic. The blood of Lazarus is on the head of
Dives, who will find his hell hot enough in French revolutions, etc.

In all ancient States, including Greece and Rome, during their palmiest days, the right—the sacred
right—of practising infanticide was universally recognised, and surely nothing could strike one as more natural
than the claim of people to do as they will with their own. The prohibition of infanticide may be described as an
extremely violent, revolutionary, Democratic, one may almost say incendiary, and assuredly hazardous, piece
of legislation. By forbidding infanticide, the modern State virtually recognises in the child an independent claim
to life; and this seems to include or to imply a claim to some property, or, in some way, to means of
subsistence, or the opportunity of laboring for its own maintenance. One might even say that the two things
were identical. He who has not this, independently of anyone's convenience, caprice, or will, is a real slave. Far
LANDLORDS.

Nearly all the lands of England, though not of Ireland or the Highlands, were got by violence by the Normans and appropriated by the barons, save and except some common lands, which have since been grievously encroached upon, and were held for centuries under the feudal tenure under the feudal Norman Kings, and a large proportion of them are still possessed by the lineal descendants or the direct heirs of those adventurers. The nature of the feudal tenure was this: The baron owed military and civil service to his liege-lord, and his relation to his serfs or tenants was somewhat analogous to that of the sovereign to his vassals and his subjects. That is, as has been said of the sovereign, he possessed a vast but undefined prerogative. Vast, undefined, and inconstant was that prerogative, yet was it never absolute in the one case more than in the other. Moreover, the baron's post was no sinecure. He was a real ruler of his serfs and a real servant of the King and of the State, active enough in both capacities, no figure-head, but indispensable to the machinery of government. Above all, it was the baron's well-recognised business to keep his serfs upon his estate, and not by any means to turn them off it. These are the very facts upon which Carlyle and Froude have always insisted for their own purposes. But gradually the law has been utterly revolutionised, in an extraordinary manner. The landlord has been relieved of all his burdens, and his most dangerous privileges have been confirmed or enlarged. To such an extent has this been carried that a modern landlord, although perhaps no könig (no cunning man), no dux (no duke or leader), but a poor creature emasculated by ennui, is able to enforce claims by the aid of State-paid police which Warwick the King-maker would not have dared to speak of. The maddest Asian despot was never yet so mad as to propose to turn his subjects adrift upon the seas, yet this very thing has been done in Ireland and the Highlands with every circumstance of cruelty. Shall I say with the Spanish Jesuit Mariana that such a man should be shot down like a wolf? No; all Bibles, all churches, all ages, nations, races, and men of all persuasions, parties, characters, conditions, and in the list a long catalogue of Israelites, beginning with Moses and ending with Lord Beaconsfield, have approved tyrannicide, but I shall not commit myself so far. Yet almost any one of high courage is capable of this deed, and it is something to be calculated upon, an appropriate consequence of given causes.

With what new wine must a man have made himself intoxicated even to conceive the idea of disposing of a county in the same irresponsible manner as a yard of calico? The outrage is more enormous than slavery itself. "France, that is I," said the Grand Monarch, and we call that a very utterance of lunacy. Yet precisely the same sentiment in our landed gentry is applauded by the capitalist press. What sheer heartless mockery to congratulate a man on possessing the priceless boon of liberty, when he has no assurance of the roof which shelters him or the ground whereon he treads! Well might the evicted Irish cottier cry, with as natural pathos as the persecuted Jew, "Nay, take my life too, spare not that."

The memory of those wrongs is not going to be forgotten. It is being handed down as an heirloom from the fathers to the sons. I heard Burke, the Fenian, speak in the Boston Music Hall. The house was crowded with Irish Americans, from the boy who had scarcely well learned how to hate to the wrinkled man who had spent fourscore years in learning it. Burke is a rude fanatic, but true as steel to the marrow of his bones; and when he spoke of Ireland's wrongs, her sorrows and her hopes, the house rang with applause straight from warm Irish hearts. It sounded in mine ears like this: "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning." Take the first steamer or train of cars anywhere, and go along until you stop. That is the place to find an Irishman. Alas, not unothen he is emerging from a whisky saloon, and all too ready to drink your honor's health to the detriment of his own. Yet good father Mathew labored not in vain; he was worth O'Connell and O'Brien rolled in one. There, too, in the same town with Pat is the ubiquitous Biddy, with her ingenious blunders and occasional naïve repartees. A devout Catholic is she, and confessor of terrible sins to the honest priest, whose portrait she treasures in her sanctum sanctorum, but her sons will be more Irish than religious. Scattered through many parts of Europe, in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and the United States, and almost everywhere stationed with the Queen's troops, are the Irish, and they have sucked in treason with their mother's milk, and the tale of that long agony is not concluded, and the seven centuries' drama is not played out yet.

Now, if a less must be sacrificed for a greater, or a worse for a better, let it be done, of course. It is expedient that one man should die for the people. I have nothing to say against Carlyle's figure of the starved rat, only it does not here apply, for Ireland, though starved enough, is not a rat. An intelligent perusal of Irish history affords no warrant for believing that the Irish belong to an inferior stock.

To return from this digression, since the form of our monarchy has undergone a change, it might have seemed appropriate that our land laws should likewise have been remodelled conformably to the principles of 1688—at the least, that some check should have been put upon landlord rapacity. According to Whig principles, a land ruler would deserve a liberal salary, like a constitutional king. But the principles of 1688 were
aristocratic. Suppose the people should elect to have a Democratical land law and a Democratical government too?

GAME.

With what words shall we describe the battue? What language can sufficiently condemn it? Compare the scandalous waste which it entails and the other mischiefs of it with the paltry nature of the offset in pleasure and the fewness of those who share it. And what a sport it is! Not to object to it on the score of refinement or humanity, the preserve is surely no school of many qualities. The Nimrod who rides to the hot corner on a hundred-guinea shooting-cob, and slakes his thirst with champagne cup, can hardly be thought to be cultivating an aptitude for hardship. And if murder must still remain one of the fine arts, why not practise shooting at targets and glass balls?

Sportsmen occasionally have the coolness to remind us that hares and pheasants are edible, just like beef and mutton. The reply is, that when sheep and oxen are left to scamper harum-scarum across country we may discuss the point. Meanwhile it is unnecessary. Suppose a club of schoolboys should insist on having rats preserved in the city granaries for sporting purposes? I dare say rat-flesh would make delicious ragouts. Certain Highland lords have depastured whole mountains in order to convert them into deer forests. Doubtless they have a plausible apology. They have obeyed the doctrines of Ricardo. Those districts would fetch more rent in forest than in pasturage.

Now, mankind is deeply indebted to Adam Smith, but it is less indebted to Adam Smith's disciples, for some of these latter, being men of acute but narrow understandings, have adopted that cheap device for simplifying things on paper; they have laid down as absolute rules, rules which are subject to considerable exceptions. For instance, they have laid down the lust of greed as the master-passion of the soul, always to be reckoned on; and, furthermore, that its free play always best subserves the public weal, whereas, to go no farther, the behavior of game-preservers in the low countries, and again on the Highlands, respectively, disproves both these theories.

Now, the depasturing of a mountain involves, if nothing else, the banishing and virtual and real expatriation of numerous families, because the Highlander's true fatherland is not Great Britain, nor even Scotland, but his own locality. To the town-dweller, to the young, strong, rich, or book-learned, society everywhere extends a welcome, and everywhere is home. Not so to the worn-out Highland cottier. Within the glen where his fathers have been nurtured since long ere the days of Wallace are gathered the memories which give life charm and sanctity for him. Yet all this protects him not against the Philistinism of a partial culture, nor does the white flower which marks extreme old age. He is turned out that cockneys may shoot grouse, and as he goes he says: "Surely the bitterness of death is past."

In denouncing game, I plead not for the poacher. Whether poachers, as a class, differ much morally from other criminals is extremely doubtful, and the nonsensical notion that game belongs to anyone because it is wild is purely mischievous. The Legislature is abundantly competent to pass any game or fishery laws which may appear judicious, and no Dick or Harry has any God-given claim to lead a riff-raff life.

LAND.

Now that landowning has been in practice substituted for land-ruling, the purpose of entail and primogeniture no longer exists. Failing more radical remedies, they should be abolished, together with distress and hypothec, which have no raison d'être except sheer favoritism. But if this were done, and even if trade in land could be made free (which does not seem very feasible), that would not solve the land problem. The danger of landowning lies here: Land can be bought for a twenty-five to thirty-five years' purchase—that is to say, for the value of the usufruct of the land for the space of a generation. The after-consequences are not thought of or cared for by anyone. Posterity is left to protect itself, which means left to fight with its hands tied. The same thing is true of all property, only the injury in other cases is both less apparent and also far less considerable.

Undoubtedly the nationalisation of the land could be effected legally, since, in theory, all estates in land are still held of the Crown for the public service, and subject to conditions which may be altered in any manner which the exigencies of the times demand, nor would there be any hardship in the exercise of this prerogative, inasmuch as inheritors and purchasers of estates have always well understood upon what terms they held them, and that landowning is something unknown to the English law. It would not be necessary to buy the land from the present holders, since it was never theirs, but only to provide them with handsome pensions. When or how a landlord acquired his estates does not affect the question. Any way, he holds them according to the law, and with the attendant risks. At the same time it might be well to buy up the smaller estates at market rates and to
compromise with the larger holders. Truly the men of this generation are not answerable for the sins of all their predecessors, whether or no their predecessors have likewise been their forefathers, and a revengeful policy towards them would be no less irrational than wicked. But before any steps at all are taken there is urgent need of deliberation. I am no advocate for shooting Niagara.

The Irish under the Brehon code and the Scottish Highland clansmen held their lands in common, and the ryots of Hindustan held their lands immediately of the sovereign, subject, however, to the government or superintendence of the zemindars, a species of hereditary officials, and at a fixed quit-rent, until John Bull, playing the part of Providence, and with a truly god-like recklessness, deprived those poor peoples of their immemorial rights. There have also been a good many other instances of lands having been held in common, or upon a more or less communal basis. Yet in no very highly advanced state has the land been nationalised. It were idle to deny, therefore, that the question is surrounded with difficulties, and demands the highest statesmanship to solve it.

The most salient features of the existing situation may be briefly summarised. The poorest land in England, which can grow wheat or grain as cheaply as it can be sent from America or the Black Sea or Baltic ports, now does so rent-free, and lands of better quality are rented, and the amount of the rentals is partly determined by the law of supply and demand, yet not so much so as the price of common articles of merchandise, by reason of some disturbing causes, by far the most operative among which is this, that many landlords lease their farms to old tenants at much below a market price. This is a common custom, and it proceeds from the worthiest motives, for the landed gentry are by no means bad men as men go. But the cheapening of transport rates always tends to throw the poorer lands of old countries out of cultivation, and to reduce the rents of other lands, and this is precisely what is now taking place, and in the circumstances it inevitably must take place under any system of holdings. It is not the result of the land laws of either England or America. I urge this with some insistence, because it is very mischievous to make random accusations easily shown to be unwarrantable. The speculative farmer is no more aggrieved by paying rent than is the manufacturer by paying usury or rent for houses, or mills, or machinery, or anything else. The aggrieved party, if any, is the public. Of course, the rent-rolls of the gentry are not lost to the country, except in cases of absenteeism, but they are often wastefully or viciously expended, as upon horses, hounds, game and gamekeepers, lacqueys, and retainers, many of them unworthy beings and all of them non-producers. But the worst mischief is that the gentry are possessed of a dangerous power, social and political, and that estates are often badly administered.

America can teach England nothing on the land question. The conditions of the two countries are too dissimilar. And not only so, but trouble is already brewing in America notwithstanding her broad, rich territory. Large estates are growing up on terms of irresponsible ownership, and the U.P.R. Company owns a territory of fertile soil larger than France. What a power in the hands of one corporation! What may not this one day lead to? Much more is to be learned from a study of the land systems of the Continent. If the land were national property, taxation could be discontinued, and the Treasury would still be in receipt of a large annual surplus revenue, incredible as that sounds. That, however, could hardly be embarrassing. Failing other resorts, the Government might constitute itself a gigantic loan society. As to the land, the most suitable plan would seem to be to let it upon long or life leases, with judicious guarantees for the preservation of the soil in good order. If it could be let to capitalists of the Mechi stamp it would probably yield much-improved returns in crops, but the laborer's lot might not be immediately ameliorated. If let to peasants the crop yield would again be good, though not so good. Co-operative farming would be the hopefullest arrangement if it could once be got fairly under weigh. Further experimentation in this line were much to be desired.

What is most essential is to organise a system which shall produce or favor a high morale in the cultivators. Michelet describes the French peasant's passion for the soil, which he compares to love for its intensity. This is excellent indeed, but I am persuaded that landowning is not necessary to the sentiment. I have known tenant-farmers, and even day laborers, inspired by a like enthusiasm and devotion to the art. Many a leisure Sunday, true Sabbath, have I stood in such society, as Michelet pictures his model peasant, absorbed in worship of the goddess Ceres, nor have I seen such men to be less prone than Michelet's peasant to cast aside the offending weed or stone, regardless of clean clothes, nor have these been among the least moral occasions of my experience. Peasant proprietorship sharply severs the people in a dangerous manner, creating a conservative class, not too fertile in ideas, and an outside aggressive class, blown about with every wind of doctrine. This double evil undeniably exists in France, although the French proletariat is growing soberer and wiser every year, and the French peasant possesses some most admirable qualities. Napoleon's trust was in the peasantry.

**Laissez Faire.**

There are three sharply distinguished systems of government theoretically advocated, the paternal, the Social Democratic, and the police, Manchester or *laissez faire* systems. According to the first of these the
people is to be governed; according to the second the people is to govern itself; according to the third all
government is to be dispensed with, except for the protection of persons and property. The paternal government
has been often tried, and with very varying degrees of success, but its faults are obvious, grievous, radical,
incurable, above all its hopelessly non-progressive character. The Social Democratic form of society has never
existed except on a small scale, and under special conditions not generally attainable. The police government
has never been tried, nor could such a government, or no-government, be suffered to exist even by way of
experiment, Herbert Spencer to the contrary notwithstanding. The most advanced states have always had some
mixed form of government hitherto, and it may be possible that a mixed government is the best in some cases,
or even in all cases. One thing at least is clear. Every government must distribute, as well as protect, property,
and do much else beside. The ridiculous imbecility of laissez faire is well illustrated by the land problem.

**Virgin Soil.**

It is a pretty prevalent delusion that so long as plenty of unused ground remains anywhere there need be no
distress among the poor. But the trouble is that the very people who are recommended to emigrate to those
distant regions cannot get there, and, what is more, if they were taken there they would forthwith wish
themselves back again. Weaklings are at a discount among the pioneers.

The real worth of new lands to a country is moral rather than material. Amid the vast solitudes of those
broad, silent plains, where the buffalo and the antelope stilt range, in many a little turf house, almost as obscure
as the burrows of the prairie dogs, there is growing up a lot of shoeless, ragged boys and girls whose spirits and
whose minds are free.

What a career it is, that of the frontier man! He grapples with a very Cerberus, and chokes him throat by
throat. Ere the day dawns he sallies forth, not to return till dark, with axe on shoulder, to hew himself a clearing
in the bush. At home remains the wife, with or without young children. This is a brave woman. She cannot (that
with her next-door neighbor forty miles off, having no telephone; she has for company the racoons and owls, or
now and then a bear. There reigns the silence of the grave; all is hushed in a primeval slumber; to borrow a
figure from another sense, it is a very stillness audible, save when Jove's thunder reverberates like untold
artillery, or when the tornado in its furious race tears down the giants of the woods. The bush is liable to catch
fire and sweep all away; the savages may descend blooded from their internecine wars; or, when with painful
toil the man has raised a first patch of maize or buckwheat, the blight may strike it just before the harvest, and
the gaunt wolf of famine may show his grim visage on the threshold. Solitude, want, desolation, doubt and
danger, five horrors, hem in this lonely pair, but they are self-dependent. Lean hunger's shadow dims their path,
but there is no repining, nor submission, baser; no prayer to heaven; no charity blankets; no lady bountiful with
condescension broth. What a morale is theirs, and what high hearts expand beneath their tattered clothes!

It is there, if anywhere, that a pure Democracy may be developed. There are no drudges broke loose and
stirred by greed and envy, but sober people with sense of dignity, thirst of knowledge, and the idea of
responsibility. There is no caste, and therefore no place for demagoguism. There is not much done, but there
exists the raw material of a great society. A new growth and a new morale may be hoped for, and I think
expected. In a new world, where taste and culture shall flourish in the absence of caste, a new type of Democrat
may arise who would have charmed and converted Tocqueville, most generous yet most hypercritical of
aristocrats. And there, it may be, in that far Western land, where Berkeley saw such hope, there is now in the
process of formation a Social Democratic Republic.

**The Illogical Imaginativeness of Ireland.**

In a letter to the *National Reformer*, of January 4th, 1880, Mr. L'Estrange attempts to throw the blame of
the chronic distress in Ireland upon Irish improvidence and priestly morality. The Celtic race is certainly not
naturally improvident, for the French are provident to a fault, and so, too, are the Irish frequently out of their
own country. On the other hand, the influence of Catholicism upon social morals is unquestionably the worst
imaginable, since the Church blesses what reason holds accurst—*i.e.*, the reckless multiplication of the people
and professional mendicancy. It is not true, however, that Ireland was ever too densely peopled. On the
contrary, as Mr. M. S. Crawford, in a sensibly-written letter to the *Times* of December 26th, 1879, states that
while Guernsey curiously resembles Ireland in soil and climate, and natural products, Guernsey with a
superficial area of 10,000 acres supports a population of 30,000, Ireland with an area of 15,550,000 acres has
only a population of 5,500,000. That is to say that Ireland, peopled at the same rate as Guernsey, would have a
population of 45,000,000. The truth is that the population question has really never affected Ireland, because, as
the Abbé Perraud justly urges, in his "Etudes sur l'Irlande Contemporaine," the reduction of population—the
removal of "overstock" tenancy can afford no permanent relief against the evils of rack-renting accompanied with absenteeism; and Mill expresses the same opinion in his "Political Economy." Now if this opinion of Mill's and Perraud's, shared by several French and German critics and economists, be correct, it should seem that what the Times calls the illogical imaginativeness of Ireland may after all have some basis in logic and in fact. Let us see.

The English landed system is in theory so entirely monstrous that foreigners are often at a loss to comprehend it; and what it is in theory in England it is in fact in Ireland. The landlord may wring as much rent as he can obtain from the necessities of his tenants, it may be half or two-thirds of the gross value of the produce of the soil, an amount not always determined by the law of supply and demand, but sometimes by the tenant's affection, amounting to a passion, for his old home stored with priceless souvenirs. This vast pile of wealth, extracted perhaps from many square leagues of fertile territory, the landlord may carry away to Dublin, or Edinburgh, or Paris, or London, or Baden-Baden, or the Antipodes, and there, if he likes, he may squander it in gambling or debauchery, or in the search for the philosopher's stone. Whilst in his boyhood the dazzling prospect of this enormous privilege may be held before his eyes, and he can borrow money on the strength of it. It seems important to inquire whether there be any guarantee that this man shall be superior to his fellows, or if at the least there be a strong probability that he shall not be inferior to the average, because it is ill trusting to the wisdom of one who is not very unlikely to turn out a fool, and to the integrity of one who is not very unlikely to turn out a knave. Yet the actual case is worse, since it has always been a common-place of orthodox moralists that great wealth is corruptive. Behind him the absentee landlord leaves an agent who may or may not be prompted by motives of interest or of philanthropy to study to promote the well-being of the tenants and the improvement of the estate, but who has one sole recognised duty—namely, to obtain a proper rent for his employer. And what is a proper rent? As much as possible.

In England many circumstances prevent this law from working its most fatal effects, but it is not difficult to see what must be the consequences of it in a country where absenteeism is common, and where the landlords are generally out of sympathy with the tenants; and to say that this is true of Ireland is to keep within the mark—it is more than true. With a peasantry passionately attached to the soil, and having scarcely any resource except the land, and an alien aristocracy under no legal obligations to them, and able to play upon their passions and their needs in order to rack-rent them up to starvation level, but one result can follow. The thing is plain enough on paper, but it has been illustrated elsewhere than on paper.

Let this fact be published to the world and let men judge of it. At that time when the Irish were perishing by thousands of hunger and dysentery, and when Irishmen were being shot and bayonetted because they made the mistake of thinking that the produce of Irish labor and of Irish land ought to belong to Ireland; when the crowbar brigade were on their devil's errand, and the old, and the young, and the feeble, and women with infants at the breast, were sleeping their last cold sleep on the lea side of Irish haystacks and hedges, because the old roof tree was being hewn down by the profane hands of alien mercenaries, then, at that time, the Irish peasantry were raising with the sweat of their own brows on their own mother soil, oats and wheat; and native sheep and cattle were being tended with Irish care upon fat Irish pastures, a store of food consisting of the best of oatmeal and wheaten flour and the top quality of beef, and mutton, and pork and dairy produce was being created solely at Ireland's cost sufficient to have maintained the whole Irish people in super abounding plenty. Where did the food go? To England. In exchange for other merchandise? No! In exchange for the rentals of the absentee which were being abstracted from Ireland to the amount of more than five millions of money per annum. And most of this hoard of wealth was being paid over into the hands of men who are not Irishmen, nor who—nor their fathers before them—had ever given a quid, pro quo for any of it, had ever done a hand's turn for Ireland.

The harvest of cereals in 1846, worst year of the scourge, was splendid, but, remarkably enough, the cereals are not considered as food by the Irish, and the exports of that season were equal to the average. After noticing these very striking circumstances and giving the figures of the exports, says Gustave de Beaumont in his "L'Irlande Sociale, Politique et Religieuse:" "Il est done rigoureusement vrai de dire que la population Irlandaise peut mourir de faim an sein de la plus grande abondance."

What wonder now if agrarian crime be rampant! What wonder if to some impassioned souls the hate of England has become an infatuation, a religion!

I refrain from some historical criticisms suggested by Mr. L'Estrange's letter, which would be very easy, but which would occupy too much space in the present busy crisis.

The metayer system of holdings, which Mr. L'Estrange recommends at the end of his letter, might answer in Ireland; but it would never do in England, because it ignores the claims of the urban and mining populations and also of the farm laborers.
The Lands Of Ireland.

THE MEMORIES OF THE PAST.

There has been a famine in Ireland, and after the famine sedition, and now we are resorting to coercive measures. This is not a new experience in Ireland. On the contrary, there has always been a dismal uniformity in the past relations of England and her subject country; and a subject country Ireland is, for never at any time has she endured the English yoke otherwise than as the felon bears his fetters. Ireland hungered, she starved, not because she is poor in resources, but because her heart's blood is being sucked by England. Ireland murmurs and resists, then we English coerce, and afterwards concede a little with a bad grace, and get no thanks, as surely we do not deserve them. Now might it not be worth England's while, for the sake of her own credit and her own material interest, to incur some preliminary expense in order to convert Ireland from a source of constant confusion, weakness, and disgrace into a prosperous neighbor with whom she might drive a profitable commerce? The thing could be done—there is no doubt whatever about that—only it would cost money. Money it would cost. One cannot hope very often to obtain what is worth a great deal for little or nothing. People who promise that are, usually speaking, quacks. But by incurring an expense, not exceeding what we are able to afford, we might spare the Irish much undeserved suffering, if that counts for anything, and obtain for ourselves much glory, if that counts for anything; but over and above all that, which is no doubt difficult to estimate in pounds and shillings, we could get back our own again in the shape of material wealth, full measure, brimming over. There is nothing in the physical characteristics or geographical situation of Ireland, or in the temper of her people, to prevent her from becoming a large producing country, and the best of neighbors to us.

There are evidently three points of view from whence to regard the Irish problem: the Irish, the English, and the foreign. The two first-named are necessarily prejudiced in opposite directions; the third may be, but need not be, ignorant. Now it is mark worthy, though by no means strange, that Englishmen—almost all of them—see the problem in one light, and foreigners in another. Englishmen are generally ready to acknowledge that Ireland has her grievances, but they fail to see, what foreigners almost always see, that Ireland has not so much grievances as a grievance, insomuch that to do everything for Ireland excepting one thing, and to leave that undone, were as good as doing nothing. I was never but once in Ireland, many years ago when a boy; but I remember the response of a Dublin policeman to a query of my companion's: "That, sir! that's the bank, sir; that's where we kept the money when we had it." Aye, but when one has not got it. Why then, to be sure, one needs no bank, as the farmer having no crops requires no granaries. A great convenience, sans doute. Methinks I find occasion for gratitude. So evident is the real state of the case to foreigners that even religious prejudice does not blind them to it. The Abbé Perraud, fervent Catholic as he was, writing in 1861, naturally denounces the established church, yet he does not regard that as the grievance of Ireland, nor does he for a moment suppose that disestablished would much allay the general discontent. Now we have tried tinkering legislation for Ireland, and it never avails anything. Unless, therefore, we are prepared to resort to a radical remedy we must expect the future of Ireland to be what the past has been. Hunger and discontent will reign there, only alternated with famines, accompanied with rioting and agrarian crime; and whenever England is in difficulties there will be rebellions, and all these riots and rebellions will have to be quenched with blood, and for all this cost of life and treasure we shall have nothing at all to show; we shall be in the same situation after it as we were before, we shall not have advanced an inch towards pacifying Ireland. We must make ready to meet the same emergencies by the same means again and again continually, unless accident should accomplish for us what our own wit has failed in doing.

Nothing can be more inconsequent, nor yet more superfluous, than to attribute the woes of Ireland and the vices of the Irish to the inherent tendencies of the Celt. The objections to this explanation are manifold. The Irish often reform with surprising celerity when they emigrate. The Teutons of Ulster very generally exhibit the same faults as the old Irish, and sink into the same misery when under the same territorial regime, and similar causes have led to similar results in different parts of the Continent, as anyone with a knowledge of human nature might have anticipated. And lastly, the people of the Scottish Highlands, of Wales, of the south-western counties, of the Channel Islands, and of some of the most flourishing departments of France, are all of them Celts, like the Irish, and yet the last two named, at any rate, are not only exempt from the special failings of the Irish, but they are even remarkable for the opposite virtues. The citizen virtues are not the growth of a day, and the Irish cottier of the past has had no more inducement to practice those virtues nor opportunity to cultivate them than a Negro on the Savannas, nay, he has actually had less.

The man who dares not wear a decent coat lest his rent should be increased, to what end should he do
anything but snatch any passing pleasure of the hour? Capacity and fidelity will generally win some favors for
the very slave with a hard master, but the thrifty and industrious cottier farmer, at the mercy of a griping middle
man, in a purely agricultural country, has positively no advantage whatsoever over the idle and improvident.
One man tills the soil, another reaps the fruits of all his efforts. Could surer system be devised for demoralising
both? The rule of equity of the code Napoleon, taken from the code of Justinian, *qui ne permet pas de s’
enrichir aux dépens d’autrui*, was absolutely reversed in Ireland prior to the Act of 18G0.

That Irishmen should long to see Ireland, as Robert Emmett said, take her place among the nations, is of
course to be expected, and although the best foreign writers are agreed in regarding the project as impracticable,
yet it seems to me to be against human nature to expect that they ever will relinquish this ambition, nor can I
see why it should not be ultimately gratified. It certainly does not pay England to hold Ireland as a conquered
province; and, on the other hand, an independent Ireland, suffering nothing from England and having no
distrust of her, as she need have none when democratical ideas shall have taken the place of Jingoism, will have
no enmity against England and no inducement to favor a foreign invader, much less could she be so mad as to
contemplate aggression single-handed.

Naturally, Englishmen do not generally think the question worth discussion, or, at any rate, not worth
serious discussion. One Englishman, however, has argued the point through the whole of three long volumes,
and I should think that that argument must be surely, in its way, unique, at least as proceeding from the pen of a
man of superior parts and understanding. Mr. Froude commences his "English in Ireland" by identifying might
and right. After this I do not understand why he should have troubled to write his book, for, upon this view,
every apology must be either superfluous or vain, nor yet do I comprehend the advantage of having two words
to express the same idea. Of course, Mr. Froude's dictum gives the *coupe de grace* to morality as commonly
understood. Undeterred, however, by any of these considerations, Mr. Froude perseveres, and his contention
throughout his book is precisely as follows: We English have now been engaged for upwards of seven centuries
in the attempt to govern Ireland but with almost no success; and during the whole of that very lengthy period,
ever at any time, not for a single decade, a year, six months, scarcely in any individual measure, unless during
the reigns of Henry VIII., Elizabeth and Cromwell, or when we gave ear to the sage counsels of George III.,
have we ever done anything else at all but blunder and tyrannise, tyrannise and blunder. We do not improve; we
do not learn by experience. On the contrary, never have we shown ourselves so conspicuously incompetent as
during the present century. I am stating Mr. Froude's opinion, not my own. And, therefore, argues Mr. Froude,
are we bound to persevere in the attempt, having thus shown our superiority, and, I rather think, likewise from
philanthropical motives. Although, to say truth, Mr. Froude is rather shy of philanthropy. He considers
philanthropy a not ill medicine to be administered at times, but subject to the doctor's orders and in
homeopathic doses. After having hung half the inhabitants and pitch-capped the remainder, a mild dose of
philanthropy, for which they will doubtless have an appetite, may not prove dangerously relaxing to the
pitch-capped survivors, at the least if they be not too papistical or in case there be found ten righteous
Orangemen in the vicinity, and not the shadow of a shade of a priest or a mass-book within forty leagues round.
Certainly Mr. Froude is not singular in his distrust of priests in general, and Catholic priests in particular. He
would find a large following on the Continent. For, with a few exceptions, where priests are known the best,
they are liked the worst. Yet the Irish priests have always been as worthy a body of men with as great merits
and as few faults as is perhaps consistent with the character of any priesthood. Nor is it correct to say that
Catholicism is necessarily a persecuting faith. There have been instances to the contrary. There have been such
upon the Continent, and Ireland herself is such an instance, for although individual Irish Catholics have often
perpetrated shameful outrages upon their religious rivals, yet the Irish Catholics as a body, although they have
had ample opportunity to persecute, have never used it. And Mr. Froude is indiscreet in throwing this charge
against Catholicism, because what is not true of that form of Christianity is true of another, namely, Mr.
grim creed of that dark man, his hands dyed crimson and his soul in shade—wheresoever that creed has been in
power it has invariably shown itself intolerant. Who has not heard of the Blue Laws of Connecticut? whereas,
upon the other hand, it is a fact that Maryland under Catholic rule was the most liberal state in the Union, and
Protestants should blush to know that it was at one time the only state where the Quakers could find a refuge
against Protestant persecution.

Moreover, whatever we may think of the respective merits of Catholicism and Calvinism, of one thing
there can be no question, that persistent and savage persecution of the Irish Catholics has always notably failed
of its purpose. No, it has not failed of its purpose, but only of its pretended purpose. In its genuine designs it has
been eminently successful. It has inflicted a great deal of suffering, and effected a great deal of spoliation. But it
is precisely since we have gradually discontinued that shameful policy—which was never dictated, whatever
Mr. Froude may say, by any statesmanlike considerations, but simply by religious bigotry, hate and greed—it is
precisely since we have discontinued that policy that the reverence of the Irish peasants for their priests has
begun to abate. Who that knows anything of the great English middle class does not know that spirit which has
eaten like a canker into it, and which has rendered and still renders persecution possible in England,
notwithstanding the natural generosity of the people? It is the very spirit of the murderer of Servetus.

Even the very bigots themselves, nowadays, usually attempt to conceal their designs behind some mask. They have not enough audacity openly to advocate religious persecution, but Mr. Froude advocates it in its most unrelenting form; he sticks at nothing, at no violence, at no cruelty, at no measures, however open to exception, and this, not with the excuse of a perverted enthusiasm, but in favor of a creed in which he himself
has no belief whatever. How to account for this strange phenomenon? Well, there are some men with a twist of temper which makes it necessary to them to be conspicuously singular. What to do? Bigotry is always common, and liberality has ceased to be very rare. Accordingly, Mr. Froude must needs strike out for himself a new departure. His choice is ingenious. He selects to combine a philosophical scepticism with the advocacy of the most illiberal measures and the glorification of the most illiberal men. Bigotry, cruelty and impracticable obstinacy—these are among the qualities which recommend a man to the favor of Mr Froude. He has selected for his beau ideal of heroism and sagacity (God save the mark!) George III. He would have chosen M. Jourdain if that worthy gentleman had been historical.

For a criticism of Froude's book, and especially of his manipulation of evidence—which would have done more credit to a smart attorney than to a man of Froude's mental calibre—I must refer the reader to Lecky's "History of England in the Eighteenth Century."

In order to comprehend the ideas and feelings of the Irish, it is necessary to know something of the history of the past, for the poor Irish cottier lives much in the memories of the past, having neither joy in the present nor hope in the future. And it is likewise necessary to know something of the great famine, and, furthermore, to remember what sometimes really appears to be forgotten, that this famine is not an event which took place in the times of Henry the Second, or Elizabeth, or Cromwell, or William of Orange. The men are breathing, feeling, loving, hating in America just now, whose parents, whose wives, whose very children, so recent is it, perished of hunger at that time. Supposably most people have heard something of the famine, something of the ghastly horrors of it, and of the admirable patience of the people. It is customary even among foreign writers to extol England's generosity to Ireland during the famine time. But if anyone have regard to the past relations of the two countries, if anyone bear in mind that England had plundered Ireland of her lands, had robbed her of millions and millions of wealth, had crippled all her resources, paralysed all her industries by a system which Burke bitterly complimented for its vicious perfection, and, furthermore, that England was annually in receipt of more than five millions from Ireland in shape of the rentals of the absentee's, for which Ireland got no quid pro quo in any shape whatever, even until the very year when the famine commenced—if anyone have regard to these considerations, I think that he must pronounce the aid afforded by England to Ireland in the hour of her bitter need (only a little over ten millions), to have been niggardly to a degree beneath contempt, whilst the blundering administration of it really reduced its value below zero. Moreover, England never thought of giving anything except a few paltry thousands until half the mischief was accomplished, until thousands and tens of thousands had died of hunger and the famine fever. But what business has England to speak of charity at all? Never, never in any single year has Ireland been a recipient of England's charity. The balance has always been upon the other side. I am aware that some have argued (what will not some people argue?) that the abstraction of the rentals of the absentee's does no hurt to Ireland; and there was an article in one of the Contemporaries for 1880 in which it was argued, by "an Irish landlord," that at most Ireland could lose no more than the business profits on the money. Into what sort of queer muddle the worthy gentleman had got his brain I cannot tell; but I should think that nothing can be more evident than this, that since all the money leaves Ireland and none ever returns, Ireland loses the gross amount. Once the money has quitted the country, whether it realise cent, per cent, of business profits or be put in an old stocking, is all one to Ireland.

Everyone knows what came of the famine. As usually happens, when the emergency arises, the impossible
was accomplished, and sufficiently to have satisfied Chateaubriand himself. Funds were raised in England, Scotland, and upon the Continent and in America, but chiefly in Ireland, and ship after ship set sail from the ports of Dublin, Belfast, and Queenstown and Liverpool freighted with overstock tenantry. I desire to draw the reader's particular attention to that last phrase. It is taken from an advertisement which used to appear in some of the papers of the time, but it strongly reminds one of the language of a well-known school of economists. Ricardo asks in one of his works: "Providing a country have the same amount of gold and material wealth, what possible difference can it make whether it contain eight or ten million inhabitants?" upon which Sismondi comments with as much truth as wit: "Verily no more is required but to have your king dwell alone on his island and turn a crank to get all his work done." Mill actually endorses Ricardo. It is melancholy to find men accustomed to scientific thought failing to see that it is one thing to enunciate the principle which has acquired the name of Malthusianism, although it was familiar to the ancients, to Aristotle and others, and quite another to ignore, as Malthus did not, the worth of human life. Well, when the string of emigrant ships charged with
overstock humanity reached right across the ocean, and the harbors on both sides were clogged with the famine-stricken, then the *Times* and the *Pall Mall Gazette* threw up their caps and shouted, and Disraeli said in the House of Commons with a leer of satisfaction: "Well, the Irish have now gone with a vengeance." Yes, they had gone. The shores from whence they sailed were lined with their weeping loved ones, and from the ships there sounded a cry and then a curse: "We must go; we must leave you now, but we will come back again."

Our author statesman was never a malevolent man, and I have no doubt that, other things being equal, he would just as lief that the expatriated Irish were waxing rich in the streets of New York and Chicago, Quebec and Montreal, as sizzling upon the Devil's gridiron, or gathering in big ricks of grain and maize upon the fat prairies of Ohio and Illinois, as hungering upon the drear wastes of Connaught. I make mention of the two places where Cromwell recommended the Irish to betake themselves. Connaught in Cromwell's days had not much advantage over hell, its dismal bogs and wilds being better suited as an abode for curlew and grey plover than for human beings. But the desideratum with the large party whose ideas Disraeli voiced was to have got done with Ireland and the Irish. But have we got done with the Irish? On the contrary, with our mislearned political economy and our deliciously naif policy of exporting the tenantry, as one gets rid of overstock hogs or bullocks, we have raised up to ourselves two Irelands in the place of one, a lesser and a greater, a weaker and a stronger; seven millions of Irish in Ireland poor and cowed by tyranny, and eight millions of Irish in America, not so poor and not cowed by the tyranny, and linked in a bond of hate against the English. The incendiarism of Irish incendiaries is milk and water compared with the language of the *Irish World*, the *Irish American*, and several other papers of less ability, but, if possible, still more violence, which are published in the great cities of the States and Canada, and have a wide circulation, and, which, moreover, are read, not with the lukewarm interest of the ordinary newspaper reader, but as one reads a letter from a distant friend.

The modern Irish are patriots. It is not a hereditary quality with them, for they were originally clansmen, and the public spirit of the clansman assumes the form of loyalty to the sept and to the chief, and not of patriotism. But England has linked the modern Irish together by the bond of a common hate. Nay, she has done more. She has shut dog and cat in a cage, and made a happy family of them. Catholic Celt and Protestant Teuton vie with each other, and the Teuton not unoften surpasses the Celt in violence and in devotion. At one time (I know not if the rule be still in force) we were so alarmed by this enthusiasm that we actually would not suffer the children in the schools to learn Scott's fine, savage lines, which thrill one like the Hebrew Psalms—"Breathe there a man with heart so dead"—etc.

And, truly, Irish patriotism, although of late growth, is not a factitious sentiment. Notwithstanding the Scotch colony in Ulster and some infusion of Scotch and of English blood, and a little of French elsewhere, and a very little of Spanish in the West, yet the Irish is, in the main, one distinct Celtic people. It is as truly one people as the Italian is one people, more so than the Polish, much more so than the Hungarian, and far more so than the English is one people. One could not say, changing Defoe's audacious line—"A true-born Irishman's a contradiction."

If a devoted constancy to a failing cause can ever merit our admiration, if we cannot help but join in the spirit of the memorable scene when the loyal soldiers sang, "O Richard! O mon roi! l'univers t'abandonne!" even although it were apropos of so ridiculous a person as Louis XVI., how much rather should we not be able to refuse our sympathy to the stubborn patriot who casts a miserable prudence to the winds and throws in his lot with his people, hurls the gauntlet down to destiny, hopes against hope, and wrestles with despair, like Emmett, O'Brien, Mitchel. Of humbugs like O'Connell, whose big words were sounding bladders, I do not speak.

Philosophers and economists may ridicule patriotism, and call it, like Schopenhauer, "Die thörichte Leidenschaft und die Leidenschaft der Thöre," but statesmen can neither afford to ignore it or to dispense with it, and the generation which has seen Mazzini and which has likewise watched the amalgamation of the Germanic peoples will hardly see the last of the uprisings of nationalities. Few passions stir us more, and there is none more generous to which the vulgar rise than patriotism. Many of the most moving passages in the Hebrew psalms and prophets are patriotic, and there is nothing in the Gospels to surpass "And thou, Jerusalem."

There are plenty of sources of information about the famine crisis, without going to John Mitchel or back numbers of the *Nation*, against whom one need hardly caution the English reader. To mention a few. There are the back numbers of the *Times* and the *Pall Mall Gazette*, and the other chief organs of English public opinion, which may be trusted, at least, not to exaggerate the woes of Ireland. The *Times* had an attack of Liberalism, and averred that the landlords reclaimed their privileges with a grip of iron, and denied their duties with a brow of brass, and so on in the too well-known style, of course overstating the faults of the landlords. Then there are the Parliamentary Debates in "Hansard," especially some remarkable orations by Mr. Macaulay and Lord John Russell, whose zeal for Ireland knew no bounds. Mr. Macaulay denounced English tyranny with adjectives of seven syllables. Those two gentlemen, in fairness one is bound to say, were at that period out of office. Upon the occasion of their coming into office, their thermometers dropped all at once below zero. "Pauperism," an economical work by Mr. Fawcett, contains an account of the famine. Mr. Fawcett was in Ireland during the
famine years as an agent for the ever ready charity of the Quakers. Mr. Trevelyan contributed an article to the *Edinburgh Review* for 1851 upon the famine crisis, full of facts and figures, and since published separately. The Abbé Penauds "Etudes sur l'Irlande Contemporaine" has an account of the famine, and Léonce de Lavergne, the celebrated economist, who died last year, has written of it in his "Economie Rurale de l'Angleterre," and Jules de Lasteyrie, in a long article in the *Rèvue des deux Mondes* for July, 1853.

Traditions handed down from the old days of the Brehon code still exert a marked influence upon the opinions and sentiments of the Irish, nor need we wonder that such should be the case when we remember that Brehon usages were widely prevalent in Ireland even so recently as the reign of James I. Under the Brehon code the lauds were held in common, and the Brehon chieftain, although he might be a violent and rapacious man, was still at the least a man occupying an intelligible status in society, having the necessary business of government to execute, and not, like the modern landlord, a fainéant quartered upon the soil, returning no quid pro quo in any form for the immense revenues which he receives, and having no apparent raison d'etre in the social economy—a thing which, as Mill said, was never contemplated in any well-devised system of land-holding.

However, I will not occupy space with anything more than a mere reference to the Brehon code, because, of course, no legal claims of the present day are traceable back to it, and not O'Connell himself, upon the hill of Tara, would have proposed a return to Brehon institutions.

One sometimes hears the modern land law of Ireland spoken of as a feudal law, but utterly incorrectly. Feudalism was at the least a system, whereas that new-fangled thing, modern landlordism, is devoid of all system. The existing law has been altered, and altered, and altered since feudal days, until in the process it has lost all method and all principle, as is so liable to happen, and especially in a country like Great Britain, where, shameful to say, the law has never been codified." There existed a close analogy between the feudal baron and the feudal king, but no manner of analogy between the feudal baron and a mere owner of personal estate. The baron was not an irresponsible owner of his lands, but he owed services to his liege lord representing the State, and likewise to his serfs. These latter he was sometimes able to shirk, but not always, for his liege would enforce their observance on him. Thus the Irish landholders were several times mulcted in heavy fines for absenteeism by the English kings, and Henry VIII. actually went the whole length of threatening recalcitrant absentees with the confiscation of their estates, nor does it appear to have occurred to anyone that in so doing he had exceeded his rights as liege lord. As was perhaps to be expected, the semi-feudal monarch who aspired with some success to render his government a paternal government, pursued a partially socialistic policy, the very same as has been favored by Irish patriots of later times. Instead of exporting the overstocked tenantry he put a veto on overstock landlords.

Irresponsible ownership of land is no more a feudal principle than it is a Brehon principle. What is it, then? It must have had some paternity. Yes, it is a Manchester principle. But what is Manchester trying to do? Why, Manchester is trying to fit the square block into the round hole. Manchester persists in treating the landed gentry simply as property-holders, but never, either in their own eyes, or in the eyes of others, have they been so regarded. Those sentiments of pride and dignity which still attach to the hereditary possession of the soil, whence have they originated? Beyond all doubt they are associated with government. Those sentiments are proper exclusively to rulers and to the members of a ruling class. A feudal aristocracy which does not govern has no raison d'etre. Well, the English aristocracy was once a feudal aristocracy, but it is so no longer. What has it become? No one can say. It is, as the saying goes, neither fish, flesh, nor fowl. The feudal baron's revenues, however large, were not raised at all upon the principle of renting, but upon the same principle as the sovereign raises his, and if the land laws had been made to square with the principles of 1688, what the modern landlord would have been entitled to would have been simply a liberal salary in return for his public services, so that the English people, having raised expectations in the minds of the landed gentry which ought never to have been raised, is yet bound to gratify those expectations. It must therefore effectuate at its own proper cost, and not at the expense of the aristocracy, any changes in the law which may be judged desirable.

It is idle to say in defence of landlordism that with a model landlord, a model agent, and model tenants the system works tolerably. Despotism itself may not work amiss with a model king, model statesmen, and a model people. In order to work well, landlordism requires qualities in ordinary men which all experience proves that...
ordinary men do not possess. Qualities, moreover, intellectual as well as moral, and qualities which it is not always at a man's option to possess if he even desire it. And, besides, the Irish landlord system does not always work well even under the most favorable conditions. Some of the absentees are personally above all praise. Their absenteeism is simply due to the fact that they have found themselves saddled with conflicting obligations, and they have done the very best which under the circumstances was possible. They have taken a genuine interest in the welfare of the people, and have sunk large sums of money in permanent improvements without charging an extra shilling of rent, although they could have easily obtained it. I am the first to pay a tribute of respect to such men. True, in all this they have simply done their duty; but, then, there are only some men who ever think of doing those duties which they are not compelled to do.

A propos of that last reflexion one sometimes hears it urged as an apology for game that it induces the gentry to reside upon their estates, or at any rate to visit them in the shooting season. Induces them! Should a man be induced to do his duty? Ought he not rather, if possible, be made to do it?

FREE SALE OF LAND.

The measure known as the three F's is aside from the scope of my argument. I will only say of it, therefore, that it is evidently a compromise devoid of all system and all principle, and which can never possibly prove a permanent solution of the Irish problem. But in regard to a fourth F, much spoken of, namely free land—that is to say, the rendering of the sale of land cheap and easy by means of a system of registration, what would result therefrom? The analogy of the Continent seems to show that it would lead to a wide extension of peasant proprietorship. Arguments to the contrary are usually based upon a mistake about the facts, upon the belief, namely, that land of equal quality is generally dearer in Great Britain than upon the Continent, whereas the reverse is true. Mr. Jevons, in the Fortnightly Review, argues that free land would not extend peasant proprietorship in England, because the tendency is for large owners to buy and small owners to sell, and he thinks that increased facilities of sale could no more alter this than large pipes will make water run up hill. At present large landowners are eager buyers of petty parcels of land adjoining their estates; but I believe they are often obliged to buy such parcels at a fancy price, which seems to show that the anxiety is all on one side. It does not appear to me by any means clear that increased facilities of sale, which are all in favor of the small purchaser, as compared with the present law, would not change this state of things. There is no existing class of peasant farmers in England, but with free land such a class might arise, and from the analogy of the Continent it appears as though small buyers will give a better average price for land than large buyers. The obvious advantage of peasant proprietorship, namely, that the peasant works for himself, appears to more than counterbalance, at least in the peasant's own eyes, the equally obvious disadvantages of it. Co-operation may remove or diminish some of the drawbacks of the small farm system, but by no amount of co-operation, short of merging the small farms into large co-operative farms, can the small agricultural capitalist ever rid himself of all or some of the most considerable of those drawbacks.

Regarding the matter from the public stand-point, two questions present themselves, namely, whether peasant proprietorship, supposing it to result from free land, would be an improvement upon the existing system, and, whether it be the best system attainable. To say that peasant proprietors live, and are satisfied, and of merging the small farms into large co-operative farms, can the small agricultural capitalist ever rid himself of peasants superior to farm laborers—granting it to be true—does not dispose of the problem. Statistics show a better return of crops in England than in any country under the small farm system, and this is a head point.

But there is another aspect of the question quite equally important. The peasant proprietor is said by his friends to be a very good citizen. He might be much worse, but he also might be better. He is pretty sure to be to some extent soundly conservative, but he is very likely to be also to some extent unsoundly conservative. The proletarian of Lyons, Paris, and Marseilles will not soon forget that the man of the 2nd of December leaned upon the peasantry. The women of the peasantry are often priest-led, and the men, although seldom very believing, have yet seldom that jealousy of sacerdotalism which is wholesome. As compared with farm laborers generally, peasant proprietors generally are doubtless very intelligent and ambitious. The peasantry of the Swiss Cantons are enthusiastic for education, and grudge neither time nor money for it, an throughout France and Belgium I believe it is appreciated.

But whatever may be the defects or the merits of the peasants themselves—and I am far from having a low opinion of the morally educative advantages of the life—we must always bear in mind that they together with their families will seldom amount to so much as fifty per cent, of the population. Even when towns are fewest there will always be a large class outside, a large unpropertied class. Even in Ireland itself, if all her cottier farmers should be converted into proprietors, there would still be a very large proletariat outside. I believe that it is not generally known how numerous a proletariat class Ireland has. Thus wherever peasant proprietorship prevails the population will be split into two hostile camps. And will the proletariat under this system be any more conservative, or satisfied, or pacific than even under an aristocratic regime? I should rather suppose the
NATIONALISATION OF LAND.

The scheme for nationalising the land meets with but little favor. It may be, however, that even among Radicals the opposition to it, or distrust of it, proceeds more from the inertia of Conservatism than from any reasoned objections to it. The utter strangeness and novelty of the project must be conceded, because of course a government property in land, as it would now have to be constituted, would bear no manner of resemblance to the rude Socialism of half-barbarous times. It must be allowed, however, that if the project be practicable it would possess some very important advantages. 1. It would provide the State with a certain and perpetual source of a very large revenue. 2. It would secure a means whereby the unearned increment in the value of the soil would continually accrue to the public exchequer without trouble. 3. By drawing revenue from the land, it would case the burdens of the poor and afford more hope to them than any other system. 4. It would give more unity to the people than any other system. 5. It would diffuse the prime citizen virtues of ambition and Conservatism more widely among the people than any other system.

The lands of Great Britain have always been public property in the theory of English law. And there has always been some recognition of the fact that the irresponsible and absolute ownership of land is inconsistent with any degree of public liberty, for the plain reason that the land actually is the country. It is the country and it is more beside; it is the sole source of all material wealth. It is evident that a people which should possess all imaginable privileges, except to walk upon the ground and eat the bread which grows on it, would subsist in a condition of slavery the most absolute and the most unqualified. Valuable privilege, indeed, to go where one will and do what one will, providing always that one can compress one's self into no dimensions and subsist upon nothing. Such is the vaunted liberty of the proletariat, the only liberty which the law guarantees him outside the workhouse or the jail. I really wonder that the religious do not think it blasphemy for a man to tread upon the ground and say, "This land is mine;" for a man to say to men, "Ye shall not walk on God's fair earth saving through my permission." It is scarcely a figure of speech that Emile de Lavelaye, in his "Propriété Primitive," calls the soil "La mère nourricière de la race humaine."

To lay claim to be privileged to be idle, useless, even imbecile, and to dispense with the aid of free men, and, notwithstanding all this, to bear despotic sway over broad tracts of fertile country, pastured with cattle, tended by servants or by slaves—this is the last insanity of pride and egoism. It has been attempted at various times, and has always resulted in disaster, but, happily, nothing so disastrous as its own success is possible. It was attempted in the Roman campaign, and was applauded by the elder Cato, a man who has been held up as a pattern of public and private virtues, but who was in fact a hypocrite, and whose humanity we may estimate from a precept which he has left in favor of selling off old broken-down slaves, upon which Plutarch comments that some men are more tender of their working oxen. By following the counsel of men of this stamp, the patriciate of the campaign brought things to such a pass that the farmers had nothing left to lose, and those men formed the legions of Cæsar. Cæsar fell beneath the daggers of Brutus and his co-assassins, who perpetrated that outrage, not to free Rome, but to enslave her to the members of their own order. Cæsar fell, but the assassins did not succeed in their intent, not even in averting the empire, much less in perpetuating their own iniquitous regime. Well, times and men have changed, and Mr. Parnell is not Cæsar, nor would I for a moment compare the English-Irish aristocracy with the decaying aristocracy of Rome. Yet Mr. Parnell's movement may prove as fatal to landlordism in Ireland as Cæsar's sway was to the Roman patriciate, and to that extent I venture to state that many an Englishman's heart goes with him, national prejudices and antipathies notwithstanding.

The great obstacle to the nationalisation of the land is the circumstance that it must inevitably be at the least a full generation before the chief benefit of the measure could be realised.

If the lands were let by the State upon long leases, I see no reason to fear but what quite as much capital would be attracted on to it as on any other system, and that the tenants would show quite as much energy and ambition as any peasant proprietors. Nor is this mere matter of theory. Immense sums of money have been sunk in houses, and even costly public buildings, upon land let upon ninety-nine years, or even shorter leases, and expensive farm improvements have been executed, especially in Scotland, upon very much less favorable terms. There would be no objection to granting long leases, but there would be no need whatever to make them so long as a hundred years.

Whatever we may think of the advisability of nationalising the land in old countries, in new ones, I think, there can hardly be room for doubt. It is a gratifying sign, therefore, that there is an energetic society established in New South Wales to oppose the further sale of the public lands. Never was political society actuated by purpose at once more far-seeing and more practical. The Government of the United States, on the other hand, is throwing about the public lands right and left with a reckless prodigality which may lead to
trouble, and a similar policy is being pursued in Canada.

The Land Law (Ireland) Act.

IRELAND has now got her new Land Act, embodying the three F's, and has had an opportunity to express herself upon it, and Mr. Bright says that she ought to be satisfied and pacified, yet she is actually neither the one nor the other. Thank you for nothing, is her response to all our generosity.

Be the new Bill worth to Ireland what it may, much or little or nothing or less than nothing, in any case, to whom does she owe it? Not to the Government, nor to the Liberal party, nor to Messrs. Gladstone and Bright, with all their good intentions, but to theagitators whom England denounces, to the two hundred men who are at present rotting in the gaols of Ireland upon the instance of Mr. Forster, and who are regarded with esteem and gratitude by the mass of their countrymen and especially their neighbors and those who know them best, a gratitude which is not measured by the imagined worth of the Bill which they have won, but by the zeal and courage which they have shown, and by Ireland's recollections of the past, and by what she hopes from such men in the future. But for such men there would have been no Land Bill nor any thought of one. Upon that point there exists no particle of doubt whatever.

But what has the Land Law (Ireland) Act accomplished for Ireland? First of all, it has effectuated a new metamorphosis in the character of the landlord (for so is he still called, though with ludicrous incorrectness), and what has it made of him? Precisely the very thing which Mill declared to have been never contemplated in any well-considered system of landholding, namely, a sinecure quartered upon the soil. The sinecureist is one of the tares which grow up along with the wheat in the course of civilisation. In every civilised country there always have been sinecureists, but every one of them is one too many; but to select a whole class of men claiming to occupy the front rank among their fellow-citizens, and to make of this class a class of sinecureists, is, I believe, a feat of statesmanship which has been reserved for the nineteenth century. Whatever involves absurdities must be itself absurd. So argues Euclid; and accordingly I must regard the new Bill as the *reductio ad absurdum* of current theories about land. The landlord may still go upon his lands for purposes of mining, or quarrying, or road-making, or draining, or sporting, but beyond this he has almost nothing to do with the management of his estates. In general, there are no mines nor quarries, nor any new roads or drains required. What, then, has the Irish landlord left to do, in a usual way Shoot his woodcocks and pocket his rents. *Des raisons d'être, les voici.*

The Bill further affords facilities to the tenants for the acquisition of their farms. That is to say, England generously offers to sell upon favorable terms to Ireland what ought to have been given to her. Well, half a loaf is better than no bread, and I hope that, after having been for some years protected by the Bill against the capricious tyranny of the landlord (he having been reduced to a cypher), the tenants may gain the confidence and ambition which they at present lack, and learn to take advantage of those facilities.

What has the Land Law (Ireland) Act left undone for Ireland? The lands of Ireland are still in the hands of aliens, and the wealth which her labor and her soil produce still flows into a foreign country. Is this equitable, or is it tolerable? The lands of Ireland were wrested from her, some by sheer violence, some by violence accompanied with fraud; but that was long ago. Yes, the original robbery was committed long ago, but the mischief of it, the drain upon Ireland's resources, still continues. Thefts of money or of goods, or murders done, may be forgiven and forgotten, and Ireland has suffered many thefts and many murders at the hands of England; but a theft of land is an open and a running sore, impossible to be forgotten or forgiven.

Lastly, the Act offers aid to emigrants, and there are still believers in emigration as a panacea for all the woes of the Old World. It seems to be sometimes forgotten by these persons that banishment is a punishment for the worst criminals, and that the office of the soil of a country is not to raise criminals, but to support, a people. I should advise that an American and a Frenchman lay their heads together and patent a machine for shooting through the ether in defiance of gravitation as a mode of transport to the planet Sirius, because, otherwise, I fear lest we should come to a deadlock after a while with our too much humanity. I am no opponent of prudent emigration, but emigration can never be a remedy against pauperism artificially created by an unnatural drain upon the resources of a country. As a rule the capable man, with or without capital, but especially with it, will improve his lot in a new country; but the poor and the incapable, by quitting their native land, only get out of the frying-pan into the fire. To emigrate hopefully, a man should surpass the average in capacity and wealth. State aid may put the capable poor in a situation to emigrate, but that is nothing else but charity, and it does look to me to be a vicious system. We prefer their room to their company, and so give them something to quit us. It may he the lesser of two evils, but the money so given is a dead loss to the givers of it, to the Exchequer, and it all counts for so much murderous drudgery to be gone through.

In a preceding paragraph I have spoken of England as for the Irish a foreign country, but you may hear it
said that the English and the Irish are one people. Are they one people? They are not one people, but two peoples, and scarcely any two peoples of Europe are more dissimilar, nor was there ever any likelihood of their amalgamation, nor has such a contingency been ever more remote than it is now. Closet doctrinaires may ignore, or deny if they chose, the most patent facts in nature, but the statesman who will not be imbecile must recognise them; and assuredly the chief European political developments of the present century afford the least possible encouragement to the opinion that the spirit of race is dead or dying. Mr. Senior, the economist, remarks that almost every considerable community contains some foreign elements. True, that is the case, but the more it is so the more unsatisfactory, as a rule, is the condition of that community. What do we see in the Austro-Hungarian empire and in the East? Races are jumbled up enough together there, and they have had centuries enough to try the experiment of race amalgamation. Yet does it make any progress? They only sometimes unite together like the tarantula upon its victim, to suck each other's blood.

The dream of Mazzini's life is being by degrees accomplished. It was not in vain that that lofty spirit pined in solitude and exile; it was not in vain that that fine frame, of woman-like delicacy, endured so many hardships. When Orsini died he warned Napoleon that Italy was full of daggers. That was Italian-like, and Napoleon took alarm. But Mazzini rose above patriotism to morality, to philosophy. The principle was with him indeed a passion, but it was likewise a religious faith; it formed for him a part of natural justice. He was a unique figure, belonging not to the age, but to the ages. I remember when I read the news of his death in the local papers a chill ran through me. It is shocking that such men should die. Nature shows her skill so well, and all to leave a lump of carrion. Well, we need not in reason look for Mazzinis among the Irish patriots. They may sometimes more resemble Kossuth. When Kossuth was in America he formed friendships in the South, and the anti-slavery men said to him: "Will you endorse slavery?" "Yes," said Kossuth, "I'll endorse anything to win support for Hungary." That is patriotism. And the Irish patriots are patriots, and whatever merit appertains to that belongs to them. Until so recently as under the rule of Cromwell the native Irish were always styled in the public documents the Irish enemy, but since then we have concluded that they should be our brethren, only the brotherhood must be of the sort described in the "Tale of a Tub," and we will be the lord Peter. The Irish, however, do not, somehow, relish that species of fraternity, and we have continued to remain for them the English enemy. What did O'Connell say? If ever man of strong passions and vigorous understanding were subdued by superstitious awe and devoted to the Church, that man was O'Connell. Yet what did O'Connell say? "I have always declared both before and since I passed the Bill that I would relinquish Catholic emancipation—yes; I would even give up in a minute what I had fought so hard for, for the sake of repeal." They will not be one with us. But the peasant always wants the land, he does not wish to be a slave; whereas the man who may not tread upon the ground without another's leave is not a free man. Why are the Celts of Great Britain, comparatively speaking, tranquil and contented? Because their lands are still held by Celts, and no attempt has been made to force upon them a union against nature. Let the Irish enjoy the same immunity (I use that word advisedly, the same immunity) and then possibly, but not before, they may bend to our yoke as Wales and the Highlands have done.

**Irish Intransigeance.**

When I first read the news of the Parnell arrest and of the events which transpired immediately subsequently, I experienced little or no surprise, but some chagrin. Seven centuries appear a long enough time to try a political experiment, and we have now been attempting, during that period, to achieve the same end by the same means, but with no success, for Ireland is no less resolute now than she ever was, or than she has always been, to sever her connexion with us. Will she at length be induced to recant what Father Sheehy called, the other day, amid a scene of great enthusiasm, the sworn vow of ages? The Irish differ much from us, yet, after all, not so widely as to endure patiently what we must know that we would never tolerate, an alien landocracy and an alien yoke. That is what Father Sheehy calls the sworn vow of ages, the vow of independence. "Les crimes de l'étranger s'expliquent comme s'explique la lutte du faux et du vrai," says Georges Sand, writing to Mazzini in 1848. Yes, rapacity, harshness, uncrupulousness, are to be looked for from the foreigner. It is in the normal course of things that he should often exhibit those qualities. One demands, Why?—why should the foreigner be inequitable? To respond fully to that might, perhaps, require an elaborate psychological analysis, for which I have no space, and which I am most likely incompetent to give. Suffice it that he is known and allowed to be so; suffice it that no people, saving under compulsion, will ever tolerate his dominion. But what more than all else makes Ireland feel keenly her subjection, is that her lands are actually in the hands of foreigners. To contend, as the *Times* did during the course of the present agitation, that this circumstance has nothing to do with the anti-rent movement, which is, in fact, no more than an objection to the extremely disagreeable process of paying debts in hard times, is on a par with the contention once raised in the
same journal, that slavery had nothing to do with the American Civil War. To denounce the movement as communistic, as the Church has done, is equally beside the purpose. It is well-known that the Irish Nationalists were never welcomed among the political agitators of the Continent, and the reason of it is easy to discover. The mere patriot, the man of crude impulse, may have little in common with the propagandist of revolution upon a broad philosophical basis. A patriot's devotion is, of course, very likely to affect him with national selfishness, and although to insist upon ignoring those of his claims for his country or his race which have their ground and justification in the very nature of things, as the Manchester economists would like to, is surely not the way to cure him of his fault, yet, from dwelling too exclusively upon his central idea, he may find it difficult to work with the cosmopolite, or he may even cry out against cosmopolitanism as if it were something monstrous. Besides, the Irish always remain firmly attached to the Church, even when they emigrate, whereas the Socialist revolutionary movement throughout Europe, which partly originated in a revolt against the pretensions and exactions of the papal hierarchy, has become continually more and more pronouncedly unchristian and Atheistic. It is true that in the Irish World, and even in native Irish papers less vitriolic, one meets with Communist, or at least Socialistic reasonings, and I can well believe that plenty of the Irish Intransigeants will applaud any argument which seems to favor their views or interests, without, perhaps, very well understanding it—a most culpable looseness, I grant you, but not peculiar to the Irish. But, as Lord Derby says, the leading thought throughout is that of nationality. Ireland for the Irish: that it is which now, as hitherto, gives enthusiasm to the movement, and to the strength and genuineness of that enthusiasm Lord Derby himself bears testimony, and his testimony is, on all grounds, above suspicion. I shall keep referring to Lord Derby, because he has every competence to speak on Ireland, and his article in the Fortnightly Review was no hole-and-corner argument, but very open and explicit.

Lord Derby has no tenderness for patriotism—he would crush it, yet he recognises that crushing it may prove no easy business. In the past we have failed utterly, and not from being too delicately scrupulous, for we have stuck at nothing. Have we any ground to anticipate any better success in the future? There is everything to favor patriotism in Ireland. The people are purer in race than the Hungarians, and politically more united than the Poles. The sentiment of nationality has been very strongly developed in Ireland, as it never was in the Highlands. The country is considerable in size, wealth and population, and its geographical position as an island is very conducive to patriotism. Above all, the ever-growing and strengthening Irish power in America will always make it its business to fan the flame of native patriotism.

Of course Ireland can show nothing comparable to the unique record of Greece, nor even that of Italy; yet she is not without an authentic history going back into remote ages, and (what may seem strange) her earliest triumphs were won peacefully, in letters and in missionary enterprise. The anti-Irish English, indeed, will not believe Irish history, neither will they believe any testimony at all in favor of the Irish. In modern times Irishmen have shone in the English, the French, the Spanish, the Austrian and the American services, in the field, at the bar, in letters, in diplomacy, yet capacity is absolutely denied to them, for bigotry sticks at nothing. Everything is denied to them; being itself is denied to them, although they are charged with all sorts of faults. Macaulay (oblivious, apparently, of his own very evidently Celtic name) has been among the loudest in this immoderate decrying of the Celts; whilst, as to the champion of Orange ascendency in Ireland, he appears to have contracted the Irish habit of perpetrating bulls, for, after arguing at great length for refusing all rights of citizenship to the native Irish because of their natural inferiority, he goes on to inform us, very gravely, that the people have got so mixed up with other races that the very name has become unmeaning. Of course this is great nonsense, and of course, were it correct, it would simply quash Mr. Froude's case. I remember Punch introducing an Irish patriot saying: "Belave me, sorr, ivviry landlord who lives in the counthry is an absenthay." If Punch can produce the patriot I should think that he and Mr. Froude between them will be able to put the question in a clearer light for us. The eminent and talented historian does not surely compose under the influence of the national potheen. I have understood that some of the romancists seek inspiration in that

Intransigeants will applaud any argument which seems to favor their views or interests, without, perhaps, very well understanding it—a most culpable looseness, I grant you, but not peculiar to the Irish. But, as Lord Derby says, the leading thought throughout is that of nationality. Ireland for the Irish: that it is which now, as hitherto, gives enthusiasm to the movement, and to the strength and genuineness of that enthusiasm Lord Derby himself bears testimony, and his testimony is, on all grounds, above suspicion. I shall keep referring to Lord Derby, because he has every competence to speak on Ireland, and his article in the Fortnightly Review was no hole-and-corner argument, but very open and explicit.

Lord Derby believes that Irishmen, out of Ulster, would vote against English rule by four or five to one. The movement is thus a thoroughly nationalist movement, and Irish patriotism is, as we have seen, neither unreal, nor feeble, nor absurd. Shall we be able to extinguish it?

The policy of the early Norman kings was to extirpate the Irish people, and the wisdom and feasibility of this were discussed by Henry VIII. and Elizabeth, and the project was advocated by Edmund Spencer, who (somewhat curiously for a poet of love and war) favored the starvation process by the destruction of the crops and herds, and there is little doubt that Cromwell would have liked to put it in execution. Now, there was a policy, not, at one time, evidently impracticable and not against the morality of the age of chivalry, which, had it succeeded, would have led to a definite result. When the Irish judge sentenced a criminal to be hung he said he hoped it would serve as a warning to him for the future. A second such caution ought not to be required. But
coercion, as it has been practised in Ireland during the last two centuries, can lead to no result, because so long
as the causes of the discontent remain the discontent will continue, smouldering but always ready to break out,
so that coercion must be reckoned on as a constant item in our expenditure in perpetuity.

Lord Derby says that in the opinion of almost all Englishmen the late Bill has given more than justice to
Ireland. What is justice for Ireland? I know what an Irishman means by the phrase, but what an Englishman
means by it I was never well able to find out. Ireland may have some special grievances; the franchise is not
now so liberal in Ireland as it is in Great Britain; but the one grievance which we have always heard most about,
before as well as since Disestablishment, before as well as since Catholic Emancipation, has been the status of
the tenant farmer in his capacity of tenant farmer. Now, so far as I am able to interpret English principles from
the often incoherent utterances of the London press, the Irish tenant farmer had full justice, as against his
landlord, before the passing of the late Bill, before the Bill of 1870, before the Bill of 1860. In the judgment,
however, of some (perhaps revolutionary and unpractical persons) the ownership of the soil of a country by
aliens and absentee is an institution against nature, and which, therefore, no laws nor prestige can warrant.
There are even some who go the length of condemning the absolute domination of one race over another. How
far the discontinuance of this might be either desirable or practicable I will not hazard an opinion. Yet
Jefferson's witticism about the suffrage, that if a man be unfit to rule himself he must be very unfit to rule
another, although clearly inapplicable where the inferior races are concerned, does seem to have some point
where the races are about upon a level like the English and the Irish.

The late Bill has been at the least a thoroughly English measure, which is surely a merit. It has been a
striking exemplification of that positive preference for illogicalness with which Mill charged the English
people. Upon no principle whatever can our treatment of the landlords be justified. We have actually seized
from them property we yet pronounced to be rightfully theirs. We have fined them, punished them. What is
their crime? Moreover, as Lord Derby points out, the most liberal among them will be the severest sufferers.
They will say that we have made scapegoats of them, and—they may say so—we cannot rebut the charge.

Lord Derby is not entitled to speak of the Irish landlords as Irishmen. What is an Irishman? Although, to be
sure, as O'Connell said, à propos of the Duke of Wellington, to be born in a stable doesn't make a man a horse,
yet a man may be to all intents and purposes a good Irishman and sound patriot without being of purely Celtic
extraction or even without having any Celtic blood in his veins. Lord Edward Fitzgerald was sprung from the
Norman Geraldines, and Mitchel, the arch-rebel of 1848, was of Lowland Scotch descent. But the absentee
landlords of Ireland are many of them in no sense or measure Irish, nor are they in the way of making any
progress to become so. When the Normans intermarried with the Celts, the saying was that their descendants
became more Irish than the Irish; but the absentee landlord, whose sole concern with his tenants is to squeeze
the maximum of money out of them, is not likely to become more Irish than the Irish. No, we need not fear that.
He will not, on the other hand, become more English than the English. We must not hope that. No, but if he
have any badness in him, he will be apt to develop qualities which I am happy to think are not very convenient
to be cultivated in England.

Lord Derby makes mincemeat of the notion that Ireland owes us gratitude. We have yet to give her the
occasion for it. In our dealings with what we are pleased to call, facetiously, the sister isle, the one lesson which
we have taken pains to teach her is, that we have no ear for equity, and that we only listen to gunpowder and
dynamite. We conceded her native parliament in 1780 to the Irish volunteers, because we were sick with an
overdose of civil war in America. The Duke of Wellington, who hated Catholic Emancipation, avowedly
conceded it to avert an insurrection. The Clerkenwell explosion won disestablishment, and Mr. Parnell's
agitation won the recent Bill.

As to Mr. Parnell and his coadjutors, they simply took the course which hot-headed patriots were sure to
take, and cool-headedness has never been among the merits of the Irish patriots. Tone and Fitzgerald were the
reverse of phlegmatic, and Emmet's attempt was most unjustifiable, having never a chance of succeeding; and
the Liberator, himself, upon whom the Premier has recently lavished such generous eulogies at Mr. Parnell's
expense, was not, after all, it must be allowed, exactly cool-headed, nor did ever man use language more
inflammatory than he did. True, we know from Sir Charles Gavan Duffy that he never meant anything by it. But
is that an apology? To my mind it is an aggravation of the offence. It is a capital good plan for people who
mean nothing to say what they mean, especially where their language may be of so much consequence.
However, our main concern is with Ireland, and not with Mr. Parnell. And, after all, his incarceration does not
much affect the situation, for there was no new principle involved in it.

Boycotting and outrage continue, aggravating rather than abating, and a good many are obeying the Land
League manifesto, and the Premier's son gives dark accounts of the south. Still the Land Court keeps busy, and
there appears to be some prospect now that the Act of 1881 may get a fair trial. If it does, how will it operate?
Will the tenants buy up their farms? If they can, even at the cost of great pains and privations, thus peacefully
abolish landlordism, then certainly this is such a chance as Ireland never had before. Lord Derby judges that
they cannot; but what are his arguments? He argues, firstly, from the natural thriftlessness of the Irish character. He says: "The industry of the French and Belgian proprietors is admirable, though often ill-rewarded; but a negro or Red Indian village is not a very beautiful sight." I am puzzled to interpret this language, coming from Lord Derby. He cannot intend to liken the Irishman to the negro or Indian. The Irish race is neither an inferior race nor a race apart. Belgium herself and the north-western provinces of France are full of the same Celtic blood. And does Lord Derby forget that those very French proprietors of whom he speaks were themselves, prior to 1789, sunk in the very lowest state of abjectness to which a human being can descend, and that it is only since the legislative favors which the revolution gave them that they have made such rapid strides in intelligence and prosperity?

Lord Derby reminds us what a bad figure the Irish have cut in California and New York, and it is true that they have been among the ringleaders in some of the worst outrages upon the black and the yellow races. The Arabian proverb has been illustrated—God save me from the enriched beggar and the freed slave. But the New York emigration agents and the Irish American priests could furnish some very different evidence respecting the doings of the Irish in America. They could testify to thousands and thousands of pounds spared from the hard-won earnings of the emigrants to be remitted to the old country—alas! on what a melancholy errand!—to enable their compatriots to quit the one spot upon the globe which seems to be accursed for Irishmen—their native country. Thousands and thousands of dollars of the Irish hoardings, too, go to help to swell the army of the black (not the red) international, and even money saved for a bad object does at least prove a capacity for saving. That the Irish are eminently capable of thrift admits of proof by direct evidence.

Lord Derby goes on to speak of Ireland as a very poor country, but surely this is an exaggeration. The climate of Ireland is too humid, yet is not unfavorable for some profitable crops. In the south it closely resembles that of the Channel Islands, which produce enormously. In this regard France has doubtless a clear advantage over Ireland; but in soil. I imagine, the advantage rather lies upon the other side. Her climate is the making of the southern provinces of France. Some of the best Burgundy wines are grown on soils which an analysing chemist would pronounce poor. Ireland contains a great deal of good soil, and the extensive bogs would generally pay for draining. There is a rather large percentage of more or less barren mountain, but even that could be mostly utilised, either for sheep-walks or for timber. Mr. Trench, a very capable and active land-agent, devoted to the landlord interest, says that opportunities for the cultivation of mountain timber are much neglected, although it would sometimes pay a good and even a pretty quick return. The fisheries are a further source of wealth, and Ireland used to grow the best of flax, and manufacture the best of linen, until the Imperial Parliament assassinated the trade.

Testimonies of Medical Men,
From 1805 to 1881.

London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination Westminster, S.W. 114, VICTORIA STREET
Price One Penny, or Five Shillings per Hundred.

Preface.

It is often said that a discovery so momentous as that of Dr. JENNER, affecting every household in its most sacred relations of parent and child, creating, as it does, the most intolerant anxiety to use compulsion, and thus utterly destructive of all respect for the right of private judgment, could not by any possibility have obtained general belief until it had passed the ordeal of stringent inquiry and positive proof.

Little do such reasoners understand the motives which sway the popular mind, or the exaggerated hopes and fears in which superstitions take their rise; and little do they comprehend or admit the infinitesimal difference between to-day and a century ago, in the logical acumen and mental activity of the leaders of society and of fashion. Had Dr. JENNER's famous discovery been delayed till the present day, inquiry and sarcasm, in certain narrow circles, would doubtless have been trenchant and severe. But did not JENNER himself bitterly complain of the opposition of his medical comppeers; of their determined refusal to confer the much-coveted degree of the London College of Physicians, unless he consented to undergo the usual and not very difficult examination; and of the ungracious reception of the cow-pox by the medical world, as compared with the bright and glowing enthusiasm of lords and ladies, the simple faith of philanthropists and theologians, and the involuntary admiration of wondering country squires?

It must in candour be admitted that the public of our day, though critical, is eminently superficial; it has no time to spare from its amusements, it has had a surfeit of discoveries, and it is content to accept with credulity and adhere with pertinacity to the sentiments and dogmas instilled in the nursery, and completed, confirmed, and established in the school. For the beliefs of our youth, growing with our growth like a cherished tree which...
our forefathers planted, gradually and insensibly wind into our affections, and imbue us with the feeling of our own superiority; and our anger at the woodman who ventures to strike at the root of the leafy monarch of the pasture, is paralleled by our anger at the logician who strikes at the root of our infantile superstitions and schoolboy science.

When we survey the diversified grades of society which surround us, we cannot avoid observing that untold thousands still patronise the advertised cures for almost every form of bodily affliction; and when we search the files of a former century, we find a multitude of advertised protectives against almost every variety of human ill. Of this state of things Vaccination is a survival; and in place of medical protectives against plague, ague, and a score of varying zymotics, the present generation reposes its hopes and fears on an imaginary royal road to security by the aid of calf or cow, against its outrageously-exaggerated fears of the beauty threatener which permanently endangers the careless and ignorant breakers of every sanitary law.

It was not the publicity, but the secrecy, of the manifold mixtures and practices, curative and protective, that fascinated and overawed the general public in the protection era. Even now the purchasers of pills and draughts, patent or otherwise, embrace and engulf them in faith and hope, without the slightest knowledge of their constituent ingredients. Medicine has always required, and has always obtained, a much greater amount of uninquiring submission than theology. SUTTON, a famous inoculator of the last century, amassed a large fortune by a method which was avowedly secret; and the amazing sums paid to DIMSDALE, MAITLAND, and others, for operating upon princes, were assuredly not given for the common routine easy of accomplishment by the certificated members of the profession. And when did JENNER disclose his secret? The constitution of vaccine lymph is a mystery even now. Whether it be a suppositious disease in the cow, or a transmuted or transubstantiated small-pox; or whether it be, as many anti-vaccinators assume, a mingled result of varied zymotics, are questions still sub judice.

When JENNER’s Memoirs were published in 1838, we learnt to our surprise, that in 1817 he had already supplied The National Vaccine Establishment with horse-pox; and we were told in JENNER’s own words, that the horse's diseased heel "contained the true and life-preserving fluid.” This horse-virus, says JENNER’s biographer, was extensively used in England and in Scotland. We need not wonder then, that the vaccine dogma, in all the stages of its developement and growth, has constantly been discountenanced by the few thoughtful and independent minds, in a profession peculiarly under the influence of aristocratic whims and courtly exigencies; and the following pages will display the continuity of the opposition of the really scientific portion of the medical confraternity to the infallible empiricism which the fashionable circles of the gay world have so persistently and pertinaciously sought to thrust upon them.

Medical Testimonies.

DR. Benjamin Moseley, 1805, Physician to the Chelsea Hospital for 30 years.

The people at large are not to be reproached for putting their faith in this splendid imposition on humanity; and to the credit of their discernment and parental feelings, the middle and inferior classes have taken precedence in renouncing the delusion. At this moment, unless attacked by surprise, or with threats, or cajoled by artifice, (all of which have been practised on them,) there are now none among them in London and the adjacent villages who will expose their children to cow-pox inoculation.—*A Treatise on the Lues Bovilla or Cow-Pox.* By BENJAMIN MOSELEY, M.D. Second Edition. London, 1805. P. 142.

The Royal Jennerian Society.

It is admitted by the Committee, that a few cases have been brought before them of persons having the small-pox who had apparently passed through the cow-pox in a regular way.—*Report,* 2nd January, 1806.

The Royal College of Surgeons, 1806.

In reply to a circular letter addressed to more than eleven hundred of its members, asking their experience of the protective powers of vaccination, the Board received 426 answers, and the information obtained was that there had been 56 cases of small-pox after vaccination, 3 deaths, 66 cases of eruptions, and 24 bad arms.—*See Pamphlet by JOHN BIRCH, Surgeon to St. Thomas's Hospital.* London, 1807.
Thomas Brown, Surgeon, Musselburgh, 1809.

The practice (of vaccination) was introduced and recommended to the public by its Author, as a perfect antidote and security against small-pox without any exception or reserve, and capable of banishing variola from the catalogue of human misery. I have no hesitation in confessing that I became an early convert and advocate of the new practice; and it is now eight years and a half since I have uniformly advised and practised Vaccination, in which period, I may safely say, I have vaccinated upwards of twelve hundred patients, and have only inoculated three at the positive request of parents. This course I persevered in until the present time, notwithstanding I met with several instances where it appeared to fail in giving security; some about three years after the introduction of the practice; a few more about two years ago; and those which make part of the present volume within the last six months.

An epidemic, in which his own perfectly vaccinated patients fell victims to small-pox, at last opened his eyes to the delusion in which he had so long walked, and to the perversity with which he and others had resisted the light of truth—

I am convinced from what has passed under my own observation for these last three or four years, that we have been all guilty of rejecting evidence that deserved more attention, in consequence of the strong prepossessions which existed, from the very persuasive proof of vaccination resisting inoculation and exposure to infection, and from our judgments being goaded and over-powered with the positive and arbitrary opinions of its abettors. I am now perfectly satisfied, from my mind being under the influence of prejudice and blind to the impression of the fairest evidence, that the last time small-pox was prevalent, I rejected and explained away many cases which were entitled to the most serious attention, and showed myself as violent and unreasonable a partisan as any of my brethren in propagating a practice, which I have now little doubt we must ere long surrender at discretion.—An Inquiry into the Anti-Variolous power of Vaccination; in which, from the state of the Phenomena and the occurrence of a great variety of Cases, the most Serious Doubts are suggested of the Efficacy of the Whole Practice, and its Powers at best proved to be only Temporary. From which also will appear the Necessity of and the proper period for, again submitting to Inoculation with Variolous Virus. By THOMAS BROWN, Surgeon, Musselburgh. Edinburgh, 1809. P. 307. From Vaccination Inquirer, Vol. 2. P. 159.

John Birch, Surgeon to St. Thomas's Hospital, 1815, referring to the excuses made by the Jennerians for vaccine failure.

It cannot be meant to class Mr. WACHSELL, Apothecary to the Small-pox Hospital, or Mr. RING, the Accoucheur, among ignorant and equivocal practitioners; and yet from the patients vaccinated by these two persons, I could bring instances of more failures, more deaths, and more diseases than have occurred in the practice of any other two persons who have come within my knowledge.

And again, were an architect to undertake to build an edifice which should be firm in its foundations, all its rooms wind and water tight, and such as might be inhabited with perfect security; if before the edifice were well finished, the foundations were discovered to be rotten; and if in less than seven years, several apartments had fallen in and killed those who occupied them, while in a great number of rooms the wind or rain was continually beating in, could I be blamed for declaring that the architect had broken his contract, and that the edifice ought no longer to be inhabited? Certainly not. Why then am I to be told that I am acting perversely when I remonstrate against the practice of cow-pox? for such an edifice as I have described, so rotten in its foundations, so ill built, so ruinous, is vaccination.—An Appeal to the Public on the Hazard and Peril of Vaccination, otherwise Cow-pox, by the late JOHN BIRCH, ESQ., together with his Serious Reasons for uniformly objecting to Vaccination; and other Tracts by the same Author. 3rd Edition. London, 1817.

PROFESSOR Maunsell, M.D., Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland.

The term imperfect or spurious vaccination is frequently to be met with in books, and has been the cause of no small degree of confusion in practice, although, at the same time, it has frequently afforded the practitioner an excellent asylum against the storms now and then arising out of failures in the protective power of the vaccine disease.—A Practical Treatise on the Management and Diseases of Children. By RICHARD T. EVANSON, M.D., and HENRY MAUNSELL, M.D., Professors in the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland. 2nd Edition. P. 422. Dublin, 1838.

George Gregory, M.D., Physician to the London Small-pox and
Vaccination Hospital.

DR. JENNER suggested the notion that cow-pox possesses powers adequate to the extirpation of small-pox from the face of the earth. The doctrine that cow-pox possesses an exterminating power assumes, first, that small-pox arises invariably from contagion; secondly, that the susceptibility of cow-pox is universal in mankind; and, thirdly, that the influence of vaccination is permanent through life. All these are questionable points, and therefore on physiological grounds the notion must be abandoned. Vaccination, then, we confidently affirm, can be maintained only by having small-pox constantly before our eyes; and nothing warrants us in the expectation of banishing the bane by even the liberal application of the antidote.—Elements of the Theory and Practice of Medicine. 5th Edition. London, 1839.

DR. Copeland.

Just half a century has elapsed since the discovery and introduction of vaccination, and after a quarter of a century of transcendental laudations of this measure, with merely occasional whisperings of doubt; and after another quarter of a century of reverberated encomiums from well-paid 'vaccination boards'—raised with a view of overbearing the increasing murmurings of disbelief among those who observe and think for themselves—the middle of the nineteenth century finds the majority of the profession, in all latitudes and hemispheres, doubtful as to the preponderance of advantages, present and prospective, to be obtained either from inoculation or vaccination.—From COPELAND'S Medical Dictionary. P. 832.

DR. T. Brown, 1842.

The practice of vaccination is full of inconsistencies, contradictions, and imperfections, and unless it be improved is unworthy of further confidence. *** When we consider, that vaccination has not yet been proved by above one half of the period of human life, it does not seem asserting too much to say, that unless some expedient can be contrived to render the anti-variolous effect more complete, the whole, or nearly so, of the vaccinated cases may suffer an attack of small-pox, and this not of the safest and mildest, but of the most severe and fatal nature.—From An Investigation of the Present Unsatisfactory and Defective State of Vaccination. By Thomas Brown. 1842.

Lancet, 21st May, 1853.

In the public mind extensively, and to a more limited extent, in the profession itself, doubts are known to exist as to the efficacy and eligibility of vaccination. The failures of the operation have been numerous and discouraging.

DR. J. Brady, M.P.

Whether or not the Act, as a compulsory measure, be in accordance with the spirit of the British constitution, I will not discuss; but the very able and excellent "report on the state of small-pox and vaccination in England and Wales, and other countries, of the Vaccination Committee of the Epidemiological Society," clearly shows, that in those countries, such as Sweden and Denmark, where vaccination is compulsory, the percentage of deaths from small-pox is much higher than in those countries, such as France and Belgium, where honorary distinctions and rewards are held out to medical men as inducements to exertion in furthering the object of vaccination; and this important fact I strenuously brought before the House, and endeavoured to point out the inference that it would be found impossible to fully carry out the provisions of this Act, however desirable general vaccination might be considered, unless the operators were treated with some degree of courtesy, and were somewhat better remunerated than a cab-driver.—Speech in the House of Commons. 1854.

DR. Noirot, France,

After stating the general increases in the duration of middle life in the half century, adds : "Notwithstanding that the mortality of all ages has successively diminished, that of the period from 10 to 30 years has considerably increased. A disturbing cause has therefore appeared in our day, not only to arrest during that period of life the progressive decrease of mortality, but even to give it an impulse in the opposite direction." This disturbing cause (M. NOIROT names it elsewhere) is Vaccination.—Etudes Statistiques sur la Mortalité. P. 29.
Josef Hermann, Principal Physician at the Imperial Hospital, Vienna, from 1858 to 1864.

My experience of small-pox during those six years of bedside attendance has given me the right, or rather has imposed on me the duty, of taking part in the bold and spirited onslaught on vaccination which is now being carried on in Switzerland, Germany, England, and other countries. ... I am convinced that vaccination is the greatest mistake and delusion in the science of medicine; a fanciful illusion in the mind of the discoverer; a phenomenal apparition, devoid of scientific foundation, and wanting in all the conditions of scientific possibility.

T. Massey Harding, M.R.C.S., formerly House Surgeon of Middlesex Hospital, and for 12 years Public Vaccinator in Worcestershire.

In 1798 small-pox was gradually on the decline, and in all probability would have continued to do so without vaccination, unless artificially kept up by the evil practice of variolous inoculation. It was not very long before cases of post-vaccinal small-pox were announced, and though for a time the vaccinists sought to discredit these cases, they were so numerous that the possibility of small-pox occurring after vaccination was acknowledged. When a variolous epidemic occurred, the number of cases of post-vaccinal small-pox was increased, but I see no reason for concluding that the vaccinated in the time of JENNER were more effectually protected than the vaccinated of the present day.—Small-Pox and Vaccination; an Essay published by the Ladies Sanitary Association. 1868. P. 32.

Mr. Badcock, of Brighton.

Vaccination is in a wretched state, getting worse instead of better; more than 60 per cent, of the cases admitted with small-pox at the London Small-pox Hospital, last year, having been previously vaccinated.—Letter to T. Massey Harding, M.R.C.S., Surgeon to St. Pancras Union; formerly House-Surgeon of Middlesex Hospital.

C. T. Pearce, M.R.C.S.

In his Essay on Vaccination (1868), and in his voluminous evidence before the Vaccination Committee of the House of Commons(1871), he has demonstrated that vaccination is a violation of God's law, and a contaminator of the body: that the increased death-rate of children is coeval with the extension of vaccination: that so far from the practice being protective against small-pox, the liability to small-pox in adult life is greater in the vaccinated than in the unvaccinated.

Dr. James Rowell, Health Officer for San Francisco, U.S A.

"Another marked peculiarity of this epidemic, was the want of prophylaxy afforded by vaccination." And further, "those vaccinated or revaccinated since the commencement of the epidemic, were apparently thereby rendered more susceptible to the disease.—From Dr. Meares' Report of the Small-pox Epidemic, in San Francisco, of 1868-9.

Dr. Ballard, one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Vaccine.

DR. JENNER's prediction has not been fulfilled, experience has not verified it, small-pox is not eradicated. Let me add that scientific observations lend no countenance to the belief that it ever will be eradicated, even from civilised communities.—Prize Essay on Vaccination. P. 36.

Sir James Y. Simpson, M.D. Edin.

Small-pox can never be exterminated by vaccination.

Mr. Simon, F.R.C.S., Medical Officer to the Privy Council.
Small-pox after vaccination, has been a disappointment both to the public and the medical profession.

DR. Caron, 22, Rue du Bouloi, Paris, Chevalier of the Legion of Honour, and late Government Physician to the Paris Prisons:

Writes, under date of March 20th, 1870:—Vaccination, so called, modifies not one tittle of either the virulence or the consequences of the small-pox. I have long since refused to vaccinate at any price.

MR. Marson, Surgeon to the Highgate Small-pox Hospital.

Of the 950 cases of small-pox, 870, or 91.5 per cent, of the whole cases had been vaccinated.—Report of Highgate Hospital for 1871.

DR. Farr.

To operate on the mortality, [referring to vaccination and inoculation,] protection against every one of the fatal zymotic diseases is required; otherwise the suppression of one disease element opens the way to others.—Thirtieth Annual Report.

Lancet, January 21st, 1871.

From the early part of the century, cases of small-pox after vaccination have been increasing, and now amount to four-fifths of cases.

DR. Muller, Privy-Councillor to the Imperial Government, Berlin.

Of 3552 cases of death by small-pox in 1871, 484 were children under 5 years of age, all vaccinated, and yielding the following result:

—Quoted by DR. KOLB, of Munich, from DR. MULLER’s Report on Small-Pox in Berlin, in 1871; and Published by the National Anti-Compulsory Vaccination League.

DR. Vick, Eckerbery, near Stettin.

I should have been glad to say a few words about small-pox epidemics, because in the year 1871-72, I had 652 small-pox patients under my care, of whom 431 were French and 221 German, of various origin and ages. According to my experience—from accurate notes made at the time—vaccination does not exercise the slightest influence in mitigating the force of the epidemic; for many of the patients had been recently vaccinated, some only 14 days, and others within 6 months of their being seized with the disease. The theory is propounded, that after vaccination small-pox is less severe. I contest it most vigorously; because the majority of those vaccinated were seized with the genuine small-pox (variola). Among the French who were not vaccinated, the spurious small-pox (varicella) principally prevailed; which speaks strongly against vaccination. You must be aware of the injurious consequences so frequently resulting from the vaccination of children. Vainly do I seek to discover the advantages of vaccination.—From Papers read at Medical Congress, Chemnitz, Lower Saxony, September 27th, 1872.

DR. Druitt.

It is just as reasonable to say that umbrellas prevent thunder-storms, as that vaccination can prevent a small-pox epidemic.

DR. Nittinger, of Stuttgart, writes, in 1872, of Wurttemburg:—

In five districts scarcely any medical man practised vaccination. Out of the 462 physicians in the country, only 229 vaccinated. We have to lament that since vaccination there has been no year free from small-pox; that small-pox hospitals have been built, and are continually open; that of 100 patients before vaccination, only 5 to 7 died; but since, from 10 to 20 die.—The Anti-Vaccinator, October 1st, 1872.

I shall be ready at any time to state my belief in the inefficacy of vaccination as a preventive of small-pox, and also that the practice of vaccination is contrary to the principles of medical science. I believe it would be a great benefit to mankind if it were rendered penal to vaccinate.—Letter to Thomas Baker, Esq. February 17th, 1872.

Dr. Leander Josef Keller,

Who is chief Physician to the Austrian State Railways, kept a record of the mortality amongst the Company's servants and their families, of 373 small-pox cases, during the year 1872.

Dr. Keller concludes his paper as follows:—

• Generally more vaccinated than unvaccinated persons are attacked by small-pox.
• Re-vaccination did not protect from small-pox, and did not lessen the general mortality.
• Neither vaccination nor re-vaccination exercised a favourable influence upon the mortality of small-pox.

Dr. Keller concludes by saying that, if all reports on smallpox were made in the same way and with the same conscientiousness as his, there would very soon not be the slightest doubt about the complete uselessness of vaccination.—Allgemeine Wiener Medizinische Zeitung for August 1873.

Chas. T. Pearce, M.R.C.S.

Vaccination was made compulsory by an Act of Parliament in the year 1853, again in 1867, and still more stringent in 1871. Since 1853 we have had three epidemics of small-pox.

—From a Letter to the Right Hon. G. Sclater-Booth, M.P. February 1877.

John Simon, Medical Officer of Privy Council.

The small-pox epidemic of 1870-3 was part of a world-wide prevalence of the disease. It seems universally testified by skilled observers, that no small-pox epidemic in living memory had been, (if I may so express it,) of equally malignant intention with that which is here in question.—Public Health Reports. No. 4, for 1874. P.9.

Dr. H. Oidtmann, of Linnich.

In Sweden, prior to the introduction of vaccination, in 1801, died of small-pox, 600 persons per one million inhabitants, and since vaccination has been assiduously practised there, the mortality of small-pox has gradually but regularly increased. In 1874, with a population exceeding but little the number of four millions, there died of small-pox, in this state, 4,063, exhibiting thus an increase of more than 400 per million of inhabitants.—Impfgegner vor dem Polizeigericht, P. 99.

Dr. Stramm, Medical Staff Officer in the Prussian Army.

I, myself, have been vaccinated, and twice successfully re-vaccinated; and yet, in the exercise of my official medical duties during the late epidemics in Prussia, I have been attacked with small-pox in the most virulent confluent form, and been only saved from worse consequences by a speedy change of climate.—From a Pamphlet on Vaccination.


One of the most interesting facts brought out by the hospital cases, (Small-pox Hospital Blackwell's Island,) is the value of vaccination as a prevention. The vaccination of childhood is of no value unless repeated at intervals of three years. This is proved by the fact that all, or nearly all, of the cases have good pock marks. Again, the fact of having had the disease does not preclude the possibility of again taking it; and should not preclude the necessity of re-vaccination. It not unfrequently happens that a patient enters who is strongly pitted.—Quoted in Public Opinion, March 13th, 1875.

Dr. Seaton.

The epidemic of small-pox, which began in England towards the close of 1870, and terminated in the second quarter of 1873, was part of a general epidemic outbreak of that disease, of world-wide diffusion,
marked wherever it occurred by an intensity and malignancy unequalled by any previous epidemic of the disease within living memory. In every country attacked, so far as our information extends, the peculiar intensity of this epidemic was manifested by the extreme diffusiveness of the disease; by its attacking, in unusual proportion, persons who were regarded as protected against the disease, whether by previous small-pox or by vaccination, and by the occurrence with quite remarkable frequency of cases of a malignant and hemorrhagic type, and a consequent unusually high ratio of deaths to attacks.—Public Health Reports, No. 4. for 1874. P. 51.

Thomas Skinner, M.D., Liverpool.

I will add this, however, that according to the most recent statistics of the mortality of small-pox in the metropolis, out of eleven deaths, five were vaccinated and six were not. Where is the advantage or protection? I am perfectly certain that if this point was thoroughly sifted and accurately observed, it will be found that vaccination, at the present day, is no preventive of fatal or other consequences of small-pox, coroners', judges', lawyers', and doctors' opinions to the contrary notwithstanding.—Liverpool Daily Post, Oct. 25, 1876.

DR. Charles Lakin, L.R.C.P., Leicester.

Objected to have his child vaccinated as it did not alleviate small-pox, and there was danger attending the operation.—August 28th, 1876.

DR. J. Shorthouse.

Vaccination either is, or is not a preventive. If it be so it is effective the first time, and does not need to be repeated. To say that it requires repeating at stated periods of five, or seven, or ten years, is arrant humbug and quackery.—Croydon Chronicle, Jan. 6th, 1877.

DR. Von Niemeyer, Professor of Medicine at Tübingen, 1878.

The remarkable fact that, even at the present day, extensive epidemics of small-pox occur in spite of most persons being vaccinated or even revaccinated, once or oftener, has induced me to make some very careful observations regarding the duration of the protective power of vaccination; I have not yet completed this work, but have gone far enough to satisfy myself that the protection afforded against variola by vaccination, is for a far shorter period than is generally supposed.

MR. Ceely, M.R.C S., Aylesbury.

They would not be able to annihilate small-pox by vaccination, and he defied any one to shew that he had claimed such a result; from the experience he had had, no such thing could, or ever would happen.—Address at Calf Lymph Conference, London, Dec. 1879.

DR. W. Job Collins, L.R.C.P.

That, having regard to the fact that Vaccination has in no way mitigated the severity, nor lessened the frequency of small-pox epidemics; and farther, that it has on several occasions been the means of extensively propagating syphilis, as shown by DRS. WARMONT AND CAMERON,—Resolved—That this Conference condemn the present system of Vaccination as mischievous in its results, and inoperative as a prophylactic against the disease it is designed to suppress.—Resolution read at London Medical Animal Vaccination Conference. 1879.

DR. Chas. Cameron, M.P.

From a return laid before the House of Commons on August 14th, 1877 (Table 16), it appears that while in seven years prior to the Vaccination Act the mortality from small-pox in England and Wales amounted to 0.0302 per cent, of the population, in the following 14 years, when vaccination was obligatory, but the obligation, owing to defective machinery, was not enforced, it fell to 0.0189. But in the following eight years, when the defective machinery was rectified, and the national system of vaccination was greatly improved and extended, the mortality rose to 0.0297. The return concludes with the year 1875, but as since then we have had several most alarming outbreaks of small-pox, the average would hardly be improved if carried down to the end of last year. Now, it is all very well, as has been done, to explain this recrudescence of small-pox mortality by
the occurrence of exceptional epidemics; but it seems reasonable to argue that in the course of the 22 years, during which vaccination has been compulsory and over which the return extends, some impression should have been made upon epidemic as well as sporadic smallpox. The recurrence, therefore, in the latest period, of mortality almost as high as that experienced prior to the Vaccination Act, shows, either that the protective virtues of vaccination are mythical, or that there is something radically wrong in our national system of vaccination.—Letter to The Times, Nov. 24th, 1879.

Enoch Robinson, M.R.C.S.

Epidemics of small-pox will recur from time to time, and the cry of the newspapers ascribing the origin to neglect of vaccination is ridiculous and mischievous. We read, sometimes, Brussels is free from small-pox, whilst Paris is decimated, a striking instance of the value of vaccination! Next week we regret that small-pox has been introduced into Brussels and spreads. The same is said of Ireland. But we may ask, where is the boasted power of vaccination if it does not defend from imported disease? The fact is small-pox exists without us; we may hope for its extinction when poverty, filth, sordid homes, and sordid-clothes-tramps and beggars shall be extinguished.—From Can Disease Protect Health. P. 19-20. 1880.

Enoch Robinson, M.R.C.S., late Medical Officer of Health, Dukinfield.

Whilst I have shewn that the increase of 53 to 75 per cent, of small-pox after vaccination, is owing to vaccination as an operation having a tendency to increase small-pox, I wish the reader to understand that I do not look upon this tendency as constituting the most serious of the unsafe conditions inseparably connected with vaccination. The promotion of the other diseases referred to in former pages is the influence which condemns vaccination as an unsafe remedy.—From Can Disease Protect Health. P. 32. 1880.

DR. C. Spinzig, St. Louis, U.S.A.

It is believed that vaccination was never more generally resorted to by our citizens, than during the winter of 1871 and 1872.

Report of Board of Health, 1872, p. 87.

To convey an idea what commonly the course of small-pox at Philadelphia has been, the figures of the mortality of this disease, commencing with the year 1860, are therefore here represented. The years of the epidemic, 1871 and 1872, when vaccination and revaccination was carried to an extent never before paralleled at Philadelphia, exhibit the highest rate of small-pox cases since 1807.


Geo. Worthington, M.D.

Every one knows that it is not maintained for vaccination that it is a sure and certain protection against small-pox, even should the operation have been in all respects efficient.—British Medical Journal, July 31st, 1880.

DR. Gayton

I suppose no one is prepared to say that primary vaccination is an absolute preventive of small-pox.—Homerton Report, from 1871-7.

DR. H. Oidtmann, Linnich.

The number of unvaccinated persons is at present 5 to 6 times less extensive than fifty years ago; but, secondly, the rate of occurrence of small pox is 26 times more extensive. These facts may be learned from the following table.


DR. Risdon Bennett.

Nobody maintains that Vaccination is an absolute protection after the expiration of a certain number of years, against the taking of small-pox.—Lancet, 7th August, 1880.
DR. Charles Pigeon, Fourchambault, (Nievre,) France.

Every physician who has been engaged in an epidemic knows, that a relatively large number of the vaccinated have been attacked; and that the vaccine virus, instead of being a preservative, actively assists, the natural causes of small-pox, and tends to render the attack more dangerous.—Letter to the French Deputies, 1881.


A large number of medical men consider a general vaccination and revaccination to be in itself one of the causes of small-pox; a crowd of the newly vaccinated to be itself a dangerous centre of infection; and the 150,000 revaccinations in Paris during the siege to be in some degree responsible for the great epidemics of 1870-1.—Address before the French Academy of Medicine, 1881.

DR. Charles Cameron, M.P.

Since 1836 our statistics have been compiled so as to enable us to compare the mortality, not merely in small-pox occurring in all classes of vaccinated persons, at different periods, but in each separate class of vaccinated persons—in persons, that is, with one, two, three, or four good or indifferent marks. I have gone into these details, and found that not merely has the mortality in small-pox occurring after vaccination progressively increased in the aggregate, but it has increased in each class of cases, and increased enormously in the best vaccinated class of cases.—Letter to The Times, May 24th, 1881.

DR. Fraser Nicolson.

Reports that he recently had charge of 43 cases of small-pox in Bromley Union, between April 25th and June 29th, of which 16 were confluent, 14 discrete, 13 modified; two of the confluent cases died. All had been vaccinated, and three re-vaccinated.—Lancet, August 27th, 1881.

W. J. Collins, B.Sc. M.R.C.S.

He would ask, Has compulsory vaccination realised what was expected of it? has it annihilated small-pox? has it lessened the mortality from that disease? In reply, he would refer to the statistics of London and England, which showed that with 94 per cent, of the community vaccinated under a "perfected" system, there had been far more small-pox than when only half the population was protected, and vaccination was purely voluntary. In conclusion, he would repeat his conviction that there was not a shred of scientific evidence which lent support to the theory of vaccination; and that there was not a single dogma of JENNER that had stood the test of time and experience, and that ere long vaccination would be discarded before the advance of sanitary science.—(Speech at the Abernethian Society, St. Bartholomew's Hospital.) Reported in Student's Journal for March 19th, 1881.

J. J. Garth Wilkinson, M.R.C.S.E.

But it is demonstrable that vaccination has no influence whatever over the small-pox death rate. For the whole hospital death rate now of vaccinated and unvaccinated is just about 18 per cent.; almost exactly what it was before vaccination existed. The tables of JURIN in the last century, and of MARSON now, attest this. There is, then, no difference in the hospital mortality of small-pox since vaccination. The difference is, that vaccination has sorted the deaths into two classes, and that the unvaccinated are from the necessity of the case, the rotten sheep of health, rotten before they were sorted, and afterwards. A thousand other factors, which cannot be causal, would, as sorters, produce the same effect as non-vaccination. Thus, the people who wear best black and employ fashionable tailors, die of small-pox at a vastly less rate than those who wear fustian; and these again, than those who are in rags. The drinkers of the best port die less in the case than the drinkers of the cheapest beer. Any circumstance that shows condition and social quality, as vaccination also does, is attended with a smaller death rate from zymotic diseases; anything that demonstrates weak persons and sordid surroundings, which non-vaccination docs, is attended with the greater death rate. But the sifting process produced by a thousand circumstances is of no consequence. For put the two heaps of deaths together, and they come to just the same figure now, as before vaccination existed.—From the Eastern Daily Press, Sept. 2nd, 1881.
Recent Vaccination Disasters in the United States.

Vaccination and Death.

WALTHAM, VERMONT,

February 17th.

A singular death, resulting from Vaccination, has just occurred here; Miss Flora Hare, aged 18½ years, an only child of a substantial farmer, was vaccinated on the arm, and, seven days after, the operation was repeated on the same arm, at a distance of six or eight inches from the first incisions. Soon after, she was taken with pains about the head, followed by swelling of the head and neck, and she soon entered into a semi-conscious condition, which continued for three days. Her parents became alarmed, and summoned physicians from Middlebury, Burlington, and other places, who seemed unable to account for her illness, or to relieve her. On Monday she sank into a comatose state, and died on Tuesday evening. The vaccine virus was obtained from a reliable house in New York, and the young woman had enjoyed good health up to the time of her Vaccination. Several parties who have been vaccinated here have been severely indisposed in consequence. The fatal result in Miss Hare's case has caused a general feeling that one had better leave Vaccination alone, rather than to invite the Grim Monster by such dangerous experiments.

—Boston Daily Globe.

Smallpox Much Preferred to Vaccination.


The following communication from Dr. T. S. Hopkins, of Thomasville, Ga., concerning the results which have followed the use of "patent solid lymph," is published for general information: "Our town authorities have employed a physician to vaccinate all persons who present themselves for the purpose. The virus was procured from the New England Vaccine Company, Chelsea, Mass., as 'bovine matter.'

The Result has been Fearful.

Nearly everyone vaccinated has suffered severely from ERYTHEMA or ERYSIPELAS, the arm swollen from shoulder to wrist, and the point of puncture presenting the appearance of a sloughing ulcer, discharging freely sanious pus. Many of the sufferers have been confined to bed, with high fever, from five to ten days, requiring the constant application of poultices to the arm, and a free use of morphia for the relief of pain. I deem it my duty to inform you of the result here from the matter used and from whence it came. It came in cones, each cone said to contain enough to vaccinate 100 persons, at a cost of one dollar per cone. "Those who have tried it tell me they would much prefer to have smallpox."

The London Society for the Abolition of Compulsory Vaccination,

114 Victoria Street, Westminster, S.W.

Any persons who may suffer, in their own persons, or in those of their children, from the effects of Vaccination, are invited to send the fullest particulars to William Young, at the above address, stating whether the operation was performed with lymph from the arm, or with so-called calf lymph, with the name of the Vaccinator, as the Society is resolved to give the utmost publicity to these lamentable atrocities, which, although of daily occurrence home hitherto been rarely recorded.
Officers for the year 5636.

1876.
President: Julius Hyman, Esq.
Treasurer: Maurice Joel, Esq.
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Secretary: J. Benjamin.

Laws for the Management of the Dunedin Jewish Congregation.

I.
That this Congregation be entitled "THE DUNEDIN NAME JEWISH CONGREGATION,"
Hebrew text

II.
The Synagogue shall be opened on all proper Synagogue when opened Forms of prayers occasions, and the form of prayers shall be the same as read by the Jews of England under the jurisdiction of the Rev. N. M. Adler, Chief Rabbi.

III.
A person having paid six months' seat rent shall Members, Low constituted be constituted a member, provided always that he has held a seat for that period, and subscribed to these bye-laws.

IV.
Clause 1.—No member under the age of 18 years Qualification for voting and holding office shall be allowed to vote, and shall not hold office under the age of 21 years.
Clause 2.—All persons who have been members Qualification for voting or holding office six months shall be allowed to vote, and those who have been members twelve months to hold office.
N.B.—Subject to Clause 1, and law of arrears.

V.
Members leaving Dunedin, and not in arrears,
Membership may be retained by absentees
may retain their membership upon payment of one guinea per annum.

VI.
Persons withdrawing, how reinstated to membership
Any member who shall have withdrawn in arrears, and should wish to rejoin, shall, upon paying all arrears
due up to the time of his withdrawal, and thirteen weeks seat rent in advance, be restored to his seat of
membership.

VII.
Persons withdrawing in arrears how reinstated to membership
Any person who has previously been a member of this Congregation for twelve months, and paid his
account up to the time of his withdrawal, shall, should he request, be reinstated to his rights of membership
upon payment of thirteen weeks' seat-rent in advance.

VIII.
Country members
Persons who have been seat-holders not less than twelve months, residing over ten miles from Dunedin,
wishing to continue members of this Congregation, can do so by payment of arrears and one guinea per annum
in advance : such persons to have all the privileges of regular members, with the exception of seat in
Synagogue.

IX.
Disqualification of membership
Any Jew marrying contrary to the Judaical rites, shall be disqualified from becoming or remaining a
member of this Congregation.

X.
Management
The management of the affairs of the Congregation shall be vested in a President, Treasurer, Secretary,
Retiring President, and a Committee of eight members, four of whom shall retire annually in the inverse order
of their election.

XI.
Officers, when elected, and when duties commence
The President, Treasurer, and four Committeemen shall be elected annually at a general meeting to be held
on a Sunday during the month of Ellul, and their duties shall commence on the eve of "Shobas Berishes."

XII.
Persons nominated tor office in their absence
Any member nominated for office in his absence shall be informed of it by the Secretary in writing, and
unless he signify by letter within three days his intention to stand his elction, his name shall not be placed on
the ballot paper.

XIII.
All elections, excepting Auditors, shall be by
Elections, how conducted.
ballonet.
Voting by proxy shall not be allowed.

Proxies

XV.

Father and son or two brothers shall not be allowed to be on the Committee of Management at the same time; and should they be nominated for office, they may go to the ballot, and the one having the greater number of votes (if elected) shall sit at the Board.

XVI.

Any member owing more than the amount of two quarters' seat-rent shall be considered in arrears, and shall neither be entitled to vote or hold office.

XVII.

No member shall be eligible to fill the office of President or Treasurer until he shall have been a member of the Committee for twelve months; he must be a married man, or have attained the age of thirty years.

XVIII.

On the first day of the Festival of Tabernacle, the reader shall announce the names, in Hebrew and English, of the Officers elected for the ensuing year.

XIX.

Retiring officers are eligible for re-election.

XX.

In the event of the demise, resignation, or disqualification of the President, Treasurer, or Committee-man, a general meeting shall be convened within fourteen days to fill up the vacancy so occurring, providing such does not take place within two months of the general election.

XXI.

The President shall be entitled to preside at all meetings, and in his absence the Treasurer, or, in the event of both being absent, a Chairman shall be chosen from the Committee.

XXII.

President or Treasurer may convene by circular any meeting whenever he shall deem it requisite.

XXIII.

The President shall convene a Committee meeting upon requisition signed by not less than four members of Committee, and a general meeting upon receipt of requisition signed by not less than ten members of the
Congregation; such requisition shall state the purpose for which the meeting is required, and no other subject shall be discussed but that for which the meeting is called; meeting so requested must be convened within seven days of the receipt of such requisition.

XXIV.

President to have casting vote
The President shall have a casting vote, in addition to his deliberative one, when the numbers are equal.

XXV.

Presiding Sigon
The President, or, in his absence, the Treasurer, shall preside as Sigon, and have the distribution of "Mitzvas,;" in the absence of the above-named officers, the ex-President, or, in his absence, the Senior Committeeman present, shall preside.

XXVI.

President's power of expending money
The President shall have power to expend for Synagogue purposes, once in three months, any sum not exceeding Five Pounds.

XXVII.

President's power of relief to poor
The President shall have the power of giving relief to any poor Jew (but not more than once in three months to the same individual), to the amount of L1 1s.

XXVIII.

Treasurer to pay salaries and accounts
The Treasurer shall pay all recognised salaries and such accounts as may be passed by the Committe, under abstract signed by the President, or, in his absence, by the Chairman for the time being, or by order of the President according to law.

XXIX.

Treasurer to keep accounts
The Treasurer shall keep correct accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the Congregation.

XXX.

The Treasurer shall, at the Committee meeting
Treasurer to produce audited balance sheet at nomination meeting
previous to the annual election meeting, produce a balance-sheet showing the receipts and expenditure for the past year, certified as to its correctness by the auditors, which said balance-sheet shall be read at the annual election meeting, to be held in the month of Ellul, and laid on the table for inspection and adoption.

XXXI.

The Treasurer, at the Committee meeting prior
Treasurer in re-tiring to produce supplementary balance sheet and books to be audited
to his retiring from office, shall produce a supplementary balance-sheet, which, with books, &c., shall be audited.

XXXII.

The Treasurer, upon retiring, shall hand over to
Treasurer in retiring to deliver up property, &c.
his successor all books, bonds, monies, and accounts of the Congregation appertaining to his office.
XXXIII. The Treasurer shall open an account with one of Banking and withdrawing money
the Dunedin Banks, to be named by the Committee, in the name of the Dunedin Jewish Congregation; and all monies received by him shall be deposited to the credit of that account. No portion of the money so deposited shall be withdrawn unless by the joint signature of the President and Treasurer for the time being; or, in the absence of the President, the signature of the Secretary, in conjunction with the Treasurer.

XXXIV. The Treasurer shall allot and let the seats in the Synagogue according to the rates fixed.

XXXV. The Treasurer, by direction of the Committee, shall have power to commence, prosecute, or defend any action in any Court of Law.

XXXVI. The Committee shall meet the first Sunday in every month for passing the accounts and the despatch of general business.

XXXVII. At meetings of Committee five shall form a quorum.

XXXVIII. Officers or Committee-men absenting
Any officer or member of the Committee who shall be absent from three consecutive summoned meetings without a satisfactory reason or apology shall be considered as having vacated his office, and such vacancy shall be filled up as provided by law.

XXXIX. Committee empowered to amend laws, &c
The Committee shall be empowered to make, amend, alter, or rescind any law or bye-law of the Congregation; but no law or laws so made, amended, altered, or rescinded shall be binding until approved by a general or special general meeting called for that purpose.

XLI. Committee to regulate salaries The Committee shall from time to time regulate the salaries of paid officers; recommend the same to the general body for confirmation.

XLII. Committee (may appoint additional readers The Committee may (when required) appoint additional readers to perform divine service.
Committee when to meet to call to Torah
A meeting of the Committee shall be convened within fourteen days, prior to the New Year and Day of Atonement, for the purpose of forming a list of members to be called to the Torah, to whom the Secretary shall give notice in writing.

XLIII.
Auditors duties, and how appointed
Two Auditors shall be appointed at the annual nomination meeting, who shall examine the Treasurer's balance-sheet, and all accounts relating thereto, and if found correct shall attach their signatures to the same; They shall also audit the Secretary's and Collector's book; and they shall, within one week after such accounts and documents have been handed to them, make a report of their examination to the Committee.

XLIV.
Scrutineers' duties, and how appointed
At any election meeting three persons shall be appointed (by show of hands) to act as scrutineers, whose duty it shall be to preside at the ballot-box, and immediately after the close of the poll shall proceed to ascertain the number of votes polled for each candidate, and make a return of the same to the President.

XLV.
Between the New Year and the Tabernacle
Chosan Torah and Chosan Berishes
Festival, the Committee shall appoint from among the members two persons to act as Chosen Torah and Chosan Berishes, who shall thereupon be apprised in writing of their appointment; and the Secretary shall, at the same time, require an answer within three days; or should either or both parties refuse to act, the President and Treasurer shall officiate.

XLVI.
The names of the persons appointed to act as
Chosan Torah and Chosan Berishes' announced honors and duties
Chosen Torah and Chosen Berishes, shall be announced in the Synagogue on the first day of the Tabernacle Festival, and they shall at the period of their officiation, be seated next the President, where they must attend to be called to the Torah, on "Simchas Torah," and Shobas Berishes.

XLVII.
The Minister shall on all occasions perform divine
Minister to officiate. Substitute, how appointed
service; in his absence the Senior Officer present may appoint a proper person to officiate in his stead.

XLVIII.
The Minister shall not officiate at any marriage
Minister not to officiate at marriages without authority
ceremony without a written authority from the President.

XLIX.
The Minister shall, when performing any service,
Minister when to wear robes
wear his official robes, except at Private Minyonim.

L.
The Minister shall attend all funerals, and visit
Minister to attend funerals and Shivo
the house of a mourner during "Shivo."
LI.

No offerings shall be made in the Synagogue to
Offerings
any salaried officer of this Crongregation.

LII.

The Secretary's duties shall be to regularly keep
Secretary's duties
all books and accounts in connection with Synagogue, attend all meetings, and take minutes of the
proceedings, issue summonses and circulars for convening meetings, or for any Congregational purpose, and
carry on the correspondence according to directions he may receive from the President or Committee.

LIII.

Secretary to keep book of marriage contracts
The Secretary shall keep a book wherein shall he entered a duplicate of all marriage contracts, which shall
be signed by the same parties as the original marriage contract.

LIV.

Secretary to keep a registry of births, deaths and marriages
The Secretary shall keep a regular and correct registry of births, marriages, and burials, in Hebrew and
English.

LV.

Secretary to act as Registrar
The Secretary shall attend all marriage ceremonies as Registrar.

LVI.

Secretary to prepare accounts and balance sheet
The Secretary shall prepare the accounts due to the Congregation, and have them ready for delivery
quarterly; he shall also prepare for examination by the Auditors an annual balance-sheet of the income and
expenditure.

LVII.

Secretary to keep roll of members
The Secretary shall keep a roll, in which shall be registered the names of all members of the Congregation.

LVIII.

Secretary when to allow inspection of books, &c.
The Secretary shall not permit any book or document to be inspected, except by a member of Committee,
without a written order from the President.

LIX.

Secretary to perform other duties.
The Secretary shall perform any other duty consistent with his office not herein set forth, as shall be
required by either the President or Treasurer.

LX.

Secretary to conform to rules
President may suspend Secretary, and must lay cause before Committee
The Secretary shall strictly conform to all the regulations in these laws; and in case of refusal or neglect of
his duties, or for any improper conduct, the President shall have power to suspend him from office pending investigation; and the President shall, within three days, lay the reason of such suspension before the Committee, who shall take the same into immediate consideration.

LXI.

General meetings, Quorum
At general meetings, thirteen members shall form a quorum.

LXII.

On the Sunday prior to the annual election, a Nomination meeting, when called meeting of members shall be convened for general business, and for the nomination of honorary and salaried officers.

LXIII.

At general meetings no member shall be allowed to speak twice on any subject unless in explanation or reply.

LXIV.

No person shall be elected to any paid office unless Paid officers to be recommended by Committee recommended by the Committee.

LXV.

Should any vacancy occur in any paid office, a Committee to determine if vacancy of paid officers shall be filled up meeting of the Committee shall be convened within fourteen days, when it shall be determined whether such vacancy shall be filled up.

LXVI.

Seats in the Synagogue shall be arranged, Rates of seats classed, and rated in the following order: —

- Class A.—£7 16s per annum
- Class B.—£6 10S per annum.
- Class C. (front.)—£5 4s per annum.
- Class C. (back.)—£3 18s per annum.
- Class D.—£2 12s per annum.

Ladies' Seats.

- Class 1.—1 guinea per annum.
- Class 2.—10s 6d per annum.

LXVII.

Sons of members under the age of eighteen years Minors' seats may be seat-holders in Class C. on payment of 10s 6d per annum.

LXVIII.

Application for seats shall be made to the Treasurer
Seats to be applied for to Treasurer in writing, and, when allotted, cannot be transferred or changed without his consent.

LXIX.

Seat rents shall become payable quarterly in advance, viz., in the months "Nissen," "Tamuz," "Tishri," and "Shevat." Seats taken at any other period than the commencement of the quarter shall be charged at the rate of a quarter.

LXX.

Absentees may retain seats
Members leaving the Colony desirous of retaining their seats, shall be permitted to do so upon the payment of one year's rent (annually) in advance.

LXXI.

Treasurer may re-let seats
Any member whose account is in arrears for twelve months or more, will be required, on or before the annual election, to pay 50 per cent, of the gross amount of his account, and failing to do so, the Treasurer may re-let his seat after seven days' notice has been given of his intention to do so.

LXXII. Births.

Naming children
Female children shall be named in the Synagogue by the officiating minister, according to the prescribed Judaical rite.

LXXIII.

Father to attend Synagogue
Notice in writing shall be given to the Secretary of the intention to name a child two clear days previous to the day appointed, when the father shall attend to be called to the Torah.

LXXIV.

Registration of children
For the purpose of registration it shall be incumbent on the father of every child to supply the secretary with the intended name, date of birth, name of parents, &c., in Hebrew and English (in writing).

LXXV. Marriages.

Marriage notice to be given
Persons about to marry in this Congregation, must give notice in writing to the Secretary fifteen days previous to the day of marriage for the President's and Committee's permission; when, after payment of fees, charges, and arrears (if any), the ceremony shall be performed.

LXXVI.

Marriages, when performed
Marriages shall be solemnized in the Synagogue, unless application be made to have the ceremony performed at a private residence, which shall be approved of by the President, and a fee of two guineas charged for the permission.

LXXVII.

Bides groom and bridesmen to attend Synagogue
Bridegrooms and their Bridesmen residing in the City of Dunedin shall attend Synagogue on the Sabbath before marriage, to be called to the Torah.
LXXVIII.

Members for twelvemonths and upwards shall be
Marriage fee for members of 12 months
charged three guineas for marriage fee, and ten shillings and sixpence for certificate (Kezubah)?

LXXIX.

Members and strangers desirous of being married
Committee to determine marriage fees
in this Congregation, shall be charged such a sum as the Committee may determine, and parties desirous of
being married beyond the limits of the City of Dunedin shall pay such additional sum for expenses as the
Committee may decide.

LXXX.

Death.

Upon the demise of any Member of this Congregation
Notice of death to be given to Secretary
or any of his relatives, notice thereof shall immediately be given to the Secretary, who shall apprise the
President of the Burial Ground of the same.

LXXXI.

The President shall not permit any funeral to
Arrears to be paid or arranged for before burial
take place until all arrears due to the Synagogue Funds, together with funeral expenses, be discharged,
unless in case of the failure of effects of the deceased, and the incapacity of his relatives to pay the whole of the
arrears, or the sum for the payment of the ground, when it shall be in the power of the President and Committee
to make such arrangements as they may deem fit, and, if necessary, to authorise the funeral expenses to be paid
from the Synagogue Funds.

LXXXII.

The Committee shall appoint annually a Superintendent
Superintendent of burial ground, how appointed, and duties
of the Burial Ground, whose duties shall be to take charge of the Cemetery, and see that it is kept in proper
order, make arrangements for all funerals, keep a registry of them, and see that they are properly conducted,

LXXXIII.

The Superintendent of the Burial Ground shall
Expenditure for Cemetery purposes
have power, in conjunction with the President, to expend, for Cemetery purposes, any sum not exceeding
L5 in three months.

LXXXIV.

Graves shall not be dug, nor gravestones erected,
Graves and tombstones
without a written order from the President; nor shall any inscription be permitted unless previously
approved by the President and Minister. Any person digging, or causing a grave to be dug, or interring a body
without the written authority of the President, or in opposition to his commands, shall be prosecuted according
to law.

LXXXV.

Ground reserved for a grave
Any person requiring a portion of the Burial Ground to be reserved for a grave, shall be charged such sum
as the Committee may determine, but not less than £10 (ten pounds) for a grave measuring 8ft. by 5ft., and that
such ground shall not be used contrary to Judaic laws and the bye-laws of this Congregation.

LXXXVI.

Committee to determine charge for ground
Members, their wives, or unmarried children under 15 years of age, shall, at their decease, be buried without charge for the ground; but non-members, their wives, or unmarried children, shall, at their decease, be subject to such charge for the ground and fees as the President and Committee may determine.

LXXXVII.

Fee to erect a tombstone
The following charge shall be made for permission to erect tombstones:—Members, free; Non-members, L1 1s.

LXXXVIII. Registration.

Registration fees
The following shall be the schedule of fees for registration:—
- For Births, nil; copy, 2s. 6d.
- For Marriage, 10s 6d.
- For Death, members, nil; copy, 2s 6d.
- For Death, Non-members, nil; copy, 5s.

LXXXIX. Precedence for Calling to the Torah.

Order of precedence
The following shall be the order of precedence for calling to the Torah:—
- First—Bar Mitzvah or Confirmed.
- Second—Bridegroom.
- Third—Father naming a Child, or his Wife attending after a Confinement.
- Fourth—Persons having a sitting at a Beris.
- Fifth—Father having a Beris.
- Sixth—Anniversary of a parents death.
- Seventh—Father having a son confirmed.

XC.

Every member shall, previous to exercising his privilege, sign the official copy of the rules and regulations, signifying his willingness to be governed by the same.

XCI.

Persons presenting gifts of property to the Synagogue shall have their names in Hebrew and English recorded in the book kept for that purpose, together with the particulars of the property presented.

XCII.

Letters respecting the affairs of the Synagogue shall be entered in a book kept for that purpose.

XCIII.

Proclamations shall not be made in the Synagogue
without the signature of either the President or Treasurer, excepting religious proclamations requiring immediate publication, which may be proclaimed in the absence of the President and Treasurer, by permission of the senior officer present.

**XCIV.**

Notices for any purpose, whether written or No placard to be affixed without sanction printed, shall not be affixed to any place belonging to the Synagogue without the sanction of the President or Treasurer.

**XCV.**

Any person charged with offending any officer Offences against officers in his official capacity, shall be summoned to appear at a meeting of the Committee, to answer the charge, and make satisfaction for the same, in such a manner as shall be determined by the Committee.

**XCVI.**

Every Member shall be furnished with a copy of Laws

**XCVII.**

Any person not a member of this Congregation, Non-members requiring ceremonies performed; and requiring the performance of any religious rite or ceremony, shall be charged such a sum as the President and Committee shall determine.

**XCVIII.**

No protest shall be valid unless it is made in Protests writing.

**XCIX.**

Gases unprovided for Should any person be dissatisfied with the decision of the Committee, he may appeal to the general body, provided he gives notice in writing to that effect to the President within twenty-four hours after such decision is made known to him.

**C.**

Appeal to general body

Should any case occur which has not been provided for by any law of the Congregation, the Committee shall decide,

**Cl. Interpretation of President.**

Wherever the word President occurs in these bye-laws, it shall mean the presiding officer for the time being.

_Nineteenth Annual Report of the Committee of Management of the Benevolent Institution Dunedin; With the Objects of the Same, And a List of Subscriptions & Donations for the Year 1881._

"In Prosperity Remember the Poor."

Printed At The "Daily Times" Office Dunedin High Street. MDCCCLXXXII 1881.

The Committee in submitting their 19th Annual Report and Balance-Sheet cannot congratulate the subscribers on any decrease on the demands of the funds of the Institution for the past year.

It is with regret they have to report that a large amount of distress existed amongst a number of people from pure misfortune—through illness, want of employment, and other causes. Deserted wives, as usual, occupying a prominent position amongst the recipients of the funds.

It will be gratifying to the subscribers to know that through the liberality of the public the Committee were in a position to relieve all deserving cases brought before them, not only in Dunedin, but extending to various parts of the Provincial District, and this in the face of malicious and unfounded charges made against the management and committee of the Institution.

The Committee are thankful to say the subscriptions have not been diminished from this cause.

As the subscribers are aware, a Committee of Enquiry was appointed, consisting of Messrs. John Bathgate, and John Logan, who declared the charges to be unfounded. Pending the result of the enquiry, subscriptions were not collected by the Secretary.

In proof of confidence in your Committee, one generous citizen contributed the sum of £6300 as a nucleus towards forming an Orphan Asylum for the admission of children of all nations and persuasions, and to whom the Committee express their gratitude. At present there are several orphans in the Institution, which is now open to receive deserving cases.

The total amount received was £4,764 16s 7d, of which £1,844 19s was in subscriptions and donations; a corresponding subsidy being received from the Government.

The total amount expended was £5,788 8s 2d, of which £3,413 3s 9d was expended in Outdoor Relief for food, clothing, rents, fuel, &c., £2,375 4s 5d being expended on the support of the inmates in the Asylum at Caversham, including £130 for erection of a play shed for children. For fuller particulars see Revenue Account.

The total number relieved was 1685, viz.: 171 men, 405 women, and 1,109 children, made up as follows:—Families in which the men were incapacitated through age, chronic disease, accident, or temporary illness, 61 men, 61 women, 214 children; widows, 131, with 381 children; deserted wives, 62, with 224 children; single men, 38; single women, 16; single women, 18, with 23 illegitimate children; 7 women with 21 children, whose husbands are or were in gaol; 4 women with 12 children, whose husbands are or were in hospital; 4 women with 11 children, whose husbands are or were in Lunatic Asylum. Families which were destitute through want of employment on the part of the men, 45 men, 45 women, 176 children; the remainder being cases of a casual nature.

The number received into the Institution was 51; 18 men, 18 women, and 15 children. The number discharged was, 56, 18 men, 17 women, and 24 children, leaving the number remaining in the Institution 1st January, 1882, 47 men, 13 women, and 30 children—total 90. The number of deaths was 6—see Dr. Hocken's report—both male and female adults are nearly all permanent invalids or otherwise disabled. The weekly average of inmates was 93, at a cost of 8s 4 ¾ d each per week; this includes food, furnishing, fuel, clothing, medicine, salaries of Doctor, Religious Instructor, Master, Matron, Servants, education of children, &c.

It is with regret that your Committee have to record the death of one of their colleagues, Mr. R. A. Low; in him the Institution has sustained a loss and the poor a kind and generous friend.
In view of an increase in the number of children, a new play-shed and water-closets have been added to the buildings.

The men's quarters are much overcrowded, and provision will have to be made at once for further accommodation, many deserving cases having to be refused admission. This matter the Committee commend to the consideration of their successors.

The subject of illegitimacy having been so prominently referred to in last year's report, your Committee, finding it an evil on the increase, would again commend the matter to a committee of ladies so that this Institution may be relieved of a burden not fairly within its functions.

In conclusion, the Committee tender their hearty thanks to the subscribers generally, to the clergy, and the various Protestant congregations, to the proprietors of the following publications:—"Otago Witness," "Saturday Advertiser," "Evening Star," "Morning Herald," "New Zealand Church-man," "Illustrated New Zealand Herald," "Temperance Herald," and "New Zealand Presbyterian," which are supplied gratuitously.

Attached to this report are the Balance-sheet, the Medical Officer's Report, and the usual tables, as also the report of the Commissioners, Messrs. Bathgate and Logan.

Finally, the Committee would record its appreciation of religious services rendered by Mr. Macfie—the attention of Miss Wilson to the education of the children under her charge, the care of Dr. Hocken towards those requiring medical treatment, and its continued confidence in the management generally of the Institution.

The following resolution was passed in reference to the resignation of the late President, Mr. A. Chetham Strode.

Resolved—"That the Committee of the Otago Benevolent Institution at their first meeting after taking office, cannot allow the resignation of the late President, Mr. A. Chetham Strode, to pass without placing on record their appreciation of his lone; continued and valued services."

The Committee now resign their trust, but are eligible for re-election.

(Signed) R. B. Martin, President.

Medical Report.

DUNEDIN, MORAY PLACE,

To the Chairman of the Benevolent Institution Committee

March 15, 1882.

Sir,—I have the honour to report that during the past year the health of the inmates has been, on the whole, good. There have been six deaths:—David Moncrieff, 75, of old age; John Curran, 63, of heart and lung disease; Andrew Williamson, 71, cancer of the stomach; Ellen Wood, 60, of general decay; John Simmons, 40, of old-standing general paralysis; and Elizabeth Morris, 12, of brain disease.

There has been no visitation of epidemic disease with the exception of one case of scarlet fever, which was at once isolated; and precautions were taken successfully to prevent the spread of the disease.

I must again add how highly I appreciate the care taken by Mr. and Mrs. Quin to ensure the comfort and health of the inmates; the institution is always a pattern of order and cleanliness.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient servant, T. M. Hocken,
Medical Officer.

Otago Benevolent Institution.

Revenue Account for the Year 1881.

£ s. d. £ s. d. Dr. To Live-stock, Fodder, &c., purchased 31 5 9 To Outdoor Relief ... ... ... 3413 3 9 Groceries, Meat, Bread, &c. ... 731 3 1 To House Furnishings and Repairs ... 115 12 2 To Salaries of Secretary, Matron, Servants, Overseer ... 516 12 0 N To Salary of Medical Officer ... 50 0 0 To Do Schoolmistress ... 60 0 0 To Do Religious Instructor ... 52 0 0 To Repairs to Buildings Fencing, &c. ... 71 7 4 To Clothing and Repairs ... 193 5 10 To Fuel ... ... ... 118 1 5 To Printing and Advertising ... 13 17 6 To Medicines, Seeds, Rates,
Postage, Insurance, and Labour to Unemployed 227 16 4 To Office Rent and Stationery ... 64 3 0 To Appropriation for New Play Shed ... ... 130 0 0 5788 8 2 2823 2 0 Unexhausted Revenue, 1st January, 1882 £8611 10 2 DUNEDIN, 9th February, 1882. Cr. £ s. d. £ s. d. By Unexhausted Revenue, 1st Jan., 1881 ... ... ... 3846 13 7 To Government Subsidy to 31st Dec., 1881 ... ... ... 1878 6 6 To Subscriptions, Collections, and Donations per List ... 1844 19 0 To Interest on Savings Bank Securities and Revenue vestment ... ... ... 792 11 6 To Rents of Land at Pine Hill ... 60 18 1 To Receipts on account of Inmates ... 93 1 6 To Education Grant ... ... ... 95 0 0 £8611 10 2 £8611 10 2 Audited and found correct, William Brown, Auditor. Dunedin 9th February, 1882.

**Otago Benevolent Institution.**

**Balance January, 1882.**

Liabilities. £ s. d. £ s. d. Endowments ... ... ... 14823 10 0 Revenue Appropriation "Furniture" ... 250 0 0 Do do Building ... 130 0 0 15203 10 0 Sundry Creditors ... ... ... 360 2 11 Unexhausted Revenue ... ... ... ... ... 2823 2 0 £18,386 14 11 Assets. £ s. d £ s. d. Dunedin Savings Bank ... ... ... ... 45 0 0 Pine-hill Land ... ... ... 108 10 0 Sundry Creditors ... ... ... ... ... 35 11 1 Unexhausted Revenue ... ... ... ... ... 121 4 0 £18,386 14 11 I have examined the Books, Vouchers, and Securities of the Benevolent Institution, and find the above Balance-Sheet correct. William Brown, Auditor February 9th, 1882.

**Report of Proceedings at the Annual Meeting.**

The Annual Meeting of subscribers to the Otago Benevolent Institution was held at Farley's Hall, Princes Street, at 4 p.m. yesterday. Mr. R. B. Martin, president of the Committee of Management, occupied the chair, and about 40 persons were present.

The minutes of the previous Annual Meeting were read and confirmed.

The Chairman announced that apologies had been received from the Revs. C. J. Byng and W. Ronaldson, and his Lordship Bishop Nevill for non-attendance, and that Mr. R. H. Leary would not be eligible for re-election to the Committee.

The Annual Report, and balance sheet were taken as read, and were adopted on the motion of Mr. J. Torrance, seconded by the Ven. Archdeacon Edwards.

The Rev. Dr. Stuart referred to the third paragraph of the report, and said: I have to ask you, sir, are you aware that grave charges are being circulated respecting the management and members of Committee? I have in my possession quite a bundle of libellous communications, and I should like very much to know whether you are aware that such charges are in circulation respecting the management and members of Committee, and if so, whether any steps are being taken to put an end to their circulation, as they are most certainly affecting the well being of the Institution.

The Chairman: In reply, doctor, I have to inform you that we are unfortunately too well aware of these slanderous reports. I believe there is no individual member of the Committee who has not received some of these epistles, and some are much more offensively written than others. I, along with my friend Mr. Rennie, have been most cruelly (I think) treated by the writer of these letters. Indeed all members of Committee have had to suffer annoyance, but, whether it is through our good sense or not, we have taken no action in the matter. Charges have been levelled directly against the Secretary of immoral conduct, and the Committee had a meeting to discuss the matter, and it was resolved to leave it to Mr. Quin to decide whether he should take action or not. He has taken action, having recently lodged a criminal information against Mr. Hitchcock on his own responsibility. The result, I am quite sure, will be satisfactory to all here—at least I hope so. We made no inquiry into these charges. We thought it better that the law should step in and investigate them. The charges did not influence the Committee in the slightest way, and the work of dealing with the money so liberally subscribed by the supporters of the Institution has gone on in the usual way.

The Rev. Dr. Stuart: I listen with very great pleasure. Personally, I have been acquainted with the working of the Institution since its commencement, and I never had occasion to notice anything wrong in the management; but certainly the charges circulated against the Secretary are so very grave that I think the Committee should insist upon a criminal prosecution, for the vindication of the character of their servant and the salvation of the Institution. I am very pleased to hear that the Secretary has taken action. I believe that nobody is persuaded that the letters are other than libellous. As I am very jealous of the good name of the
In Institution, I am very pleased to hear that steps have been taken in this matter.

Mr. E. E. C. Quick said that he had received a letter of a very abusive nature, and it plainly showed that the writer ought to be put under restraint, either as a lunatic or criminal. The charges contained in it were such as no sane man would have dared to make, and some of them had been previously investigated. He had moved that the Committee should not take any action, it being at that time a moribund one, which would not be justified in plunging into law expenses. Mr. Quin had therefore been left to act in the matter himself.

The Rev. Dr. Stuart: I am quite satisfied.

Mr. A. Rennie said he had also received considerable amount of correspondence of a nature most absurd and ridiculous in the extreme. He therefore did not take the slightest notice of the communications. It was very questionable, he thought, whether the writer was responsible for his actions.

Mr. H. J. Walter pointed out that while every member of the Committee could laugh at the statements contained in the letters sent to them, the Secretary was placed in an unfortunate position through having to go to law, and he suggested that in the event of his winning the case his expenses should be defrayed.

The Chairman explained that the Committee had minuted a suggestion to their successors to that effect.—(Hear.)

Mr. A. H. Ross: I may just say that I have been the recipient of a very great number of letters from this Mr. Hitchcock, and that the gravest charge made in them has been inquired into by a gentleman wholly unconnected with this Committee, who declares that there is not a word of truth in it. The feelings of the Committee was that a prosecution should be entered into, but the Committee did not think it would be right to spend money in the prosecution of a man not responsible for his actions. The Secretary has taken action, and I have no doubt that if he succeeds in vindicating his character, which I have no doubt he will do, subscriptions will be forthcoming to pay the expenses incurred.

The Rev. Dr. Stuart: I rise, sir, to move that Mr. R. B. Martin be appointed President for the present year, Messrs. Rennie and Fulton Vice-presidents, and Mr. James Brown Treasurer.

The motion was carried.

The Ven. Archdeacon Edwards: I have great pleasure in proposing Messrs. Quick, Carroll, Ross, Gourlay, and Captain Thomson for election to the Committee of Management. I believe they were members of the old Committee, and although as a rule I am in favour of the importation of new blood into committees, I do not think it would be advisable in the present instance. I would like to see these gentlemen, who have borne the burden and heat of the day, and passed through troublesome times, re-elected. It would show to the public that we have perfect confidence in them.

Mr. J. L. Gillesies seconded.

Mr. S. James moved that the three additional members be Messrs. T. S. Graham, G. Blyth, and T. W. Hungerford.

Mr. W. G. Geddes seconded.

Mr. H. S. Fish, M.H.R., remarked the absence of the three gentlemen last proposed, and thought if they really meant to take an interest in affairs they should have been present at the meeting.

It was explained that their absence was unavoidable, and the motion was put and carried.

Some discussion took place as to the desirability of organising a ladies' visiting committee, and as such a step would involve an alteration of the rules of the Institution, it was resolved—"That the Committee be empowered to form a ladies' visiting committee if deemed expedient."

The Ven. Archdeacon Edwards asked if anything had been done with the donation of £300 which was given towards the institution of an orphanage.

The Chairman said that two or three calls had been made on it, and the Committee would be prepared to meet deserving cases where children were left without parents in future.

Mr. Fish and others thought the money should have been put to a separate account, and should have been devoted to no other purpose than establishing an orphanage.

It was resolved—"That in the opinion of this meeting it is desirable that the Committee should place the £300 to a separate account, to be appropriated for the purpose indicated by the donor."

A vote of thanks was accorded to the anonymous donor of the sum, and a hope expressed that others would follow his example.

Votes of thanks were also accorded to the Chairman and to the management of the past year, and the meeting dispersed.

The Benevolent Asylum Inquiry.

In commencing the inquiry which we were requested to undertake, we encountered an initiatory difficulty
in the absence of precise and specific charges concerning which the investigation should be held.

Correspondence was placed in our hands containing sweeping and general assertions of mismanagement, tyranny, cruelty, and such like; but there was a want of necessary precision in details, while at the same time there was a jumble of irrelevant matter, which rendered it almost impossible for us, in the exercise of the ordinary rules for guidance in matters of complaint, to arrive at a proper comprehension of the charges made. We did not feel warranted in entering into a roving inquiry of a vague and general character. We hold it to be the duty of a complainer to state accurately the exact nature of his complaint in a specific manner, giving the time when, the place where, and the other facts on which he founds. It is only in this way that an accused person can understand and properly answer charges made, or that evidence adduced can be kept within proper limits. We accordingly selected a few special points for a beginning, and resolved to limit the inquiry in the first instance to the following:—1. The case of James Knight Neal. 2. Two sudden deaths—Tom Floyd and Henry Hill—on which no inquests were held. And 3. The case of John Rollins.

Mr. C. D. Hitchcock appeared as complainer, and was permitted to conduct the inquiry and to adduce such witnesses as he desired to examine. We found that he had a very strong bias against the members of the Committee of the Benevolent Institution, Mr. Hocken, and Mr. and Mrs. Quin personally, which warped his judgment in the proper management of the inquiry and led him into indiscretions. He apparently had no experience in judging of the value of testimony; nor did he seem to be acquainted with the ordinary procedure for expiscating the truth. In his eyes the testimony of a brothel-keeper was of the same weight as that of a respectable citizen. Every help was given to keep him right, but it finally appeared that unless we were prepared to sacrifice our own judgment and look at everything from his point of view, he considered us as actuated by partial and hostile motives. He was at last carried away by his indiscretion, and used language which we could not with self-respect submit to. For this he was requested to apologise, and he having declined to do so, we refused to hear him further in the matter. Anxious, however, that the investigation should not be checked, we agreed to examine any witnesses Mr. Hitchcock might tender, and even to allow him to suggest questions. He declined to proceed on the terms offered. He inquiry was then brought to a premature termination; but before closing, an opportunity was given to Mr. Quin to answer the evidence which had been led, and to any other party to appear who had information to give. From the circumstances mentioned, the inquiry has not been so full and exhaustive as we could have wished; but in so far as regards the specific cases previously stated, we have no hesitation in affirming that there is no reason for believing that any blame is attributable to Mr. and Mrs. Quin connected therewith. Attempts were made by inuendo to insinuate that money had passed into Mr. Quin's hands and had not been accounted for. We are completely satisfied that such insinuations are entirely groundless. Every payment referred to was duly entered in the books and accounted for in the printed annual report, and we cannot condemn too strongly the suggestion made that there was any malversation, as on all the items mentioned the complainer might have satisfied himself by previous inquiry; there was no room even for suspicion. In the examination of one or two witnesses there was in the questions put a false suggestion thrown out that Floyd had committed suicide. A very little care would have enabled the complainer to ascertain the real fact—that Floyd had not committed suicide, but had died from the incurable malady under which he was labouring when he left the Hospital and was admitted to the Institution. In this point, as in others, the complainer was carried away by an undue bias which made him anxious that the facts should square with his preconceived but unwarrantable conclusion that there had been misconduct on the part of everyone connected with the Institution. We are of opinion that Mr. Hocken exercised a wise discretion in not holding inquests in the cases mentioned. There was no necessity for subjecting the country to the expense of inquests in these cases, and Mr. Hocken is to be commended for declining to hold them, although he might otherwise have pocketed the statutory allowance. The only matter with which we could fault is one for which neither the Committee nor the officers are to blame. A number of helpless incurables from various parts of the Provincial District have been placed in the Institution without there being any suitable structural arrangements or proper means for their due care. Such inmates would require one or more wards for themselves, and a nursing staff. There are other inmates whose failing energies ought not to be too much taxed with giving attention night and day to their helpless companions. Their rest at night must often be disturbed, and the want of proper ventilation must have an injurious effect on their health. We are of opinion that, in justice to the ordinary inmates of the Institution, as well as to the master and matron, who have quite enough to occupy their time in the management of the ordinary departments under their charge the incurables should be, as soon as provision can be made, removed to a proper hospital, where their sufferings might be alleviated under constant medical attendance and the care of trained nurses.

In conclusion, we cannot help pointing out that we think the inquiry a mistake in itself. We had no power to put witnesses on oath, and any of those examined might say what they chose without incurring the pains of perjury. We had no control over the complainer, except that we could decline hearing him further. As an instance of our being hampered and placed in a false position, the case of William Martin may be referred to.
This witness made a strong statement in regard to the quality of the food. After his examination in chief it was only just that we should allow the Committee an opportunity to cross-examine; but the witness at once said he would not remain, and although specially called on to do so, he unceremoniously walked off. Mr. Tyree, who had been assisting Mr. Hitchcock, then said the witness had been instructed not to remain. Misconduct so gross, if it had taken place in a court of law, would have involved both the refractory witness and his instructors in well-deserved punishment. We had only the alternative of setting aside the testimony of Martin, contradicted as it was by other witnesses as wholly unworthy of credit. The fact stated, that the witness had been instructed, is sufficient to discredit the complainant’s case. Tutoring or instructing a witness is considered to be a serious offence, and has the invariable result of destroying all faith in a case which is bolstered up by such partial evidence and gross irregularity. Moreover, the Benevolent Asylum is a voluntary institution, presided over by a Committee elected annually by the subscribers. The annual meeting is the proper place for making charges against the functionaries. The subscribers have it in their power to elect a special committee of investigation at any time. But we suggest that no inquiry should be allowed unless the charges are made in a formal and precise manner, so as to be fairly investigated and answered by the accused, according to the practice followed in the courts of justice.

We have finally to add that in the imperfect inquiry we have led nothing has come under our observation to lead to the faintest suspicion there is any defect or irregularity in the management, or to abate the confidence the public have placed in it. Limited to its proper uses, the Benevolent Institution is an invaluable charity, doing a large work in relieving the helpless and destitute, with comparatively small means. We think the Committee entitled to the warmest thanks of the public for their gratuitous and philanthropic labours, and we cordially recommend that their hands be strengthened by a greater interest being taken generally in support of the Institution.

John Bathgate
John Logan.

Dunedin,

September 28.

Table I. SHOWING the Number of adult Inmates at Caversham 1st January, 1882 and what incapacitates them from earning a living.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total Old and past work, or infirm</th>
<th>Paralysed</th>
<th>Crippled</th>
<th>Blind</th>
<th>Chest Disease</th>
<th>Weak Intellect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. SHEWING the respective Ages of the Inmates of the Institution at Caversham, 1st January, 1882.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men's Ages</th>
<th>Women's Ages</th>
<th>Children's Ages</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Grand Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85, 82, 79, 76, 82, 72, 72, 71, 14, 13, 11, 10, 76, 75, 75, 75, 70, 66, 65, 61, 10, 10, 9, 9, 74, 74, 74, 74, 74, 52, 45, 45, 36, 9, 8, 8, 8, 7, 73, 73, 72, 72, 32, 7, 6, 6, 6, 6, 6, 5, 71, 71, 70, 70, 5, 5, 5, 4, 3, 70, 69, 68, 67, 3, 3, 3, 67, 66, 66, 66, 65, 64, 63, 63, 62, 60, 60, 60, 58, 55, 55, 50, 50, 48, 45, 43, 40, 34, 47, 13, 30, 90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table III. SHEWING the Number of Persons Discharged from the Institution during 1881.
Table IV. SHEWING the Number of Persons Admitted to and Discharged from the Institution during 1831, and Number remaining 1st January, 1882.


Table V. SHEWING the Total Number of Persons relieved Outdoor and Discharged during 1881, and the Number remaining on the Books, 1st January, 1882.


Rules of the Benevolent Institution, Dunedin.

Objects: To Relieve the Aged, Infirm, Disabled, and Destitute of all Creeds and Nations, Afford Them Medical Relief, and to Minister to Them the Comforts of Religion.

Rules and Regulations.

Qualifications and Privileges of Governors and Subscribers.

Qualification of Life Governors.
1. Every donor of £20 or upwards shall be a Life Governor; and every person who may have raised, or shall raise, by one or more collections in one year, the sum of twenty pounds (£20) or upwards, from persons not claiming membership on account of their contributions towards such sum; and every executor first named in any Will, proving the same, and paying to the Institution a bequest of fifty pounds (£50) or upwards, shall have all the rights and privileges of a Life Governor.

Qualification of Members
2. Every Subscriber of one guinea or upwards shall be an annual Member, and shall have the privilege of recommending cases of distress for relief, and of voting at the election of office bearers, provided that he shall not be entitled to vote until three months after the payment of his first Annual Subscription. The Annual Subscription shall be due and payable on the 1st day of January in each year.
3. There shall be, in the month of January in Annual General Meeting In the month of January, every year, a General Meeting of the Life Governors and Members of the Institution, to be held at such
place as the General Committee shall appoint (of which meeting fourteen days' previous notice shall be given in two or more of the Dunedin newspapers), to receive the Report and Accounts of the Committee of management; to elect the Committee and other Office-bearers; and to transact the general business of the Institution.

4. The Office-bearers of the Institution shall
Office-bearers to be elected annually.
consist of:—a President, Vice-President, Honorary Treasurer, and a General Committee of any number not exceeding eight members (exclusive of ex officio Members), to be elected at the Annual General Meeting, by and from the Life Governors and Members.

5. The President, Vice-President, Treasurer,
Ex-officio Members of Committee.
Honorary Medical Officers, and the resident principal Minister of each congregation contributing a collection to the funds of the Institution (being qualified as Governors) shall be ex-officio Members of Committee; but no ex-officio Members, except Honorary Office-bearers, shall vote on the removal or appointment of any paid servant of the Institution.

6. The General Committee shall meet once in Committee Meetings, when to be held.
the week, and at all such other times as they may appoint, to receive the report of the various officers, and to discuss the general business of the Institution; three to form a quorum. A Committee Meeting shall be held on the first Monday in every February and August, to enter into the contracts for the supply of provisions and other necessaries; five to form a quorum.

7. The President, Vice-President, or Treasurer
Who to preside at Committee Meetings.
shall preside at all meetings of Committee; and in their absence, the majority present shall appoint their own Chairman, who shall have an additional or casting vote.?
Committee to frame Bye-laws and Regulations.
8. The Committee shall frame such Bye-laws and Regulations as they may deem necessary, the same not being at variance with the general laws of the Institution.

Special General Meeting of Subscribers, how to be convened.
9. The Committee of Management may convene a special general meeting of subscribers at any time, upon giving notice at least fourteen days previously, in two or more of the Dunedin newspapers, which notice shall be repeated three times. Any thirty Life Governors or Subscribers may request the Committee to call a special meeting at any time; and should they, after receiving such requisition so signed, refuse or neglect to call such meeting within fourteen days, it shall be in the power of the said requisitionists to convene such meeting, upon given notice as directed above.

Bye-laws to be repealed only at special meetings.
10. No bye-law or regulation shall be altered or repealed except at a special meeting of Committee; such meeting to consist of not less than five members.

How appointments are to be made by the Committee.
11. That in electing to any appointment by the Committee, when there are more applicants than are required, the voting shall take place by voting cards; and in all cases the salary shall be determined before proceeding to election.

Honorary Medical Officers and their qualifications.
12. There shall be two or more Medical Officers, not to exceed four, whose appointment shall be honorary; and no one shall be eligible for the office of Medical Officer who is not certificated by the Medical Board of Otago.

Appointment of Honorary Medical Officers and filling up of vacancies.
13. The Honorary Medical Officers shall be chosen by the Committee, and shall be amenable to the rules made by them. If any vacancy occurs by death, removal, or retirement, such vacancy shall be filled up at a special meeting of Committee, to be convened for that purpose.

How Medical Officers shall report.
14. That the Honorary Medical Officers shall report on the state of the inmates at the weekly meeting of Committee.?

15. That no application be received unless
Conditions of admission to Institution.
signed by a Subscriber; and no person shall be admitted until the expiration of one week from the date of applying, to allow time for inquiry, except in special cases.

16. Tenders for all supplies shall be invited
Tenders to be called for supplies.
for a period of not less than 6 months, the amount of such tenders to be duly recorded in the Minute-book. No
member of Committee to supply any article for the use of the Institution, for which he may receive pecuniary or
other compensation.

17. The House Visiting Committee, consisting
House Visiting Committee, how to be appointed.
of three Members, shall be appointed by and from the General Committee, at the monthly meetings in
February, May, August and November in each year, to act in rotation. Members retiring to be eligible for
re-appointment.

18. It shall be their duty to visit the Institution
Dunes of Visiting Committee.
at least once a week, to make a general inspection, and to record the result in the Minute- book to be kept in
the Institution; such book to be produced at the weekly meeting of the Committee.

19. The superintendent, or other officer appointed
Management of Institution.
by the Committee, shall have the management of the Institution, subject to the regulations and orders of the
Committee.

20. The inmates of the Institution will be
Religious Instruction.
allowed religious instruction from the ministers of the denomination to which they belong, at such times as
the Committee may appoint.

Life Governors.

- Bannerman, Rev. W.
- Barr, John A.
- Bastings, Horace
- Bateman, G. C.
- Bell, Sir F. D.
- Borrie, Donald
- Bunbury, Cornelius
- Burton, A. H.
- Byng, Rev. C. J.
- Cable, H.
- Calcutt, Thomas
- Campbell, Robert J.
- Chapman, Robert
- Clarke, Wm. J. Sunbury, Victoria
- Coote, Charles
- Cutten, C. W.
- Davidson, James
- Davis, Rev. J. U.
- Dench, H.
- Dodson, George
- Dodson, Thomas
- Douglas, W. S.
- Dowse, George
- Driver, Henry
- Edinburgh, H.R.H. Duke of
- Edmond, John
- Edwards, Rev. E. G.
- Fargie, John
- Farrer, W. E.
- Fish, H. S. junior
- Forsyth, Robert
- Fulton, Francis
- Fulton, James
• Reeves, Charles S.
• Rennie, A.
• Robin, James
• Russell Geo. G.
• Scoular, J.
• Simpson, James
• Shrimski, Samuel
• Smith, S. G.
• Snow, William
• Spedding, D. M.
• Stephenson, John
• Stratford, H. A.
• Street, C. H.
• Strode, A. C.
• Stronach, Donald
• Stuart, Rev. D. M.
• Sutherland, Rev. J. M.
• Taggart, W. H.
• Talbot, H.
• Telford, William
• Templeton, Thomas
• Thomson, C.
• Thompson, Captain
• Thomson, R.
• Trotter, Wm. S.
• Turnbull, George
• Valentine, Arch.
• Vogel, Sir Julius
• Wain, Job, jnr.
• Walter, Henry J.
• Watson, J.
• West, George
• Wilson, W.
• Young, Joseph

Ladies who are Entitled to the Rights and Privileges of Life Governors.

• Mrs. L. O. Beal
• Miss Buchannan
• Mrs. E. B. Cargill
• Mrs. Caldecutt
• Mrs. C. Cook
• Mrs. S Dewes
• Mrs. Dick
• Mrs. Edwards
• Mrs. Farley
• Mrs. Fisher
• Mrs. Graham
• Mrs. Harvey
• Mrs. Holmes
• Mrs. A. Inglis
• Miss Jarrat
• Miss Lachman
• Mrs. Lawson
• Mrs. Muir
Otago Benevolent Institution.

List of Subscription, Donation, and Collections

Dunedin Female Refuge.
1879-80.
President: MRS. MATTHEW HOLMES.
Vice-President: MRS. UPTON DAVIS.
Treasurer: MRS. SALMOND.
Hon. Secretaries: MRS. E. B. CARGILL, MISS LAMBTON.
Matron: MRS. TURNER.
Committee: MRS. CHAPMAN, MRS. T. CARGILL, MRS. MOORE, MRS. BORROWS, MRS. COOMBS. MRS. DICK,
MRS. SHAW, MRS. S. LITTLE. MRS. BATHGATE. MRS. WILLIAMS. MISS M'DOUGALL.

The Dunedin Female Refuge.

DURING the past year, the entire number of women who enjoyed the shelter of the refuge was twenty-one; of these, ten were admitted for the first time, and several, both of these and of the previous inmates, were admitted more than once into the Institution.

Nine of the inmates were natives of Ireland, five of Scotland, three of England, and four of the Colonies. Five were married, three were widows, and the remainder single women. Four could not read, seven could read but not write, the rest could both read and write.

The Committee feel that the task of reforming these poor women is both difficult and slow from various causes. The marked change from unrestrained self indulgence to a necessary submission to discipline is not easy to bear; therefore, while the Committee regret that they cannot point to an abundant result of good from their labours during the past year, they still take courage from little gleams of light to press on in their efforts to reclaim these fallen ones. A previous inmate has sought the shelter of the Refuge to obtain some needed rest, having been in a situation for some time, where she has conducted herself most satisfactorily. A second has returned to her friends in Christchurch. A third appeared to be rather of weak intellect than of vicious tendencies, and has been received into the Benevolent Institution. Eight women still remain in the Refuge, one of whom is waiting for a suitable situation, having been an inmate since January, 1879, and during the greater part of that time her conduct has been very good. The remaining nine have returned to their old life.

During the past year the Committee have had considerable anxiety and difficulty in procuring a suitable Matron; at last they have now been successful. Frequent changes in the management is, no doubt, a drawback to the Institution.

The Refuge is not quite self-supporting, and while the Committee gratefully acknowledge the pecuniary assistance rendered to them in time past by many friends and subscribers, they would express their earnest hope that the general public of Dunedin will assist them with the necessary funds efficiently to work an Institution which has for its end the salvation of poor souls otherwise but little cared for; remembering that, inasmuch as they show kindness to one of the least of these, they do it unto Him who will not forget even the cup of cold water offered in His name.

The Committee beg to acknowledge with many thanks the services of Dr Borrows as Medical Officer of the Institution, and many valuable gifts from other friends.

Dunedin Female Refuge in Account with the
Treasurer.

Balance Sheet from 1st June, 1879, To May 31st, 1880.

DR. £ s. d. Balance in hand ... ... 102 12 11 Subscriptions and Donations ... 145 6 6 Government Grant ... ... 100 0 0 Proceeds of Washing ... ... 276 10 10 £624 10 3 Audited and found correct, Thomas H. Lusk. CR. £ s. d. Grocer ... ... 128 14 1 Butcher ... ... 39 17 1 Milk ... ... 13 6 6 Fuel ... ... 47 10 3 Clothing ... ... 47 7 5 Petty Cash ... ... 39 9 0 Repairs, Painting ... 38 14 5 Express Hire ... ... 46 14 6 Labour ... ... 16 19 0 Matron's Salary ... 41 4 4 Matron's Travelling Expenses ... 7 8 10 Wages ... ... 18 2 6 Furniture ... ... 38 9 1 Printing ... ... 3 12 0 Rates ... ... 10 1 0 Insurance ... ... 2 8 0 539 18 0 By Balance ... ... 84 12 3 £624 10 3 JANE P. SALMOND, Treasurer.

List of Subscriptions and Donations from June 1, 1879, to May 31, 1880.
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Dunedin Female Refuge.

1880-81.

President:
• MRS. HOLMES.
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• MRS. NEVILL.

Treasurer:
• MRS. J. L. SHAW.
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Committee:
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- MISS LAMBTON
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Dunedin Female Refuge.

Report for 1880-81.

In presenting a record of the past year's work in the Female Refuge to the public, the Ladies' Committee express their hope of good having been done, notwithstanding much of perplexity and disappointment. Two unavoidable changes in the office of matron have been somewhat unsettling; that difficulty, the Committee sincerely trust, is now overcome, and under the present management they have reason to hope the Institution will be efficiently worked.

During the year seventeen women have been admitted and fourteen discharged. Altogether two-and-twenty women have received the shelter of the Refuge. One inmate (M.S.) who left the Refuge last August has since died in the Hospital. Another woman (J.M.) has been respectably married, both she and her husband being members of a Christian Church. Of another inmate (M.S.) the Committee has the most cheering intelligence. She has rejoined her family, and is now walking in the paths of peace and virtue. Of two or three other inmates who are now in respectable service, the Committee have reason to entertain good hopes of reformation.

The Committee desire to tender their sincere thanks to the public for the measure of support given to the Refuge in time past; and as it is not yet possible to render the Institution self-supporting, they earnestly beg for a continuance of the assistance so generously afforded. The need of such a home is most evident, and the Ladies' Committee will feel greatly indebted to all Christian or philanthropic minds who will direct any poor fallen ones they may meet with to seek the shelter of the Refuge.

Let us not grow weary in well-doing because the fruit of our labour is less abundant than we could desire, grateful that in any degree our efforts may contribute to the spread of the Redeemer's Kingdom, and feeling assured that in His own good time He will crown all Christian effort with success.

The warm thanks of the Committee are also due for several donations in kind from Mrs. Holmes, Mrs. E. B. Cargill, Mrs. R. Borrows, Mr. E. B. Tait, Mr. Sise, a friend from the Taieri, Messrs. Wise, Wilkie, and several others.

Dunedin Female Refuge in Account with Mrs. J. L. Shaw, Hon. Treasurer.
Balance Sheet from June 1st, 1880, To May 31st, 1881.

Receipts Balance from last year ... ... £84 12 3 Subscriptions and Donation as per list ... ... 84 7 0
Government Grant ... ... 100 0 0 Proceeds of Washing ... ... 254 9 11 £523 9 2 Grocer ... ... £111 3 7
Butcher ... ... 48 14 7 Milk ... ... 18 5 9 Fuel ... ... 44 0 0 Express Hire ... ... 41 12 0 Matron's Salary
... ... 48 11 3 Sweep ... ... 4 4 0 Clothing ... ... 45 11 6 Wages ... ... 17 12 6 Petty Cash ... ... 24 13 6
Rates ... ... 9 12 0 Printing ... ... 3 0 0 Insurance ... ... 2 8 0 Labour ... ... 2 17 6 New Boiling Copper
and cost of setting same ... ... 16 11 0 Sundries ... ... 3 3 3 442 0 5 Cash in National Bank ... ... 77 7 3
Cash in hands ... ... 4 1 6 £523 9 2 Audited and found correct. JULIET SHAW, Hon. Treasurer. CLEMENT
WHITE.

List of Subscriptions and Donations, from June 1, 1880. to May 31, 1881.
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**Matron:**

- MRS. STUART.

**Committee:**

- MRS. BORROWS
- MRS. R. BORROWS
- MISS BRADDOCK
- MRS. CHAPMAN
Dunedin Female Refuge.

Report for 1881-82.

The Committee, in submitting their annual report to the public, feel that, though the work entrusted to their care progresses quietly, and somewhat slowly, they can yet give proof of good having been effected during the past year through the agency of the Institution, now under the management of a most devoted and efficient matron, seconded by an equally efficient laundress.

At the commencement of the year, beginning June 1st, 1881, there were ten inmates in the refuge. Twenty-one were admitted during the year, five with infants. Of these, eight are at present in the Institution, one with an infant a fortnight old.

Of one inmate, by circumstances transferred to a Refuge in another province, the Committee have received an excellent report: that she is now in a situation, giving satisfaction to her employers, and evincing by her conduct a thorough change of heart. Three other young women have gone into situations, and six have been restored to their friends, forsaking the career of vice on which they were entering, and, the Committee have reason to hope, striving to regain the path of virtue and respectability.

This pleasant picture has, the Committee grieves to say, its reverse side, and no less than fourteen women have returned to their old life. No doubt such a result is sadly depressing, but, perhaps, not surprising, considering all the difficulties attending on an effort to reclaim those so utterly given up to self-indulgence, and consequently very intolerant of necessary discipline and restraint. The work is the Lord's—let us seek to labour in faith, for in due time He will give His blessing if we faint not.

The Committee have to express their deep regret at the loss of their kind and generous friend, Dr. Borrows, who, from the opening of the Refuge till his lamented death, gave his services gratuitously to the Institution. They also beg to offer their warmest thanks to Dr. De Zouche, who has most kindly consented to replace Dr. Borrows on equally liberal terms. The Committee also offer their grateful thanks to the Rev. C. J. Byng for his unwearied and regular ministrations to the inmates of the Refuge.

The Committee beg to acknowledge with thanks a donation of twelve Bibles from the Bible Society; a gift of books and papers from Mrs. Holmes, and a donation of coals from Messrs. Martin and Watson.

D. S. Cargill,
Hon. Sec.

June 1st, 1882.
Dunedin female Refuge in Account with Mrs. J. L. Shaw, Hon. Treasurer.

Annual Balance Sheet to 30th June, 1882.

Receipts. Balance from last year ... ... £81 8 9 Subscriptions and Donations as per list ... ... 70 18 0
Government Grant ... ... ... 100 0 0 Proceeds of Washing ... ... ... 270 1 5 £522 8 2 Grocer ... ... ... ... £105 8 8
Butcher ... ... ... 40 1 10 Milk ... ... ... 16 11 4 Fuel ... ... ... 44 6 10 Express Hire ... ... ... 40 18 0 Matron’s
Salary ... ... ... 50 0 0 Laundress’ Salary ... ... ... 40 0 0 Sweep ... ... ... 5 2 0 Clothing and Boots ... ... ... 26 0 8
Petty Cash ... ... ... 22 10 0 Rates ... ... ... 12 3 0 Printing ... ... ... 2 0 0 Insurance ... ... ... 2 8 0 Sundry Repairs
... ... 27 12 3 Sewing Machine ... ... ... 5 2 6 Sundries ... ... ... 77 10 7 £522 8 2 Audited and found correct. JULIET SHAW, Hon. Treasurer, 5th July, 1882. W. VIVIAN.

List Of Subscriptions And Donations, from June 1st, 1881, To May 31st, 1882.
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Dunedin Female Refuge

1882-3.
President: MRS. HOLMES.
Treasurer: MRS. J. L. SHAW
Secretary. MRS. E. B. CARGILL.
Matron. MRS. STUART
Committee. MRS. CUTTEN MRS. TOLMIE MRS. WILLIAMS MRS. WHITE MISS LAMBTON MRS. R. BORROWS.
Medical Officer. Dr. De Zouche.

Dunedin Female Refuge.

Report for 1882-3.

The Committee desire, at the close of another financial year, to lay before their subscribers a statement of the work done by the Institution during the course of that term.

There were eight women in the Refuge at the beginning of last year; thirteen have been admitted since June 1st, 1882, nine have left, and there are at present twelve women in the Refuge, of whom five are English, three Scotch, three Irish, and one Colonial. Six can read and write.

One young woman, E. P., has gone into a respectable situation, and one has rejoined her husband, of whom the Committee have excellent accounts, peace and comfort now reigning in her previously unhappy home; two have returned (the Committee fear) to their evil ways.

The Committee freely admit that the work of reclaiming those fallen ones is slow and disheartening, but the duty and privilege of holding an open door to those poor outcasts is still very obvious, and they desire to enter upon another year of labor, looking not so much at past failure, as at the promise which standeth sure, "In due season ye shall reap if ye faint not,"—all the more hopefully because, in looking over the records of past years, they can point to one and another who can bless the opportune help of the Refuge for restoring them to virtue and respectability.

The Committee beg to acknowledge with many thanks, gifts in kind received from Mrs. Holmes, Messrs. Paterson and McLeod, and Messrs. Clarke and Wright.

D. S. Cargill, Hon. Sec.

June 30th, 1883.

Dunedin Female Refuge in Account with Mrs. J. L. Shaw, Hon Treasurer.

Annual Balance Sheet TO 30TH June, 1883.

RECEIPTS. £ s. d. Balance from last year... ... 77 10 7 Subscriptions and Donations as per list... 60 3 0 Government Grant ... ... 100 0 0 Proceeds of Washing 289 3 2 £526 16 9 30th June, 1883. EXPENDITURE.
List of Subscriptions and Donations, from June 1st, 1882, to June 30th, 1883.
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How to Spend Sixpence, Containing Sixty-Nine Valuable Vegetarian Recipes.
Compiled By W. M. Wright,
STOCKTON-ON-TEES.
"How to Spend Sixpence."

A SHORT time ago I was in Durham on business, and whilst soliciting an order in a grocer's shop, a poor woman came in and spent 6½d. as follows:—

She complained of being in great want, and asked the shopkeeper to give her some waste paper to light her fire. I felt sorry for her. This woman, thought I, is a representative case of many who are suffering from poverty, and to whom a knowledge of how to spend Sixpence to the best advantage in obtaining that food which is the cheapest and most nourishing, would be an incalculable benefit. After she left the shop, I said to the grocer, if that woman had bought she would have had food which would have been three times as serviceable to her. To this the shopkeeper agreed. Indeed, many of man's requirements are supplied by his Creator, without money and without price. The Sun, with his revivifying light and heat, shines freely alike on the evil and the good. The air we breathe is boundless and free, and costs man nothing. The water we drink is easily obtained.

Wheat, rightly termed the "Staff of Life," can be bought for 1½d. per lb., Indian Meal for 1d. per lb., Rice, Barley, Peas, Beans, and other kinds of grain are cheap and easily procured.

Much other useful information on this subject has been collected by the Vegetarian Society, and is freely placed at the disposal of any enquirer who may write to the Secretary, 56, Peter Street, Manchester.

It is strange, yet true, that men lightly esteem these things because they are freely and plentifully supplied, and prefer to spend, or rather waste, their money on that which is not bread, and which destroys, instead of sustaining, human life.

Yet the fact remains that those things most necessary to sustain the life of man are not only the simplest but the cheapest and the best. In order to impart a little knowledge on the very important subject of diet, I subjoin a few simple Recipes showing "How to Spend Sixpence" to the best advantage.

1. Durham Pudding.

This pudding, if taken regularly, is a great preventative of rheumatic pains, and can be eaten cold or hot.

2. Oatmeal Porridge.

Mabel Stephenson fed her son, George Stephenson, the great engineer, on porridge. When eaten with Prunes, stewed Gooseberries, Apples, or other Fruits, it is much liked.

pointing handThose who take Oatmeal Porridge to breakfast regularly are seldom troubled with toothache.
   This Pudding is a great favourite.


5. Indian Meal or food Reform Knobs.
   Stirring the same with a spoon, and bake in a quick oven in convenient sizes, to which may be added carraway seeds crushed or whole.
   These Knobs are much liked by young and old. 24 good sized Knobs can be made, which we will reckon at a halfpenny each.

6. Indian Meal Porridge.
   Professor Johnstone says that Indian corn meal is richer in gluten and fatty matter than wheaten flour, with much less starch and water.

7. Indian Meal And Oatmeal Porridge.
   This recipe is well worth trying for rich and poor; it makes excellent Porridge for breakfast or supper.

8. Whole Wheat Meal Porridge.
   This Porridge was taken three times a day by a man who was laid up with Piles; it brought him out, and he continued to take it for some time after, and gained weight with a general improvement in health.
   Consumptive people find this Porridge rest in their stomachs where other foods disagree. See Dr. Nichols' report about this article of diet.

   This is usually much enjoyed by children, and is good for health and strength.

10. Batter or "Egg-Bread."
    Beat the egg light, and the soaked bread to a smooth batter, melt the butter, stir all together quickly, and bake immediately in shallow tins.


13. Combination Porridge.
    This makes an excellent and sustaining breakast.

    The Cocoa Nut gives the Rice an excellent flavour.

15. Stewed Rhubarb.
    This is a good substitute for Butter.

17. Lentil Soup.

Is much liked by all who have tried it.

18 Hominy Pudding.


Makes an excellent Breakfast, agreeing with the most delicate stomach. It is very sustaining, giving health and beauty to those who give it a fair trial. May be eaten three times a day to advantage.

Vegetarian Recipes.

Porridge, &c.

20. OATMEAL PORRIDGE.—Twelve ounces of coarse oatmeal; one ounce-and-a-half of salt, and three pints of water.—Dissolve the salt in the boiling water; rub the meal smooth in a little cold water; add it to the boiling water; boil gently about twenty minutes; pour into plates, and serve with treacle, syrup, milk, cream, or stewed fruit.—Wheatmeal Porridge is similarly made.

21. RICE PORRIDGE.—Six ounces of ground rice, and one quart of water.—Steep the rice in a little cold water while the rest of the water is boiling; add it to the boiling water; boil twenty minutes, stirring all the time; pour into plates. To stew in the oven, or boil in a double saucepan, are other methods.

22.—OATMEAL CAKE.—Half a pound of Brazil nuts mashed and worked into three small tea-cupsfuls of coarse oatmeal, and half a cup of fine, one tea-spoonful of baking powder, a little sugar and allspice; wet with milk and bake.

Soups.

23. PEAS SOUP.—One pint of split peas; one turnip, one carrot, one onion, and one ounce of butter.—Drop the peas, adding the other vegetables, into three quarts of boiling water with a little salt, and a piece of soda the size of a pea; boil the whole till quite soft; rub through a sieve; return it to the pan to be made hot; add butter, season with pepper and salt; serve with toasted bread.

24. GREEN PEAS SOUP.—One pint and a half of dry green peas, half a pint of boiled spinach, one lettuce, four ounces of butter, and one tea-spoonful of flour.—Steam the peas twelve hours in soft water; set them on the lire with a quart of boiling soft water, a tea-spoonful of salt, half the butter, and a piece of soda the size of a pea; simmer gently till the peas are soft; pass through a fine colander; add the lettuce, the boiled spinach and two quarts of boiling water; simmer till nearly ready; remove the lettuce add some heads of asparagus, cut small, the flour mixed with the rest of the butter, pepper, salt, and a piece of sugar; boil twenty minutes.

25. BARLEY SOUP.—Soak four table-spoonfuls of Scotch barley in cold water for an hour. Put it in a stew-pan with about a pint of cold water. Stew it gently on a moderate fire; and add three good-sized onions, two small turnips, a carrot, and a head of celery. Season to taste with salt and pepper. When quite soft, add a table-spoonful of mushroom ketchup.

26. KIDNEY BEAN SOUP.—Half a pint of dry kidney beans, and one quart of water.—Stew the beans about six hours in an oven; strain the soup without mashing the beans; season with pepper and salt, and serve with toasted bread. This soup, being highly nutritive, should be diluted with warm water if found too rich. It may be used with advantage to supersede the ordinary "beef tea."

27. BROWN SOUP.—Six moderate sized onions, two turnips, and three carrots; cut these up into small pieces, sprinkle them with com flour, and fry them brown in salad oil; then place them in a saucepan, together with three pints of water, a table-spoonful of dried herbs, some pepper and salt; keep the vegetables stewing for two hours, then strain; and, if you wish to make the soup firmer, add a tea-cupful of tapioca.

This is also a good brown stock.

28. HARICOT BEAN SOUP.—One pound of haricot beans, wash them and steep all night in one quart of water.—Put the same into a pie dish or earthenware pot, put them into the oven with the water they have been steeped in, adding a little butter, parsley or mint, pepper and salt, two onions, and two apples, cut up line and stew for two hours.—Peas and lentils can be treated in the same way, which is better than boiling in a pan.

29. LENTIL SOUP.—One pound of crushed lentils, wash them, pouring off the water, and steep all night. Put
into an enameled pan with the water, boil for one hour.—Take four onions, cut up into small pieces; fry in
butter or olive oil, and add to the lentils, along with bread crusts, half a pound of Indian meal, a spoonful of
brown sugar, and pepper and salt, and boil for another hour.—If Indian meal cannot be had, use rice, barley,
oatmeal, or Hour.

30. LENTIL SOUP.—Half a pound of whole lentils, wash them, add a small piece of soda, then soak them in
water all night. Boil in a saucepan for one hour, adding one carrot, three onions, one leek, two pounds of
parsnips, an ounce of parsley, all chopped up, pepper and salt, a spoonful of brown sugar, and half a pound of
bread crusts, and boil for one hour altogether.—(Lentils are turned black if boiled in an iron pan.)

Fruit Preparations.

31. TO PREPARE APPLES.—Let the apples be pared, cored, and sweetened, and placed in a deep dish, on the
upper part of a stove; a large teacupful of boiling water poured over them, and a plate laid over the dish.
Simmer until soft. There is no trouble about removing the skins when eating them.

32. TO STEW APPLES.—Three pints of water, and a pound and a half of sugar; boil this syrup thoroughly.
Then peel your apples, core them, and put in as many as the syrup will allow; let them stew slowly till they are
done.

33. RUBARB PUDDING.—One pound of rhubarb, 12 ounces of bread without crust, and sugar.—Lay the
rhubarb in water ten minutes; cut the bread into slices a quarter of an inch thick; toast the slices, and soak a few
minutes in boiling water, pour on a plate, and mix with two table-spoonfuls of sugar; place some of the slices at
the bottom of the dish; cut the rhubarb into pieces an inch long; till the dish; mix the sugar with it; place the
other slices over the top; bake the whole in a moderate oven, and serve either hot or cold. Various kinds of fruit
may be used instead of or with the rhubarb.

34. APPLE AND BREAD PUDDING.—Three-quarters of a pound of bread-crumbs, one pound and a half of
apples, sugar, and butter. Pare and cut the apples as for a pie; put a little butter into a deep pie dish; then a layer
of apples, with a little sugar; then a thick layer of bread crumbs; then another layer of apples, sugar, and bread
crumbs. Lay a few small pieces of butter on the top and bake in a moderately hot oven. Cooked rice is a good
substitute for bread-crumbs.

35. PLUM PUDDING.—Three pounds of raisins, stoned and chopped; three pounds of currants, three pounds
of moist sugar, one-and-a-half pounds of apples chopped line, one-and-a-half pounds of carrots, grated, three
pounds of flour, three pounds of bread crumbs, half a pound of lemon peel, cut fine, half an ounce of mace,
one-and-a-half pounds of butter melted, seven or eight eggs well beaten, and a little salt; mix all together with a
gill of milk, put into buttered moulds, and cover with a cloth; then boil for eight hours.

36. STEWED APPLES.—Take six pounds of apples, pare, cut into halves, and core; place in a pie dish two
lemons, sliced and boiled in half-a-pint of water with half a pound of sugar until tender; then pour out the
apples and stew in an oven.

Vegetarian Preparations.

37. FRIED BEET ROOT.—Boil till tender, then plunge into cold water and rub off the skin; cut into slices and
fry them in butter, with seasoning. Keep very hot.—A few onions fried along with it are a great improvement.
37. ROASTED POTATOES.—Pare the potatoes; melt a little butter in a dish or tin in the oven; put in the
potatoes, sprinkle with a little salt, dredge a little flour over them, and turn frequently till they are enough. They
should be roasted in a quick oven.

38. BOILED POTATOES.—They should be as nearly as possible of one size, well washed, but not
pared.—Put them into cold water for an hour, then into fresh water, and boil quickly in a covered kettle, with
no more water than will cover them. When done, the water should be instantly poured off, and the kettle, with
a cloth over the potatoes, placed on the side of the fire until the steam is absorbed, and the potatoes will be dry
and mealy; or they may be steamed, which is the best plan.

40. POTATO BALLS.—Boil quarter stone of potatoes; when enough, mash with two ounces of butter, and a
little salt; then make into balls, baste with butter and put into a buttered tin in the oven to brown.

41. TURNIP HASH.—Three quarters of a pound of turnips, three quarters of a pound of potatoes, two
table-spoonful of flour, one large onion, and one table-spoonful of salt. Put two quarts of water into a
well-tinned pan; set it over the fire; put in the turnips, cut into small square pieces, the onion, cut small, and the
salt; let it boil for an hour; then put in the potatoes, also cut in pieces, and boil three quarters of an hour longer.
Rub the flour in a quarter of a pint of cold water till perfectly smooth; pour it into the pan, and let it boil slowly
a quarter of an hour longer; boil two hours, and serve with toasted bread.

42. HOTCH POTCH.—Four large turnips, one pound of carrots, one onion, one lettuce, and parsley.—Put
onion, tapioca, a few pieces of butter, and half a pint of water; cover with paste, and bake in a moderately hot
oven, and add water as required. [The same ingredients, boiled in a cloth, make a

vegetables into small pieces; stew them in a pan with the water; place them in a pie-dish; add the

butter; press firmly into small pots. (Haricot beans may be used instead of lentils.) If to be kept, a little hot

seasoning of salt, mace, and cayenne, and the size of a walnut of old cheese. Beat all together with two ounces

powder. Then beat up to a smooth paste. When cold, add an equal quantity of fine brown bread-crumbs, with

water; boil three or four hours, either with or without mint, and season with pepper and salt.

Peas; &c.

50. BOILED HARICOT BEANS.—One pint of beans, two onions, and salt.—Wash the beans; soak over night;
put them on the fire in a saucepan of cold water, just sufficient to cover them; add the salt and the onions; boil
gently two or three hours, and serve with the liquid in which they are boiled, as this contains the principal
portion of the flavour and nourishment of the beans. Any kind of kidney beans will answer the purpose.

51. RIPE MALLOWFAT PEAS.—Wash one pint of large dry mallowfat peas, and soak twelve hours in soft
water; boil three or four hours, either with or without mint, and season with pepper and salt.

52. POTTED LENTILS.—Stew a tea-cupful of lentils in water with a morsel of butter, and some mushroom
powder. Then beat up to a smooth paste. When cold, add an equal quantity of fine brown bread-crumbs, with
seasoning of salt, mace, and cayenne, and the size of a walnut of old cheese. Beat all together with two ounces
of butter; press firmly into small pots. (Haricot beans may be used instead of lentils.) If to be kept, a little hot
butter must be poured over the top.

Vegetable Pies.

53. SAVOURY PIE.—Cold omelet, three eggs, two table-spoonfuls of tapioca, quarter of a pint of cold water,
one ounce of butter, and paste. Steep the tapioca in the water for ten or fifteen minutes; cut the omelet into
small pieces; butter a pie dish, and spread a little of the tapioca over the bottom; then the omelet; then another
layer of tapioca, adding seasoning, and a few small pieces of butter; cover with paste and bake. Add the eggs
when the pie is nearly done. Supply water as needed to keep the tapioca at the bottom from burning.

54. VEGETABLE PIE.—Ten ounces of potatoes, eight ounces of carrots, eight ounces of turnips, two ounces
of onions, two ounces of butter, one table-spoonful of Hour, one pint of water, and celery to flavour.—Cut the
vegetables into small pieces; stew them in a pan with the water; place them in a pie-dish; add the butter; cover
with paste; bake in a moderate oven, and add water as required. [The same ingredients, boiled in a cloth, make a
very excellent pudding.]

55. POTATO PIE.—Two pound of potatoes, two ounces of onions (cut small), one ounce of butter, and half
an ounce of tapioca.—Pare and cut the potatoes; season with pepper and salt; put them in a pie dish, adding the
onion, tapioca, a few pieces of butter, and half a pint of water; cover with paste, and bake in a moderately hot
The late Miss Simpson's Recipe for Plum Pudding.

The late Mrs. Simpson's Recipe for Mince-Meat.

Sundries.

The late Miss Simpson's Recipe for Plum Pudding.

Instructions.—Rub the butter into the bread crumbs; add the fruit, sugar, candied lemon, and spice; then the eggs, well beaten, and mix the whole together. After standing twelve hours, add the apple sauce, or milk, and boil in a buttered mould three hours; let it stand for some time in the water before it is turned out of the mould, and serve with cream or butter sauce.

The Bread Reform.

"A proper supply of nourishing bread was of the utmost national importance. The league bad been organised because it was believed that the present English bread did not nourish sufficiently those who ate it. If children who had every possible sanitary disadvantage to contend against were also fed on white bread, it was impossible for them to grow up strong and healthy. English people had not realized the importance of the subject. Such valuable bread had now been produced under Dr. Morfit's process that although a few months ago there was not sold in London a single loaf of granular wheat-meal bread, the league had received communications from 140 shops, which had already an aggregate weekly sale of about 15,000 quartern loaves. The league was not organised to teach the manufacture of bread, but merely to spread the knowledge of its dietetic advantages. It had no special recipe for making bread, for it left that to the individual skill of practical bakers, while strongly condemning the use of chemical baking powders. Miss Yates appealed to millers and bakers to assist the association in their efforts to promote the general use of a more nourishing bread, and to the public to aid in carrying on a movement so essentially for the welfare of all classes. Pure wheat-meal bread was much superior to the ordinary white bread; for, besides having one-third more gluten, the material which forms muscular flesh, Lie big stated that it contained 200 per cent, more phosphatic salts wherewith to nourish bones, brain and tissues. The greater nourishing power of wheat-meal bread, in contradistinction to that made from white flour, which formed but a part, and the least nutritious part, of wheat, had been confirmed by eminent scientific authorities and by official analyses. Children fed principally on white bread were far more liable to bad teeth and various diseases. Wheat-meal bread must be distinguished from ordinary brown bread, which was often a mere mixture of coarse bran and inferior white flour."—Extract from speech by Miss Yates, before the Lord Mayor of London, in the Mansion House.—See Times, 18th December, 1880.
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W. M. Wright, Printer, Silver Street, Stockton.

Seven more of the young women were requested to buy 1 lb. of Dates, stone them and stew the same in a pint of water for one hour, then add ½ lb. of Sugar and 3d. of Rhubarb, cut up into squares, and boil all together for half an hour.

The other seven were requested to buy stone of Wheat Meal and make the same into bread the day before, cut the same into square pieces, and bring it with them, along with one Quart of New Milk each.

To give the ladies as little trouble as possible, we requested all who came to the supper to bring with them basins and spoons.

When the men and women were seated, the ladies commenced to serve the Porridge, to which was added Rhubarb Syrup and New Milk, with a square of bread. The meal was partaken of with evident enjoyment—all who were present praising it on account of its being so good and palatable.

Alter supper, the Rev. Canon Falconer, who took the chair, said he could assure them from his own experience that Porridge was a good and substantial food, for he used to take it when he was young.

I then addressed the meeting on cheap living. Mr. Wilson also spoke in favour of Bread and Fruit. Several questions were asked by those present, and answered by myself.

Yours respectfully,
W. M. Wright.

P.S.—Gooseberries staved with Raisins or Dates makes an excellent Syrup to cat with the Porridge, Rice, Barley, Durham, or Hominy Puddings, and by having a good supply, less milk will be required. This only need be tried to be appreciated.